
TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Remote will be Samantha Demetriou, and in case of connectivity issues, the proxy will go to Jennifer, but Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU I'm here, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Ashley Heineman?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Here, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Volker Griemann?

VOLKER GRIEMANN Present, sorry.

TERRI AGNEW Sorry, bad timing. Gaurav VEDI?

GAURAV VEDI Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE- Present, thank you.
ROBERTS

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL Namaste.

TERRI AGNEW Remote will be Damon Ashcraft, who is on, but in case of connectivity issues, the proxy will go to Susan Payne, but Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW Wonderful. Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE Present, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA

Here, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW

Most welcome. Remote, we have Susan Mohr, but in case of connectivity issues, the proxy will go to Osvaldo Novoa, but Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR

Hi, Terri, I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW

Hi. So, just so you all know, Julf is on, but we will be enacting the temporary alternate for NCSG, and it'll be Pedro Lana. So, Pedro?

PEDRO LANA

Present, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW

Welcome. Remote will be Farzaneh Badiei, but in case of connectivity issues, we'll go to Tapani Tarvainen. Farzi? Oh, there you are.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yes, hi.

TERRI AGNEW Hi. Perfect, thank you. Remote, we have Peter Akinremi, and in case there were connectivity issues, we had a temporary alternate, which was going to be Rafik Dammak, but Peter is in the room, so we are not going to enact that. So, Peter?

PETER AKINREMI Here, Terri, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE Present.

TERRI AGNEW Remote, we have Bruna Martins Dos Santos, but in case of connectivity issues, it was going to go to Benjamin Akinmoyeje. Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS Present, Terri, hi.

TERRI AGNEW Hi. Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Present, Terri, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Remote, we have Anne Aikman Scalese. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE Present.

TERRI AGNEW Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS Present.

TERRI AGNEW Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW I am here, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. And Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU

I'm here, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW

You're welcome. We do have the policy team supporting the GNSO in the room. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. All are welcome to use the chat.

Please use the dropdown menu in the chat and select everyone, if you would like everyone to see your chat messages. Councilors, if you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand and zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute and zoom, but on-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their zoom microphones disconnected for the benefit of other participants.

Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. There will be an Open Mic at the end of the session where attendees' microphones will be activated. Not yet. Those in the meeting room will be invited to cue at the standalone mic, which is back here. You all want to see it?

Those participating remotely will be able to raise their hands and zoom during Open Mic only and unmute their mics when called upon. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN

Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest.

With this, I'll turn the meeting back over to our GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE

Lovely. Thank you very much, Terri. Thank you all for joining. Welcome to our GNSO Council meeting for March, which also happens to be our meeting during the ICANN85 meeting on Wednesday, the 11th of March, 2026. So, first order of business is updates to statements of interest, if anyone has any that they need to reflect. And Tapani.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

So, Tapani Tarvainen speaking. I have a minor update to my SOI just updated yesterday. Only title change that I'm no longer the Executive Director, but Vice President of Finland.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, congratulations. Not seeing any other hands or any other updates. That sounds that's all good. Then I do have a hand. Sorry, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Sorry, I was late looking for the raise hand thing. I probably should say something right now, but it won't take into effect until much later in the year. But I've been selected by the At-Large to be the

next Board member for Board seat 15. Thank you. So, at some point in time, I will be leaving council.

SUSAN PAYNE

So, the Board's gain is very much our loss, I think. And we're already, you know, mourning you going. Hopefully, we will have you with us for a little bit longer. And we're confident that the At-Large will send us a suitable replacement. I mean, big shoes to fill, but you know. All right. Thank you, everyone.

Next, are there any proposed amendments to the today's meeting agenda? I think Lawrence, did you want to mention something in AOB if time permits? Okay. All right. We'll see how the timing for the meeting goes.

All right. And then we will just note then for the record that the minutes from the council meeting on the 15th of January were posted on the 31st of January 2026. And the minutes from the council meeting on the 12th of Feb were posted on the 3rd of March 2026.

So now we're on to agenda item two, which is our sort of review of projects and the action list. And I'll say every time I see review written down now, I just want to say Review of Reviews. But anyway, we've discussed a number of times now, the kind of the idea of reviewing our projects list and action decision radar. We had a good session in at the SPS in January. And actually, looking at what those tools are and how we use them. And we had a

suggestion from some newer councilors that will be discussing the tools in, I think, in our wrap-up session tomorrow, time permitting.

But for now, just this is really just a reminder that this is a good opportunity for any of our current council liaisons who've got any milestones or issues to flag for council. This is the chance if they would like to do so. And I'm not checking there. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG

So, council liaison to the Associated Domain Checks, PDP. Happy to report we've had our first four working sessions here in Mumbai. I think the Working Group is ready to work.

The first things they will be doing is, of course, looking at the work plan that's going to be communicated to the council. And we'll be starting our first call, I believe, on the Monday, the 23rd. Well, the one after Mumbai, looking around to see if that's correct. That looks correct, right? Okay. So, that's the small update. And it is a milestone for this PDP.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Jen. And, oh, Christian, did you have your hand up?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Just a very brief update on Latin Diacritics regarding liaison in that area. During the Public Comment period, Latin Diacritics group has received substantial and substantive comments from ICANN Org, which will likely require some communication back and forth to

determine a path forward on trying to address the comments. And there may be some facilitation that might be required just to make sure that there's alignment around how it is those will be addressed. We'll figure it out. And I'll bring back a path forward should one be needed.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks very much, Christian. I think just, yeah, keep us posted. Come and speak to council if you need any help or to one of the leadership team if you need guidance on anything.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Thank you so much.

SUSAN PAYNE

Great job. Thank you. All right. With that, then I'm, I think it's time for our consent agenda item. And I'm going to turn over to Peter.

PETER AKINREMI

Thank you, Susan. Can you confirm you can hear me?

SUSAN PAYNE

We can, loud and clear.

PETER AKINREMI

Perfect. Okay, so on the consent agenda, we just have just one item. And this should be straightforward, because we had a lot of

conversation and discussion around this. So, the council will be confirming Paul McGrady, who we know as the chair elect, as the DNS Abuse PDP Working Group chair.

So, like I said, this should be straightforward, because we've had a lot of conversation around how this play out. So, with that, I will just turn the mic to Terri to move us to a vote if there is no consent. No further discussion on that. I can see no hands. Okay. Terri, if we can move to a vote, that would be good.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you, Peter. All right. Vote time, folks, are one and only. We can do this. 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. Aye.

ALL MEMBERS

Aye.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you. With no abstention, no objection, the motion passes. Back to you.

PETER AKINREMI

Oh, thank you so much. I can see Bruna's hand.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks, Peter. As I mentioned in the council informal, I would like to make a statement on this, as I was one of the councilors raising some points about this process on the mailing list. But just to put it on the record that I personally don't think that the conduct of this process was optimal, nor was the communication between leadership, the council and the PDP members.

And I also hope that in the future we avoid having a non-confirmed PDP chair managing the sessions and instead rely on staff and council liaison to act on the interim. I think this is a good learning process for us. And hopefully in the future or nearly, like in the near, very near future on the second phase of this PDP, we get to remedy some of these issues. Thank you so much.

PETER AKINREMI

Thank you so much, Bruna. We hear you loud and clear. And I can see on the chat from Terri that you can send a statement to the GNSO mailing list. So, that would be great, so that that can be taken note and record. Thank you so much for making this a straightforward process. And I'd like to thank the SSC for their work done on this and also congratulating Paul. Thank you. And now I'll return the mic to Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Peter. Again, I'd just like to add my congratulations to Paul and thanks to everyone for supporting that recommendation and voting in favor of him. Noting the comments from you, Bruna, and I think I've learned some procedural lessons. I think we, rather than, unless we possibly could avoid it, I think what we would try and do actually would be schedule some interim meeting vote or written vote rather than trying to, rather than waiting to do something as a confirmatory matter. But I appreciate your comments.

All right. We are on council item four. This is a celebration of our GNSO accomplishments since ICANN84. This is something that we've been doing since our strategic planning session in January 2025. So, for the last sort of little more than a year now, we've been, it occurred to us and we discussed that we perhaps don't spend enough time kind of highlighting what has been done, both amongst ourselves, but also to a larger audience.

And so, we've taken now at these public meetings to highlight some accomplishments and milestones that have happened since the previous meeting. So this, in this case, this is the work that has occurred since our last meeting in Dublin.

And of those, firstly, the Latin Diacritics PDP, it published its initial report in January 2026, which was ahead of schedule. And they are currently, as we heard from Christian just now, reviewing the Public Comments that they've had in from that comment period prior to hopefully, in short order, resolving any issues that they have, and

finalizing their final report, which will come to us in due course. But that is a great milestone. You know, the work that group has been working ahead of schedule. And I think we're all really pleased with that.

Secondly, DNS Abuse. Again, we've heard already, but council voted to initiate two PDPs on DNS Abuse mitigation. So, the excitingly titled PDP1 and PDP2. And PDP1 began meeting here in ICANN85. So that is another big milestone passed.

Our third item to note is, is one from the Standing Committee for Continuous Improvement, or SCI, which completed its final report for the implementation of the policy status report on policy and implementation. Goodness, that's a circular title. And council voted to accept those recommendations at one of our recent meetings.

And then finally, just to note the Registration Data Request Service Standing Committee, or RDRS SC, which published its updated findings report and submitted that to council, which council has then reviewed.

We've had some dialogue with the ICANN Board and discussed some next steps on the SSAD recommendations based on those Standing Committee recommendations. And we are planning additional work sort of during this meeting and afterwards. So that's a, so four items really that we have to highlight in the

relatively short period between the Dublin meeting and our meeting here in Mumbai.

So, congratulations to all of the community members and councilors who participated in those work efforts. And we really appreciate all of the volunteer time and applaud you for being willing to step up and do this important work. All right. We will have another one of these check-ins at the Seville meeting. And actually, it's only a few months away, so perhaps we won't have quite as much to report, but really appreciate everyone's efforts. And we understand that this work runs on volunteers and it's noted.

All right. Item five then on our agenda, we can go back to, and it's a council discussion on the update on the proposed proposal to Un-Adopt approved GNSO policy recommendations. Honestly, I think staff are trying to give me a tongue twister. I'm pleased to say I'm handing this over to Jen, so I don't have to say that ever again.

JENNIFER CHUNG

There might be a typo on that one. Proposed proposal? Proposed, proposed? How many proposals do we need? Okay, this is Jen. I'm going to take us through this. As you heard earlier when we had our bilat with the ICANN Board, we talked a little bit about this. A little bit of a refresher for us if you weren't listening during our bilat. We had in November 2025 last year; we published a proposed process to enable the Board to reconsider a previously adopt policy recommendation from the GNSO for Public Comment. We received

a lot of Public Comments. This is kind of the time for us to take a look at it.

This proposal was based on an idea of the procedural gap and specifically the lack of a defined process for the Board to reconsider adopted GNSO policy recommendation. So, this process is proposed to be contained in the updates to our own GNSO operating procedures, specifically the updates to the PDP manual, the policy development process manual, and the GNSO guidance process, GGP manual. I can't speak these acronyms anymore.

So, based on all of this, staff has taken a look and proposed some updated text for these manuals circulated to the council to address these Public Comments, and we're going to take a look.

The recap again is we started discussing this in our previous SPS, so last year's SPS, and that was kind of coordinated internally. Those were the locations where we thought the updates were most needed. So, we actually bypassed the EPDP, we looked at more of the PDP and the GGP manuals, and then finally, as I mentioned during our bilat, this is not seeking to limit the Board's fiduciary duties, and we're going to take a look if we can go to this slide, which we're at already.

So, common themes that we got from the Public Comments, and almost everyone said and emphasized that it has to be an exceptional nature. So, it's not something that is going to be doing

that the Board hopefully is going to do frequently. We're not expecting that. We're not going to set this expectation either.

Of course, it's really important also the second part about the primary cause. Of course, there's a lot of talk even at this meeting, and to the Board as well, that there are delays, deferrals, and policy implementation, but of course, there's also a potential necessity for Board reversal, and it's not just limited to just these implementation-related delays.

So, we're looking also internally here in the council to discuss how to improve our PDP timelines and our outcomes, including at the implementation phase. So, if we ensure that policy recommendations that are Board-ready, again, every time I say this phrase, it seems a little ironic. We can make it sure that it is Board-ready recommendations, but of course, the Board has to reciprocate as well, meaning that these recommendations are both adoptable and implementable, right?

So, we're doing the most we can here, especially in our Board-readiness work, and while we've been talking about this a little bit more, there's expectations that the efforts will minimize the need for the Board to use this reversal process.

The third one is the Community Involvement in the reversal process. So, some commenters noted that it is important for the community to have some kind of involvement in the Board reversal

process, specifically, or I guess maybe like generally speaking, there has to be a greater transparency to the process, right?

And also, the expectation that the Board and the council will also raise concerns, discuss issues, I guess, through our informal channels and from semi-formal channels, of course, the formal ones that we do at our public bilaterals, and also, of course, our communications and letters to the Board. But it is really just important for us to appreciate the need for community involvement because of the tremendous work and the resource allocation that goes into one of our PDPs.

We've noted just before the incredible amount of time that a lot of people put in volunteer hours to create this policy. So, it really should be something that would be able to look at from the community standpoint as well. So, we also encourage, I guess, our own councilors to inform and update their respective constituencies and stakeholder groups so that any questions and concerns can be raised prior to decision points.

The fourth point about Reporting, there was some comments about regular reporting. So, for example, some suggested biannually of instances of where this Board reversal process is used as the reporting would help in transparency learning and review.

Leadership took note of this suggestion, of course, and also suggests that, of course, council can discuss how best to report in the process, take into the consideration that, ideally, this mechanism should not be used frequently to warrant regular

reporting. Of course, once it's used, there should be some kind of notation and report of that.

The last point is the placement of mechanism, and I think we kind of started this whole topic saying we kind of identified where this would be, which means it would be at the GGP and the PDP manuals. That would be the update, but, of course, in the Public Comment, we also heard that from specifically the IPC, they expressed a view that this process should be subject to the bylaws' amendment process, and the Board and GNSO council discussed the appropriate placement of this procedure, as I just noted, and really looking at putting it into the GNSO procedural documents. It does not diminish the weight of the process or the exceptional nature under when this process should be invoked.

So, I think, and I hope councilors also agree, if we look at updating existing red lines based on the feedback, we can still place it where we've identified as the most appropriate location for this.

Can we now look at the proposed specific edits to the process? Do we have that? There're some red lines now that we'd like to show on screen, and while they try to pull this up, I can go ahead. So, we had two commenters from the registrar stakeholder group and also Tucows propose red lines to the proposed process, and these two edits, we're going to, can we zoom in a little bit? Oh, a little bit more.

I'm going to try to look at this on my screen because I can't read that either, but I'll describe what it is. So, can we make it a little bit bigger as well, maybe? Oh, perfect.

So, for the specific edits, the first one is changing the word may to should. It emphasizes the expectation that the Board will use this process but does not unduly bind the Board, and then the second edit is adding the concept of changed circumstances would remove a potentially important limitation without either encouraging reversal or removing important safeguards that ensure this process is only invoked when absolutely necessary.

So, we've also proposed the addition of the word extraordinary to account for the rarity of this mechanism, and we propose also to add in additional time prior to Board action to allow time for councilors to consult with our specific respective groups. So, as we're kind of taking this in, I'm going to give us a little moment to take this in. Do we have any councilors that have immediate reactions to these proposed changes? We will circulate this, of course. Have we circulated this? We haven't yet. We have. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL

I have an English question. Is 'should' and 'must' interchangeable, or does 'must' means no space for negotiation and 'should' is it should be done but not it may be avoided? So, if we are seeing that this has to happen, should we replace 'should' with 'must'?

JENNIFER CHUNG

English is also not my first language. Is your proposal to change 'should' to 'must'? Okay, maybe Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE

I can answer on the English point, which is, I think, certainly as we within the ICANN community read that, a word like may or should doesn't have the same sort of outright obligation. So, if we are saying the Board must do something, then that is the term we should use.

I'm just not sure if that is what the feedback was, or indeed, procedurally, I'm not so sure if we can actually force the Board to follow the process, but I'm looking at staff about the feedback point.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thanks, Susan. This is Caitlin from ICANN Org, for the record. The specific comment from, I believe it was from the registrar stakeholder group, suggested changing may to should to note that we're, that this process can't bind the Board to act, but it's making a stronger suggestion than may. So to your point, should and must do have different meanings. Should is stronger than may, but again, it's not binding.

VIVEK GOYAL

Learn something new every day.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Vivek, is that still a hand? Okay, old hand. Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. Thank you very much. So, the IPC took a pretty heavy-handed approach to say no to these changes in this Public Comment. Appreciate the red lines. I don't think these address all the IPC's concerns. What is really our next step here? I mean, we got these red lines about 40 hours ago, and so we're not really voting on this today. What is the next step in this?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Damon. I think Caitlin might have an answer.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thanks, Damon. So, the idea would be to have an initial discussion of the updates that support staff made based on the Public Comments, but as you noted, this was provided to you all a couple of days ago, so we understand that more review time is needed.

So, depending on what people think would be an appropriate deadline, perhaps by the next council meeting there could be at least initial feedback from your groups on if additional adjustments are needed or any of these suggested edits are highly objectionable and why, that would be helpful for moving forward.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Caitlin. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Hi, thanks, Jen. It's Anne Aikman Scalese, and I'm NomCom non-voting and I'm remote. Just a question I have in relation to the phase of implementation where this action could be taken, and in the first sentence, I guess the second line, it says where that recommendation has not yet concluded its implementation, and then at the end of the third paragraph, we say in the last sentence at the end of the third paragraph, this action should not be available in instances where the GNSO policy recommendation has already been implemented and is in force.

I guess what I'm getting at is I'm not sure that those phases are completely, clearly determinable, but it's just something that popped out at me that I think we need to go maybe a little bit more thought to.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Anne. I'm also trying to understand your point. It's your point that it's not easy for council, Board, staff to determine where we are at in the implementation of said policy recommendation, or are you saying that it's not clear in this text that we're looking at, in this red line, that we've been articulating that these separate phases and what is the recommended action for the Board?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

I think the former, in that when we talk about policy recommendation and its implementation, are we speaking of a set

of policy recommendations, one particular policy recommendation? The implementation phases certainly can be long and drawn out. It's just something that jumped out at me that might require a little more thought.

Maybe staff thinks it's completely clear. You could be in the middle of implementing something already and then have the Board reverse the work that's been done on implementation because it's not final and it's not in force. There's something about that that I'm a little confused by. You asked for initial reactions.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Anne. I think it also shows quite clearly now that we probably need to articulate it clearly for councilors also to digest and bring back to their different groups before we have further reactions at our next meeting. I see a queue now. Peter?

PETER AKINREMI

Thank you, Jen. Taking a look at these, initially, we've not really had time to look at that and discuss that. Some of the changes that recently were made would be good for us to give HHSG&C time to take a look at these. Looking at some of the language and also before that, I wanted to ask, this is not binding, right?

This is just to give a guide on the process for the reversal of adoptions of the recommendation. Some of the language, I'm just kind of trying to see the meanings to that when it's read in limited and extraordinary circumstances.

This is subject to different interpretations. Also, when we say that the Board should take such actions sparingly and only where deemed necessary. These are subject to Board interpretations on what they think is right. We might need to carefully look at those languages and see how to better reframe it to reflect and not to give the Board the mechanism or instrument for them to continue to non-adopt PDP recommendations. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Peter. Of course, we look forward to suggested language should councilors have that as well. I think I can't overemphasize that because we saw there was a procedural gap and I think council previously have talked about a little bit more. I cannot stress how important it is. Just because we articulate this process doesn't mean we're encouraging regular use of this. In fact, we are discouraging that if I can emphasize this point. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Jen. Hi, everyone. This is Sam. I just wanted to respond to the question that Anne had posed about exactly what phase this process would kick in.

I think the important part to look at is Anne had pulled out the last sentence in the third paragraph, right, where the policy recommendation, this shouldn't be used where the policy recommendation has already been implemented in force. That is specifically referring to when the recommendation has

transformed, it's gone through its butterfly transformation, right, from a recommendation to actual consensus policy.

There is a generally speaking a very clear way to determine that because there is at the other end of that process an ICANN consensus policy that is documented, communicated to contracted parties, posted on the ICANN website and things like that. So, in the event that a consensus policy needs to be changed, the Board doesn't Un-Adopt the previous policy recommendation, then there would just need to be a new policy development process, right? There are new policy development processes that are initiated to revise or redo earlier existing policies that exist.

So, I think typically it is pretty clear when a policy recommendation has not been formally implemented because there is no artifact, right, there's no consensus policy, there's no documentation as a result. But to Anne's point about things that often take a long time or the status of them can become unclear because of the gap between when a policy recommendation is finalized and approved by the council versus when it is fully implemented, I actually think this is a place where this new practice of developing scorecards and keeping registers of the status of things can be really helpful.

And I think that's probably an effort that the council needs to coordinate with ICANN staff on, especially the staff that is in charge of keeping tabs on where things are and when they go to the Board and when they're in implementation and kind of how that progress progresses. So, I hope that clears up things for Anne a little bit.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Sam. Oh, I see a lot of hands. I know I'm noting the time as well, so I'm maybe, oh, and one of them went back down. Let's go quickly to Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

I just wanted to, thank you. Ashley, representing the registrars. I just wanted to put a finer point on that because it's, from the registrar perspective, it's really important. It's not when we're going through the implementation process. It's when things are published and we are held accountable to it per our requirements in the contract, because oftentimes that means we have adjusted our systems, we have created new things.

And if a policy is pulled at that point, contracted parties have already gone to considerable expense making changes to our systems. So, it'd be very difficult to pull back at that point. So, that's our interpretation of it. And I just wanted to shed some light there. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Ashley, for giving the context, especially from registrars. Anne, I'm assuming this is a quick response.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Yeah, very quick. It's just this language in the second line about the recommendation has not yet concluded its implementation.

Essentially, working, for example, on SubPro, that means a reversal, as long as it took in the IRT and SubPro to get to an Applicant Guidebook and to publish it and to finalize it.

There's a tremendous amount of work that was done, which if we're saying, and all that work's been done and the Board comes back at that stage, two years later, whatever, and reverses the policy recommendation, it's that phrase that's somewhat troubling. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Anne. Agree that I think we're all trying to avoid this very long period in this gap between policy recommendation, whatever process that happens behind that, and then to actual implementation and final implementation. I see Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks for that, Anne. I suppose, firstly, I mean, I think we all probably really hope that the kind of lengthy implementation that occurred for subsequent procedures in terms of drafting an Applicant Guidebook, we all know that was a big effort.

And I think that's more of an exception than the norm in policy processes, I would say. But also, I think it's we have to read this in the context of the second paragraph if this is going to happen, there is this expectation of a dialogue and a communication of reasons and a conversation about why it's the only or best option.

And something like we've spent three years drafting the Applicant Guidebook for you suddenly to pull all the policy there would be a conversation around that. I don't think that we could seriously imagine that would be we would look to this language and say that that was a reasonable path. I don't. So, I understand what you're saying. But I think there's a safeguard in the second paragraph there for the kind of situation you're envisaging, Anne.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Susan. Anne, is that a legacy hand? Okay, I'll go to Justine first. Yes, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Jen. Thanks, Susan. It just occurred to me and I don't know whether it's appropriate to do this on the fly, but just occurred to me, there is no mention of an understanding of the impact of the Board taking such action. So, I'm wondering whether that we should look at some language to add to maybe paragraph two, because it talks about intention, detail, rationale, and why reversal, which is all fine, but it doesn't suggest what we should look at in terms of the impact of this decision. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Justine. Very good point there. I see now the queue is now clear. It sounds like we have an Action Item for all of our councilors to really take this back, digest it, socialize this with the orgs and Cs, and we'll come back with further more detailed reactions,

including proposed texts that I already hear that councilors are thinking about by our next meeting. So, we'll have that articulated and sent over as an Action Item. And with that, I'm going to pass to Susan for our next topic.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Jen. Hi, everyone. Susan Payne for the record again. So, I think our next agenda item, item six, in a minute, we'll have the agenda back up, but this is around the next steps for the SSAD recommendations. This is really just a brief kind of mostly a heads up for the session that we are running tomorrow and a kind of reminder to the wider community of how we've got to where we've got to and just to ensure that anyone who hasn't been previously following this is aware.

Essentially, it's just a reminder that we aligned in council on the recommendation from the RDRS Standing Committee that the preferred path for dealing with the set of 18 recommendations relating to the SSAD system, that the preferred path would be for the Board to not adopt those recommendations as a package.

And that non-adoption by the Board is set, it triggers a process then that is set out in annex A of the bylaws whereby the council has some engagement with the Board and can develop supplemental recommendations. In this case, those supplemental recommendations would take into account the lessons that were learned from the RDRS pilot and would also have the benefit of the significant work that the RDRS Standing Committee did in kind of

reflecting on what the existing recommendation language says and what types of potential amendments might be appropriate.

So, during council's dialogue with the ICANN Board at our February meeting, the Board members that attended, they were members from the caucus, the relevant caucus in this area, noted that they thought that this seemed practical and that the Board would be working towards passing a resolution to non-adopt during Mumbai and indeed during our session with the Board this morning that we were given to indicate that, to understand that that will happen during the Board meeting tomorrow.

So, as a reminder then, really just what this means or even what it doesn't mean in going down this path, it wasn't the Standing Committee's intention and it isn't council's intention that the recommendations are being thrown away.

They were obviously the result of a huge amount of work from the community and a great deal of compromise but the council thinks that the path to developing supplemental recommendations is the right one in allowing modifications to get made to those recommendations so that we can keep as near as possible to what the sort of spirit of the original recommendations was but we can address the concerns that there were about implementability, how to operationalize, what the cost would be and so on and taking on board what we've learnt from running the RDRS system for its two-year pilot.

So, I think actually it's, I certainly haven't really been hearing too much concern during the course of this meeting where people, I haven't been hearing concern that people are concerned that these recommendations are being discarded but this is just a further opportunity to make absolutely clear that that's not the intent.

And then in preparation or in readiness really for the Board making that resolution tomorrow, we have scheduled to have a discussion on this tomorrow morning. So, we have a schedule specifically on next steps on the SSAD tomorrow morning at 9 a.m., so that's Thursday, and when we will talk a bit more about some early thinking on what the kind of, what the next steps could look like including things like the competition, I can't say the word, composition of the team who maybe could take that supplementary recommendation forward.

And so really this is just a kind of heads up both for councilors but also for the wider community encouraging anyone who's interested to attend that session tomorrow at 9 a.m., and we will talk in a bit more detail about next steps. Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN

Yes, thank you. Volker Greimann, RrSG, and while we don't have any objections against the proposed process in this case, I would just like to mention that if we go back on the original recommendations that these recommendations be seen as a package and not adopted unless as the full package, this might

have a chilling effect on future recommendations that might be packaged up as a compromise solution.

So, if future PDPs came up with a set of recommendations that they feel are indivisible and belong together and cannot be divided, then they might not be able to reach that compromise if we are now setting the precedent of dividing up such indivisible recommendations.

So, I think that should be part of our consideration and I fully understand where we are at and why we are at this position and I don't disagree with the proposed process but we should bear that in mind that future recommendations that are packaged as a compromise might not be able to coalesce in the PDP stage if we set the precedent now. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Volker. I'm not seeing any other hands in the room at the moment. I think, as I said, this mostly was just an opportunity to tee up that session tomorrow.

So, I think we can probably move on to our next agenda item, item seven, which is a recap from the outcomes of the GNSO strategic planning session which we held in January in Barcelona.

So I think we all agree we had a pretty productive couple of days at the SPS. I wanted to thank everyone who was able to attend and there was really active participation. We also had a couple of people, I think, who had to participate remotely and it wasn't

necessarily a terribly convenient time for them to do so but people joined us as much as they possibly could and with great willingness.

I think staff will soon be circulating a detailed write-up of the discussions and kind of points we reached agreement on at the SPS and we'll obviously all have a good opportunity to review that and submit any feedback and make sure that the detailed write-up does actually reflect what we all think we reached agreement on at that meeting. But in the meantime, I think Caitlin is going to just run us through a really kind of high level of the kind of main kind of outcomes and of what we discussed. So, I'll hand over to Caitlin now who can do this much better than me.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thanks, Susan. Caitlin Tubergen and ICANN Org for the record. So, this slide shows the predominant themes that the council discussed during the SPS. We spent some time talking about the tools the council uses to conduct its work, namely the project list and ADR. We also had a discussion taking advantage of the Board members that were present on next steps for asset recommendations. And then we talked about council's role through the PDP continuum from chartering all the way to implementation. We had a detailed discussion on council's prioritization, which will come up a bit later in this agenda.

And then lastly, we discussed an overview of improvements made to the PDP over time in light of some of the Board readiness

recommendations that the council received from that dedicated Board readiness Small Team. And that was a topic that came up recently in the council Board bilateral.

You all may remember that there was a recap after the groups or after the council broke up into small discussion groups to discuss next steps for those Board readiness recommendations and how existing improvements may account for some of them. And I believe it was Jen that went through the agreements that the council made, but we wanted to capture these here to confirm that we have them correct.

So, with my typical disclaimer that this is a recap of what we thought we heard as agreements, but if there's any additional context that folks would like to provide or any disagreement, as noted by Susan, we will be circulating a detailed report of all of the outcomes from that. And all of you will have the opportunity to adjust that if you think it doesn't reflect what happened in your memory.

So, if we could go to the next slide, please. So, the next series of slides shows on the left a summary of Board readiness recommendations. And then on the right, that is what the council agreed to if that recommendation was already accounted for. So, for example, there was a theme in the Board readiness recommendations about the Board and Working Group walking in one another's shoes.

And also, a theme that we've talked about quite a bit about Board representatives or official Board liaisons should endeavor to communicate concerns to a Working Group as soon as possible during the PDP rather than after the PDP so that where possible the Working Group can adjust those recommendations.

And so, the group talked about that while it's imperfect, the council thinks this is generally already accounted for by the addition of Board liaisons. And that Board liaisons do endeavor to always raise concerns prior to the group's publication of its final report.

Additionally, as have come up in recent Board bilaterals, there has been the addition or increase in frequency of informal meetings between the council and Board where concerns can be openly and honestly shared. So, that's another opportunity where Board members and the council can discuss these things if there are concerns prior to publication of final reports.

The recommendation two had a grouping of recommendations about when Working Groups might need additional resources. So, for example, if there's legal expertise needed or financial expertise needed, also there is a recommendation about how both initial and final report recommendations should have a concurrence of ICANN or independent legal advisor that the recommendations don't violate the bylaws.

So, what the council talked about at the SPS is that all Working Groups have the ability to request additional resources directly to the GNSO council, whether that's legal resources which have been

provided for previous Working Groups that needed that. Research requests, financial assessments, et cetera, that ability goes to the Working Group and the council can consider those.

Additionally, we talked about how Working Groups now by default have the inclusion of ICANN Org liaisons and that works with the cross functional team across the organization. That does include legal colleagues, finance colleagues who raise concerns that are incorporated into ICANN Org's Public Comment.

So, if there is a concern, whether it's a legal concern, a financial concern, an implementation related concern, a compliance concern, those would be provided by Org. And I think Steve and Karen went over how that's done during one of our working sessions. So, I encourage you all to review that if you're interested in how that's done.

Next slide. This recommendation about moving Board consideration from the final report to the initial report, this is similar to previous recommendations. The council discussed that if the Working Group desires a specific Board Public Comment, they can request that.

And that has been done in the past, particularly with the subsequent procedures PDP. However, the council at the SPS expressed a concern that a Public Comment from the Board should always be needed or requested. It should be done on a case-by-

case basis in hopes that the Board liaison is able to communicate concerns in real time.

And then additionally, I believe that councilors noted that if there is a PDP where there are concerns about fiduciary duty or specific concerns that require Board input, the idea would be to potentially extend that Public Comment period for the community so that the Board can look at those recommendations and the Board liaison has additional time to provide those concerns during the time that the Working Group reviews Public Comments received.

In line with that, the Board readiness team noted that the Working Group and Board should make decisions based on identical sets of information. And the council at the SPS noted some concerns with this said that to the extent possible, there can be a shared library of documents that both groups are using to make decisions. But because of the Board's role, there's likely confidential documents and analysis that the council would not or Working Group would not be able to have access to.

Recommendation 4 was one that I think unanimously had received concerns from the council. That was about the initial and final report should anticipate GAC advice. The concerns about this recommendation at the SPS, the agreement was the council didn't want to further pursue this.

They did note that GNSO Working Groups now extend invites to non-GNSO groups including GAC participants so that GAC members can raise concerns in real time. But that generally trying to

anticipate GAC advice really isn't the role of a Working Group. But the allowance of GAC participants at least gives the group a voice. But trying to anticipate GAC advice unnecessarily overcomplicates the process is I think what the group came away with from that recommendation.

Recommendation 5A is a recommendation where the group noted that where there's existing policy, the Working Group should indicate when they are intending to supersede existing policy. And the group talked about there's an existing Working Group or existing PDP improvement that has been added to all GNSO Working Group charters where there's a consensus policy confirmation.

Steve and Karen went over this the other day. But essentially now Working Groups are required to do this. They do a comprehensive review of existing consensus policies and confirm whether they do intend to supersede an existing policy and make that clear. This was a lesson learned from some previous experiences. So, it's now included in charters by default. I think this is the last one.

Recommendation 6 is about Working Group chairs. And the main theme that came out of this is the council emphasized the importance of training chairs, training new Working Group chairs, ensuring that the skills that are needed to chair a Working Group, folks are able to learn those and so that we can grow new leaders.

There were some concerns about the exact wording of the Board readiness recommendation, noting that it seemed quite

prescriptive and the council was concerned that it could be seen as dissuading emerging leaders or dissuading people from applying to be the chair. But noting again the importance of chair training.

So, one of the actions coming out of this was for support staff to review what currently exists in the form of training and share that with the council and see if that needs to be built upon.

So, that's a summary of the Board readiness recommendations and what existing improvements are already in place to address some of these. But again, if anybody disagrees with that characterization or thinks additional context is needed, please feel free to raise that.

SUSAN PAYNE

Not a disagreement at all, but just in relation to that chairing point, I think everyone has seen the emails being circulated regarding the sort of pilot chairing skills training which will take place before the Seville meeting.

That's being run at an Org level. It's not a GNSO's specific program, but I think it's fair to say that if it hasn't come out of some of the understanding that we were reaching in our Board readiness, then certainly others in the organization have been having similar thoughts about the key importance of having the right skills for chairs and trying to help them acquire them.

Caitlin, is there anything else we needed to talk about regarding the SPS? So, okay. And then in which case, again, not seeing any hands, obviously, please all do take the time when the fuller

materials come around to review them because it will ultimately become the record of our meeting and we do send it to the Board and that kind of thing. So please do make sure that you are happy with it. Steve?

STEVE CHAN

Yeah, thanks, Susan. This is Steve Chan from staff and I thought it just might be worth pointing out that once that report gets circulated and finalized, it includes outcomes and action items and that's sort of the determining factor when we can actually start working on the action items, too. So, it's very important for you all to review that report carefully because that kicks off the next step of actually carrying out all those actions. Thanks. Great, thanks for that. Steve.

SUSAN PAYNE

Jen, question?

JENNIFER CHUNG

I couldn't find the hand raised. So, Jen, for the record, during our bilat with the Board when we kind of gave some update on what we were looking at in our Board readiness work, Greg, at least on behalf of the Board or maybe Greg on his own personal capacity, was expressing interest to see where the next steps might be. So, maybe once we identify where those specific things are implemented, we might also somehow communicate it to the Board.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thanks, Jen. Caitlin Tubergen again from ICANN Org. That's an excellent point and the SPS report, which will show next steps and actions as well as a full recap of the recommendations discussed and council reactions to those will be included in the SPS report, which is sent to the Board for its information.

SUSAN PAYNE

All right, thank you very much. Okay, I think we can move on to our next agenda item then, which is Proposed Prioritization Methodology, and I'm turning this one to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Susan. Jen again. Now we're going to look at Proposed GNSO Prioritization Methodology. We've circulated a preliminary document, and I know it's not a lot of time for councilors to take a look at, but really this is really something, some straw man proposals, some text for us to kind of take a look at, take apart, bash it around a little bit more, discuss, and see if we can come to some kind of methodology.

I think at the SPS we've talked about the tools council has. We have the, of course, the ADR, but that in itself is not a prioritization mechanism. It's just decisions that are coming out that council needs to pay attention to, really action, decision, radar is exactly what it is.

We've had a number of discussions talking about enhancing our ability to prioritize upcoming work where there is adequate community and staff resources available to initiate new work. It's also important not to lose sight of the work that council has already committed to before identifying next projects.

So, specifically, again out of SPS, out of our February meeting, we are looking now to see if we can have or create a prioritization tool to complement the action, decision, radar, and we took away that action item from the February meeting that counts, sorry, the staff and leadership will kind of start a first draft of what this might look like, which is what you see on the screen and was circulated to council lists as well.

Caveats, staff and, I guess, leadership, we are not experts on prioritization. The options included here are certainly not the only options, and definitely the requirements and assumptions are really intended to guide the selection process, and a really good step to first consider is whether or not it's been included is a good starting point.

So please, again, look at it, digest it, maybe have some reactions now. We're welcome and invited to take this apart and take a look at it in detail, and then from there, we can probably hopefully determine what options best meet our needs, what options best meets the needs and requirements and assumptions and whatever mechanization tool, prioritization mechanism that we end up with.

So, maybe now we can open up the floor a little bit, or I don't know if staff wants to add, if I've missed anything crucial. I don't know if councilors have any initial reactions to this straw person text. Tapani.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

Thank you; Tapani Tarvainen from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. I have only had a cursory look at this, or quickly read through this proposal, but it is problematic. All the alternatives are more or less problematic. There is a lot of research dating back centuries, actually, about different voting systems and ranking systems and so forth.

And to summarize briefly, all such systems are bad. Some are worse than others. Almost all are worse than they seem at first sight. In particular, they tend to be susceptible to gaming, that is strategic voting that you should not, in order to achieve your objectives, you do not vote honestly as it were, but I wrote real preferences and also surprising outcomes.

I note that in this list of requirements and assumptions, there is no criteria for saying that they should be easy to understand the outcome, because it often happens even in a quite simple voting scheme. And then something like adding an irrelevant alternative change the outcome in a way that nobody really understands until they go through them. So, I would be very cautious against any

system that simply takes one round of voting, express your preferences and then calculate results from that.

At the very least, we should analyze, make it such a system where it's easy to see when something odd has happened, when someone has made a strategic voting. So, that, since this is intended to be advisory, but even that doesn't really help if it's seen as this is somehow good and neutral and whatever.

So, at the very least, there should be easy way to see that now this has gone wrong with rejected because somebody has played foul or because it's simply the math doesn't work out in this way the way expected. I don't have a ready suggestion to replace it with, but I have some ideas that I will try to write up later maybe. But basically, it reminds us that we can don't do a single round of voting because that will always break. Maybe that's enough for now. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Tapani. And I remembered, you told council very happily during our Strategic Planning Session that you're a mathematician. So, we really do rely on your expertise to tell us. Thank you again for reminding us that a single round of voting is probably the easiest to quote unquote game.

I think if we can scroll up a little bit on the options and caveats, requirements and assumption, the process should be flexible and easily modified to our needs as council. It has to be simple enough

to administer, but of course the consideration is if we have systems and mechanisms that are very clearly bad, see if we can find ways to incorporate substantive discussion on it or other hybrid models to kind of mitigate those bad elements of certain things.

So, we definitely rely on councilors or indeed, I guess, if you want to circulate this back to your SGs and Cs, if they have expertise to guide us a little bit more on this. Again, this is a first kind of draft that we're looking at this text. We really do invite you to take a look at it closely, bash it apart, come back to us with additional suggestions really. It's not that the council cannot work without a prioritization mechanism.

We have and we are continuing to work very hard on this, but having something that will complement the action decision radar will make council work more efficient and effective, especially considering there are many topics coming down that are very high interest and are very important as well. Thanks.

So, let me see where I'm supposed to be at. I'm looking at the time. Oh, I have missed a cue completely. I'm so sorry. Huge cue. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Jen. Fully taking on board what Tapani laid out here, and during our SPS, I very much understand where you're coming from on those points. I want to maybe offer a thought that hopefully mitigates some of those concerns, which is I think whatever methodology we test out, I don't even want to say adopt.

We don't necessarily need to commit ourselves to anything forever going forward, but if we do decide to test out any of these options listed out in the document, I think what's crucial to remember is that it would only be a starting point for a discussion, or at least in my mind, it should only be the starting point for discussion, right?

So, if each S, G, and C goes through an exercise of ranking or assigning priority levels to a specific item, we would then bring that back for a conversation among all of the councilors so that everyone's intentions would be well understood and very transparent, and then there would be a consensus building process to kind of figure out among everyone's choices, among everyone's rankings, what truly does rise to the top.

So, I'm hopeful that whatever we end up, if we end up going with one of these options, right, it is sort of step one in then a longer discussion that helps us get to this, a consensus of what the priorities are, but I will just say I do think it's important for us to do undertake some kind of exercise, right, to look at the roadmap of what's ahead of us and start to figure out how we're going to tackle things because we do know that there are some policy items that have been outstanding as potential work for the council for a while that probably do merit some attention. So, thanks to staff for putting this together. It's really good food for thought.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Sam, and yes, definitely. Steve, did you want to show, do you have your hand up, or do you want to wait? Yeah. Okay. Sorry,

Bruna, is it okay for Steve to just jump the queue really quickly for a little bit? Bruna's hand is up before you, Steve.

STEVE CHAN Me?

JENNIFER CHUNG Yeah. Oh, really? Am I looking at the wrong -- okay, I apologize, I am wrong.

STEVE CHAN No problem.

JENNIFER CHUNG Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE CHAN Thanks, Jen, I would never jump the queue. I might, but this is Steve Chan from staff, and I thought it might be helpful to point out that there's a section underneath each of the options that talks about how this could work, and I think there's still variability in that, and so Tapani mentioned that when perhaps you circulated out, and you know, once an option is determined, and you collect input from all the different S, G's, and C's, you could potentially have groups that try to game the system, so to speak.

And so, what I wanted to point out is there could be variability in how you actually deploy each of these options. For instance, if

you're worried about impartial data coming back, you could try to rely on a more impartial group to do it, and I would hazard, I guess, that staff, I can say honestly, we don't have a dog in this fight.

It doesn't matter for us which one goes forward, and so another approach, not saying this is the right approach, but potentially staff and leadership could take a first cut, and then you look at that and determine whether or not you think this is good or bad, or somewhere in between.

So, not prescribing that as an option, but just saying that there's different ways that you could deploy an option if the council gets to one that they like, that can maybe control for some of the things that Tapani and others might be worried about. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Steve. I'm looking at the right queue now, and we have Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks, Jane, and for the record, Steve was in front of me, indeed, so no jump in the queue. So, a comment, I think Sam got me thinking as well about this thing, because I would also like to look at the ranking options as a conversation starter, but at the same time, Sam, maybe replying to your intervention to us, it seems a little bit like the killer of conversation, because it would be very hard for us to go against what's on paper whenever council is trying to discuss or whenever council was trying to change the ranking of

something that was appointed by four SGs as a relevant one, but maybe for moving parts or recent developments in the broader ICANN community, we need to change the priority order of something else.

So, to us, it seems like we're sedimenting the lack of conversation and so on, and maybe a word of caution for me would be for us to not kill the debate within this. So, maybe NCSG is yet to discuss which one we would support as far as he highlighted in the chat. We would really like one that wouldn't recommend directly ranking or scoring and would not preempt the debate that we always had, but at the same time, like, regardless of the option we go forward.

It would be nice to have like two phases of council debates, like, before and after the final results and stuff like that, because to me, it feels like we're a little bit, like, killing the consensus exercise by making SGs voting on their own priorities, and we're losing the part where we all come together and discuss that maybe this is important for BC, because I'm seeing Vivek on the line as well, but also that other topic might be more relevant for CPH and stuff like that.

So, just putting that out there and maybe kind of highlighting very specifically what NCSG is concerned with, that we're in the bigger picture, we might be killing the consensus exercise that's based on debate and not solely ranking of positions and requests from community. Thanks, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Bruna. Again, just wanted to highlight again, this will be, and perhaps Sam articulated it very lovely earlier, it would be a starting point, and this should be a tool that helps council, not hinders council. So, in any way, shape, or form, if something, a mechanism comes out that actually hinders our work, hinders our progress, puts it in a deadlock, it is not a mechanism that council should consider. All right, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. I was thinking the same thing that Sam mentioned, that this should be a starting thing, and you know what, I was looking through the options and the way they are, this to be ranked, and I realized that even at a constituency level, doing this exercise will be so helpful, internally, if you do this otherwise, you just prioritize things based on your gut feeling that, oh, I think this is more important than that, right.

But if you go through this process, even at your ASO AC level, it will help you think through things more deeply. And I'm surprised nobody said this is too much work, because the first time you do this for all the open items, it might seem a lot of work, but new open items don't emerge so frequently. So, you just have to, like, do it once in one of your sessions, and it's a very good way, no matter what you pick, again, it's a direction, and I think it's a very good

start. So, kudos to the staff for putting this together. Very, very well done. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Vivek. Tapani?

TAPANI TARVAINEN

Yeah, I'd like to suggest a couple of ways that would be useful while testing these ideas.

First, obviously, try to come up with hypothetical situations where these will result in surprising or confusing results. But then also, test them so that, let's say, have a spreadsheet-type thing that we are likely to have anyway for calculating results, but use it so that people can keep changing their rankings after they see what others have done, and do that repeatedly, until people either come to consensus or know that this is not going to work and we'll do something else.

So, that we will not be surprised by the effect of your own vote. I'd like you to try, maybe I voted this way, what does it affect? That lets you see how it actually affects in the way that doing it once will not. And because sometimes it has a surprising effect. You change the order of the last two of your priorities and the top one changes, so things like that will happen in some of these.

So, maybe that might be a way to at least test this and even use as a tool that take two days or whatever to, you can change your vote as long as you like, and then say that, see after you have seen what

others do, that's the whole point. So, you can see that combined effect. So, it will be as a discussion tool, it would be useful.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Tapani, for already coming up with some suggestions on how we can look at it, and how we can possibly kind of test it, pilot it in some ways that we can see the results, and if it's actually effective and useful for Council. I've also been noticing there's a, very robust chat on this as well, on the chat, so I'd like us all to take a look at that as well. It's really important. I don't know if you want to take the floor on any of that, but I see Lawrence with his hand up. Lawrence, please go ahead.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE- Sorry, please forgive me, I wasn't physically with us at the SPS, and so maybe this was addressed. But what happens to issues that do not follow a natural course around prioritization? So, for instance, we have a letter from the Board asking us to do something, or an issue needs some kind of urgent action or attention. Where does that fall in this process? So, is this something that gets to be done periodically before any Council meeting, or there is some time where this kind of a process kicks in? Just need some clarity around this process. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Lawrence. I'm looking over to staff as well. There have been definitely big pieces of work that Council has had to put right

to the top of our list that didn't come in from the ADR. Looking at Steve, he's nodding. And I guess even with this prioritization mechanism, there will be instances where there's going to be a very urgent or very important topic that Council will also prioritize outside of this mechanism. Do you know what I mean?

I think a lot of the chat kind of tells us that Councilors are looking at, we're not going to be using this mechanism very regularly. Maybe it's like a twice a year thing, maybe once at the SPS and once mid-year. But there will be instances where there will be topics kind of airdropped onto Council's lap, and we will have to react quite swiftly on that. And I see some nods around the room as well. I don't know if there's any context or addition that we wanted to add on that point.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Jen. This is Steve from staff. And I think just to add is that I think this can be a useful tool for Council to leverage, but it would not be prescriptive in the sense that if some of the instances that you just mentioned happened if the Council has to react immediately, there's also potential to encounter resourcing constraints where there's something that the Council is already committed to do or plans to do in the short term, and then something gets airdropped, like Jen said, where the Council must react, then you have to shift things around.

And that could even include work that you're already undertaking where now you have to shift priorities. So, I think one of the

assumptions we have in here is this is a tool to use, but it is not necessarily determinative. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Steve. Just checking in with Lawrence. Does that answer your question? Okay. Ben.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE

Thank you. Benjamin, for the records. So, I just wanted to find out, whichever model we choose, would consensus come after we voted in any way we voted, or would we have the ability to go around to fight for consensus or negotiate for consensus while voting? Just thinking about that.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Benjamin, for that. I guess I think in this discussion, many of us have already expressed this is a tool as a starting point. It's something to help us and aid us kind of go through, and there's a lot of good comments on chat as well. Council's not going to use this as a be-all, end-all, we must follow this to the strictest letter with zero discussion. This is actually contrary to how Council works.

So, again, I have to emphasize this is going to be something that if we have a mechanism at the end of this process, it should be something to start our discussion, to help us look at things and organize our work. And if it comes to a point where this mechanism

deters us or is contrary to any kind of efficiency, I think Council would probably decide this is not something that we can use. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah, thanks, Jen. This is Sam again. Just wanted to plus one to what you just said. I guess I kind of alluded to this in the chat a little bit, but I guess if I could describe my ideal vision of how this process would work, we would maybe have a Council meeting where we walked through all of the specific topics that we were choosing between and going to prioritize and rank. And then each SG and C would go back to their groups and come up with --

Personally, I'm leaning towards one of the models that looks at different criteria and assigns values to each criteria. And that would be shared among the Council and submitted for everyone to review, kind of in a manner that Tapani described, where all the rankings and all the assignments are in one consolidated sheet and they could be adjusted as needed.

And what that does is then it just becomes the starting point for a discussion at something like the SPS, where we would have a good amount of time, not just 20 or 30 minutes on a Council call, but potentially a half day or even a day, where we would go through and each group could then explain why they ranked the criteria for specific topics in the way that they did.

Why did topic A get the highest urgency, but topic B got the lowest urgency, things like that. And then it really would just be a way to

promote discussion, not taking very much on-board Bruna's point, not delay or dismiss discussion. It would be a way to promote the discussion and have each group be able to kind of explain what its thinking is. And then from there, there would be some process. I'm not sure what that would look like. I think it would just be very discussion driven.

The Council would hopefully then be able to reach agreement of if we have three topics that we need to prioritize, this is the order that they go in. So, just wanted to kind of throw that out there that I think there is a way for us to work on this. There's a lot of good stuff here. I would really love to see us kind of at least just test one out.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Sam. I'm going to check the queue. It seems empty to me. I hope I'm looking at the right place. Next steps on this, I think looking at staff again, probably homework again for all Councilors to take a look at it, bash it around, take a look at the options. They're examples. They're not the only universe of options. You can propose a new option as well for us to take a look at further. Possibly we'll have that on the agenda in the next Council meeting or the one after that as well.

Happy to also note that the Board themselves, they don't have a dashboard either. Know that this is a very difficult thing to come to have and past Councils have tried and may not have succeeded.

So, maybe this is an exercise that we'll take a look at this particular Council to see how we can hopefully organize our work.

With that, I think I'm at time. Oh, and I see a hand. Steve.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Jen. This is Steve again from staff. I definitely don't want to put my finger on the scale, but from a staff perspective who are not mathematicians like Tapani, we think option one is probably the one that gives you a really good amount of data and it allows you to make educated decisions rather than something that's more-bright binary in black and white, like ranked choice voting.

So, for what is worth, as we are performing this analysis, we came to the conclusion that we think option one probably is a reasonable way to provide the Council with information to make decisions. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Steve. And now I'm noting a really good comment in the chat from Christian, and I don't want to belabor the point because I was on time for this topic and now, I'm one minute over, but I do want to also say, of course, we can look at hybrid models. We can look at the matrix model. We can look at not just a single axis of looking at the requirements.

It could be an x-axis and a y-axis. For example, in option one, those criteria mapped against, for example, Human Rights impact assessment, global public interest, something like that, multi-

stakeholder model, just throwing it out there. It can be something like that. So, please put your creative brains, mathematician brains towards this and we'll have a further discussion.

With that, I think I pass it to Susan for the next topic.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks, Jen. So, our next agenda item is just a quick follow-up on the Accuracy Small Team Recommendations, or rather one of the specific accuracy Small Team recommendations.

So, as background, council discussed how to make progress on the topic of accuracy about a year and a half ago, given that some of the limitations the scoping team that predated that discussion had encountered. And ultimately, we ended up with posing an information gathering and scoping questions to interested groups.

And a Small Team was led by Paul McGrady, which reviewed responses and came up ultimately with four recommendations. Of those, recommendation three was recommending that there should be a clear and user-friendly educational materials that could be provided before, during, and after domain name registration to assist registrants in understanding the importance of providing and maintaining accurate registration data through the life cycle of their domain registration, how their personal data is processed and how it's protected, and the consequences of providing inaccurate data or of not verifying the email or phone message that is required under the RAA timeline.

So, the Small Team didn't prescribe how those materials were to be created, but they just sort of recommended assembling a diverse and representative group of interested stakeholders to work on it. And then in the following that, ICANN Org, at the request of the registrar stakeholder group, produced a one-page document that highlights the importance of maintaining accurate registration data for registrants that registrars, registrants, and the community can reference.

And so that document, the registrar document, is not one that was produced due to the Small Team recommendation. It was actually a separate effort that just happened to be sort of more or less aligning. So, GNSO support staff sent that document to the council mailing list about a couple of weeks ago, I want to say, to gather some feedback regarding if we think that this is a useful starting point for implementation of that recommendation three that came from the Small Team.

So, I'm hoping that people have had an opportunity to look at that document that has already been produced and we can discuss any feedback in terms of whether we think it looks like it's sort of meeting the intent of the Small Team recommendation or whether we think it's a good starting point but more needs to be done. So, I'm looking at the queue and not seeing anyone. Just in a minute. Okay.

And I will just say that we now on the screen have, we can see at least the first half of the document explaining about data accuracy

matters and so on and some various sort of requirements. Again, this was sent around the mailing list a week or two ago. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thank you, Susan. This is Justine. I did have a quick look at this. I think this is some wording things that I would comment on, but I'm not going to do that right now. But I do want to sort of note that when I looked at this, I think the only thing that wasn't covered in what we requested was how is data processed. So, I don't know whether it's intended to be included in this document or linked to something else. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah. Thanks, Justine. Good spot. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. Thank you very much, Susan. I mean, I think with respect to those recommendations from the Small Team thanks to the Registrar Stakeholder Group, this is very nice, this is helpful. Certainly, spells out some good reasons why accurate data is important. But what this doesn't do and what it can't do is obviously prevent bad actors from just filling in garbage data and then using and then committing DNS Abuse.

And so, I think when we talk about priorities the IPC certainly sees it as a priority that we continue to work on accuracy. It goes beyond the recommendations of that particular Small Team, but just want to put that out there. This is an important issue for the IPC and

should be an important issue for the entire community that we continue to work on this and work on ways to have accuracy. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Damon. I now have a bit more of a cue. So, Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thank you, Susan. Caitlin Tubergen and ICANN Org. And I just wanted to note a quick clarification that I think Susan noted, but this document wasn't produced in response to that small accuracy, Small Team's recommendation. It was an independent effort, again, requested by the stakeholder group.

So, it's perfectly fine to say this doesn't meet that recommendation. It's also great to suggest what's missing, like Justine did, and it might be something that the group doesn't want to further pursue. But the idea was to show something that already exists. Maybe it does meet that recommendation. Or if there's a group like Damon, for example, if the IPC wants to have a look at this and build upon it or have a group within council build upon it, if they'd like, then that's an option.

Just wanted to provide additional information to the council of what already exists so that the group isn't starting from scratch. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Caitlin. So, I've got Jen first.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks for that clarification, Caitlin, and also for the questions that I think both Justine and Damon raised. I know that this is not actually in direct response to the Small Team recommendation. In fact, I think it was something that the registrars were working with to produce this.

So, my question really is a process. Are we supposed to recommend things to change this document? I think the answer might be no, because this is not something that we've asked for. So, we're taking a look at this as does this actually respond to what the recommendation is? And then we are supposed to be producing materials that can educate and answer the recommendation three of the Small Team. So, I think that's where we're at. I see nods. So, I think that's a good clarification.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay. Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Hi. As somebody who works primarily with web hosting providers, I wanted to point out that that first line, a domain name is more than a web address. It's a digital home that really, if you want to get accurate, it's not. It's an identifier that points to a digital home.

And the reason that that's, I think, really important when we're talking about these matters is that you start to immediately get a little bit of misinformation about what you might be able to expect out of an accuracy effort if you're decoupling it from the idea that really ultimately the content lives somewhere else and isn't directly associated with the domain name in that way.

So, I think that however this is used, we really need to do a better job of identifying that it's not where the stuff lives.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Christian. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Susan. This is Sam again. Just to very specifically answer the question Caitlin posed for us of this is a document that already exists. Do we think it's a good starting point or meets the recommendation that the Accuracy Small Team came out with?

I think the answer is no, which isn't to say that this document is not useful. I think this document is well written with the caveat of what Christian just pointed out because I agree with him on that front. But I think it is helpful and it's useful, but I don't think it meets really what the recommendation from the Small Team was looking for, which is to really specifically say this document isn't really geared toward domain registrants.

This document is answering a lot of questions about accuracy in general, but I think what that Small Team was really seeking to

provide or to create was something that is really specifically tailored towards domain registrants as they're in the process of registering a domain name and having to go through and fill out their registration data like profile and the individual fields, right?

So, I think it's not quite fit for purpose, which again is not to say that it's not a good piece of work.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Sam. Farzi? And then I've got Vivek and Justine and I'm closing the queue at that point because we do have to have time for the Open Mic. So, Farzi first.

FARZANEH BADIEI

So, yeah, this recommendation actually came from NCSG members of the council and it's exactly as Sam said. We had in mind not some kind of like webinar that the registrant can go and have a look, but some kind of like a guide that would tell them why the data should be accurate while they're registering the domain name.

And also, maybe later on when the registrar is reminding them to keep it updated, maybe there can be some kind of like messaging that tells them why it's so important and or like messaging in their portal and stuff like that. But it's exactly as Sam said, it's for the registrant and this document at the moment is not really suitable for that.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, thank you, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

The recommendation they gave, we all accepted that recommendation, right? So, we as a council are expected to create this information, see how it is disseminated, make sure it's done properly and check all that. If not, then I don't understand the purpose of this discussion. If it is not our role to make sure that the correct information is produced, is put up correctly and check whether this is done or not, then I don't understand why we are discussing this because we are not good at writing stuff. And if it is not us, then whose job it will be to do this?

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay. So, the recommendations from that Small Team, it was a council Small Team and they made recommendations to us. They weren't policy recommendations. They were just a set of four things that that Small Team suggested be taken forward.

Now, if this isn't taking that forward in the way that we thought that there was a possibility it might be, then we'll have to look again at what might we be able to do to take that forward, even if it's where do we find the home for it? It may not be that we are the people who are doing it, but we need to find a path for where to take that forward or how to take that forward.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yes, so now I'm looking at staff. So, what is the next step on this? Because we cannot take this baby and make sure it finds the right home. So, what is the process for this? If a Small Team makes a recommendation, who's in charge of implementing this recommendation? If we all agree, yes. Great. Let's do it.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

So, I think that's a council decision. I know at least in the Small Team and accuracy, Small Team members can correct me if I'm wrong. The idea was for it not to just be councilors, maybe involve interested stakeholders that might have opinions on this. But ultimately, the council would approve whatever documentation is created.

So, if you wanted to involve some communication experts in the community or if the groups that feel very strongly about this recommendation, if their stakeholders want to take a first cut and then share it, I mean that's an option as well. Or this might not be a priority for the council right now, but it was showing the document that already exists. The idea was to show there is this documentation available. It might not meet the recommendation, but it could be a helpful starting point for folks who are very interested in this topic and want to potentially enhance what already exists.

VIVEK GOYAL

If you don't mind, Justine, sorry, I know you're in the queue, but the recommendation seems very easy, right? But it is not. If you look at what it says that, before somebody registers a domain, during somebody registrations a domain, at the end somebody registers a domain, you're talking about changes in system at the registrar level.

It is not just about producing a piece of paper and putting up on LinkedIn and say we are done, right? So, I don't think we can take this challenge on it. I'm looking at my friends at CPH. They need to decide how they want to take this forward. So, maybe we should hear from them instead of us deciding, hey, let's change a to that. It won't help. So, that's my recommendation. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

All right, Justine. Actually, we did close the queue, so it would have to be incredibly short because we've got to do the Open Mic.

JUSTINE CHEW

Justine? Yeah, just very quickly. I was kind of hoping to not duplicate work, which is why I looked at it to see whether this would meet the criteria that we are looking for in terms of information sheet, right? And I spotted something that was missing from our set of recommendations.

So, that's fine. I mean, if we don't think this serves the purpose, then we'll have to look at an alternative way of meeting what we want. And I don't know if I'm wrong, but I saw something in the

chat that maybe the registrars might want to take a step at something that might meet what we want.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

Yes, if you don't mind, that's exactly what I was going to say. I'm happy to go back and with Volker and Hong-Fu to talk with the registrars and see if this is something we can put together for you all to take a look at.

SUSAN PAYNE

Lovely. Thank you very much for that offer, registrars. Very kind. All right. Thank you for all of that. And I'm conscious then that we are, I think, a minute or so behind on our agenda, but we have, I think, a next path on that and we'll circle back on it and hope that the registrars can give us an update at some point shortly.

Open Mic now is our agenda item 10. So, this is, we've allocated 10 minutes for this and this is the opportunity for anyone to bring up anything that they would like to bring to council's attention. And we have a mic behind me. I might move over a little bit, but do come and queue up if you would like to bring anything up.

TERRI AGNEW

And just in addition, remote participants, you now have the ability to raise your hand in zoom. So, please feel free to do that and you will be called upon when it's your turn.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Oh, I am so not as cute as that kitty. Sorry about that, guys. I'm Kathy Kleiman in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, but I'm really here as co-chair in my role where I was co-chair of the Rights Protection Mechanism Review Phase 1. And I wanted to share something with you that I thought might be valuable as you consider Phase 2 and whether Phase 2, the review of the UDRP, is soon or later.

Eventually it's going to come around again on the guitar and we're going to get to it. And what I wanted to do is share a story of something that really helped us when we kicked off the review. And it's staff. I'm putting you on alert that there's a real compliment coming up. Because when we started, the first thing we did was try to sort the questions.

In those days, the questions got passed to the Working Group. And we were trying to sort out the questions on the trademark clearinghouse that we were going to deal with first and how to prioritize them. And the trademark clearinghouse was still fairly new. Some people had used it. Most people had not. Some people liked it. Some people didn't. How do you review it?

And then, manna, I came from heaven because ICANN Org had commissioned an independent data study from the analysis group in Boston. And they had sat down. I remember sitting down with them in Marrakesh. They'd put out a call. Wendy Seltzer and I sat down with them for an hour and shared our questions about the trademark clearinghouse. But I noticed that they were going to

each SO and AC, each stakeholder group that wanted to talk to them and collecting their questions.

And we had questions. Other people had questions, whole different perspectives. And then this study falls like manna from heaven. And we went from arguing with each other about our perspectives to finding common ground and saying, we have this independent data and we have questions. Now let's sort them out and work together. And it totally gave us the path forward.

So, now for phase two, the UDRP review, you've got a lot of questions. Look at your 2016 charter. You've got a lot of questions to sort and prioritize. And we know you're not going to just pass it on to the Working Group the way it was passed on to us. You will be reviewing it. You will be sorting it. You will be prioritizing it.

So, please go from manna from heaven and get an independent data study where everyone, all SOs and ACs who want to participate, all stakeholder groups can provide their questions because I promise you, we will see things just like the trademark clearinghouse report that no one could have anticipated.

No one could have seen. And just because I learned from Steve DelBianco, you always have to show something. You always have to have a guide. The WIPO-ICA report is a great group of experts, great group of insiders who told you what they want and use it. We don't hear from 95% of the registrants that they don't show up at these proceedings. So, how do we reach out to them?

And also, I did have to share because I was asked to, that this group of insiders is great, but they're saying civil society was represented. And talk to me offline if you want to hear what the three members of civil society think, that they feel a little misrepresented in this, but really the answer is all sorts of expert inputs, but also independent data.

And so, you've got the time. Let's look at, oh, and you have the data. There's only a hundred thousand UDRP compliance, even if you go for the last 10 years, plenty of data. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay. Anyone else want to join the queue and tell us what you think? This is your Open Mic opportunity. So, please don't be shy. Even if you just want to come and ask us a question on why are we all here?

Okay. All right. Then I think we'll move on to AOB. And I think we have an update, certainly one item of AOB that Terri has for us, which is an update on the GNSO chair election timeline.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you very much, Susan. I just dropped a link in chat that goes to our GNSO council webpage, the election. So you will see the election timeline on that page. I just want to let you know that the notification was sent out to council on the 27th of February, and it's slowly coming up on screen. Anyway, it was sent to the council mailing list on the 27th of February with all these dates. So, you

don't have to have them memorized, but please start talking about this in your SGs and Cs. On the 19th of June, that's our date that we'll start receiving funded travel for ICANN87, which also tells us new council members that will be coming on council. They can start getting prepared.

On the 21st of September, the houses will submit the nominee for the GNSO chair to the council. And on the 18th of October, there will be a candidates' meeting during ICANN87. And then the big date, 21st of October is our GNSO chair election on that actual date during ICANN87. So, there you go. Start talking about this and getting names lined up. Back to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Terri. Okay, it feels like we just elected a chair and we're already talking about the next one. I don't know how to take that. I'm feeling very hurt. Okay. We have about six minutes before the end of our meeting. So, I know, Lawrence, you said that if there was time, you'd put something on the agenda, but you may feel this isn't enough time. In which case, we have a wrap up meeting tomorrow. So, I'll see what you think.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE- Yeah. So, we can do this tomorrow, but I think Vivek also had something to do with regards directions for later tonight.

VIVEK GOYAL

Wait two seconds.

LAWRENCE
ROBERTS

OLAWALE- No, no, no, we can do it tomorrow. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

All right. And then we have the council dinner tonight. Reminder to pay Vivek. I'm informed that he will take U.S. dollars, but he is also willing to take Indian rupees as well, which is a relief to me. And I don't know if anyone else knows any more about it than I do, but we, yes, Terri is going to help me.

TERRI AGNEW

Oh, I just, I believe Andrew is going to show a map. Do we want this off the recording portion? Maybe. Okay. We'll do that off the recording. So, yes. Also, if anybody does not have cash, come see me. I might have options for you. Some exchanges can take place at a trash can. No. Right, Christian? But yes, please come see me.

And really quick, please leave earlier versus later. Last night, cars were a little bit more difficult to get. That was some situations that we ran into. So, please don't wait till the last minute and start talking amongst each other and start carpooling. So, there you go.

SUSAN PAYNE

All right. With that, I think unless there's anything else that anyone wants to bring up, I think we can wrap up our meeting. So, thank

you everyone. And we'll stop the recording and see everyone a bit later.

TERRI AGNEW

Lisa, you can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]