

---

**ICANN Transcription  
GNSO Council Meeting  
Thursday, 12 February 2026 at 21:00 UTC**

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

[https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/Acpqy98UJ6g0PpQUkKVs834m-oPaMoInBM-WtUhLn9jK3giF96PK4RDTyx49Ryp\\_4PG2xc3ubIH7Xoph.pXfzrz2c0NoIJv2b](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/Acpqy98UJ6g0PpQUkKVs834m-oPaMoInBM-WtUhLn9jK3giF96PK4RDTyx49Ryp_4PG2xc3ubIH7Xoph.pXfzrz2c0NoIJv2b)

Zoom recording is available at:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/jnZIU8uE97sxnjazBCXduG0xE0S0jMulcBkTAGMIYbI7r1nbR25U8isNobEJ2GXG.DYFFUVE01y5QINN4?startTime=1770930058000>

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

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar/2026>

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Anne Aikman Scalese (absent)

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Volker Greimann (first meeting as Councilor, replaces Prudence Malinki)

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav Vedi

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa (apology, proxy to Susan Mohr), Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne, Susan Mohr

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi, Tapani Tarvainen (apology, proxy to Julf Helsingius), Benjamin Akinmoyeje

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Christian Dawson

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Justine Chew: ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests:

Board Caucus on Data Protection and Privacy: Wes Hardaker, James Galvin, David Lawrence and Greg DiBiase

ICANN Staff:

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

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

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

Caitlin Tubergen - Director, Policy Development Support (GNSO)  
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)  
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO) (apology)  
John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)  
Andrew Chen - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)  
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)  
Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO)  
Devan Reed - Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO/Programs and Operations)

TERRI AGNEW: The recording has started, and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council Meeting taking place on the 12th of February, 2026. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it. Nacho Amadoz.

NACHO AMADOZ: Here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Jennifer Chung.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Hong-Fu Meng.

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

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Samantha Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Ashley Heineman.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Volker Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Present and accounted for.

TERRI AGNEW: Yes. Just to alert you all, Volker replaces Prudence Malinki, and this is his first meeting in doing that. So, welcome, Volker. Gaurav Vedi.

GAURAV VEDI: Present. Thanks, Terri.

---

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

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW:                    Welcome. Vivek Goyal.

VIVEK GOYAL:                    Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW:                    Most welcome. Damon Ashcraft.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:                I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW:                    Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE:                    Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW:                    Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa.

---

OSVALDO NOVOA:            Here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW:            Most welcome. Susan Mohr.

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

TERRI AGNEW:            Most welcome. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELISNGIUS:        Here.

TERRI AGNEW:            Farzaneh Badiiei. Farzi, I do believe you're on. You're on muted on the Zoom side. Oh, she wrote in chat she's having audio problems, so hopefully we can get that fixed, but she is here. Peter Akinremi.

PETER AKINREMI:        Here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW:            Most welcome. Tapani Tarvainen sends his apologies. The proxy goes to Julf Helsingius. Benjamin Akinmoyeje.

---

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Bruna Martins dos Santos.

BRUNA SANTOS: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Christian Dawson.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I'm here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Anne Aikman-Scalese. I don't see where Anne is on, but we'll go ahead and try to reach her. Sebastian Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I am present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: So am I, Terri. Thanks.

---

TERRI AGNEW:                    You're welcome. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU:                    Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW:                    You are welcome. Some of our guests today will be from the Board Caucus on Data Protection and Privacy. And the guest that could be joining are Sarah Deutsch, James Galvin, Wes Hardaker is on, David Lawrence, Greg DiBiase is on. The policy team supporting the GNSO is also on. So, you have Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Andrew Chen, Devan Reed, and myself, Terri Agnew.

May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. A reminder that we are in a Zoom webinar room and counselors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat. Please change your chat now and select everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges.

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN Multi-Stakeholder Process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest. With this, I'll turn the meeting back over to our GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE: Lovely. Thanks so much, Terri. Welcome everyone to our GNSO Council Meeting on the 12th of February, 2026. Welcome to our Board guests, really appreciate you joining, and looking forward to a discussion in a few minutes about the next steps for the SSAD recommendations. But first up, we do initially have to do our regular check to see whether anyone has any updates to their statements of interest. I'd never expect to see a hand for this item. Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Susan. This is Jen Chung for the record. I also didn't expect that, but just administrative update to my SOI, .asia organization is the organization I work for. We recently had our AGM, so we are a membership organization, so there's been some number changes in that and also our financial interests in certain gTLDs as well. So, now the only remaining one aside from obviously .asia is .kids. So, just some administrative updates to my SOI.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Jen. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Susan. This is Justine. Just a short note to say that I will be observing the PDP 1 on DNS Abuse Mitigation.

---

SUSAN PAYNE:                   Lovely. Thank you. And Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:           Yeah, just to say that I left GoDaddy and joined Unstoppable Domain a month ago. I've informed people already and my SOI is up to date, but it's the first time I get to say it on the mic. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:                   Excellent. And congratulations on your new role, Seb. Okay. This is just unprecedented, three SOI updates. Thank you very much, everyone. And then next up, are there any amendments proposed to the agenda that we should have a quick conversation about? Okay, I'm not seeing any.

So, in which case we can move on. Just to note for the record that the minutes of the Council meeting on the 11th of December, 2025 were posted on the 5th of January, and the minutes from our 15th of January, 2026 meeting were posted on the 31st of January, 2026. So, we can move on then to our second item on the agenda, which is the regular review of the projects and action list. Yes, that's perfect.

So, we did have the opportunity to talk during our recent SPS meeting about the projects list and the action decision radar, and there were some suggestions from newer councilors. So, in particular, as a result of that, we will be doing a deeper dive into those tools and how best to utilize them, which we'll be organizing quite soon, I hope. And did also want to note that support staff is

---

endeavoring to highlight upcoming voting items by flagging them a bit more clearly in those tools.

Currently, they're apparently using a siren emoji. I'm not quite sure what that looks like, but I'm sure someone could remind us at some point, or, well, in fact, I'm sure we'll see it as we see that. But it should hopefully make it a bit easier for people to see that something is going to be voted on and therefore help get advance instructions from our respective groups.

And then also to note, also as discussed at the SPS, Council leadership is working on some draft improvements to the GNSO Council liaison documents to help assist our current and future liaisons in understanding what the liaison role is and in giving some updates. Okay, now, I think it's the point at which we just pause and see if any of our current liaisons to either any PDPs or IRTs have any kind of milestones or potential issues they want to flag for Council.

And again, I don't think I'm seeing any. That's not a particular surprise. But at which point then we can move on to the next agenda item. And I'm gonna turn the floor over to Peter who's going to look after our consent agenda and voting item that follows it. Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI:

Thank you, Susan. To move us forwards for the item number three on the agenda is the consent agenda, and we have just only one consent agenda, and this is for the Council to confirm the GNSO-nominated ICANN Program Mentor. The SCC nominated

---

one person, and the person is Imran Hossen to be the next GNSO ICANN Fellowship program manager. I'm gonna give the mic back to Terri to move us forward in this process.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. All right, folks, we're gonna go ahead and get a vote on this. Here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing No one. Would anyone like to vote against this motion, please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say aye.

EVERYONE: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And Julf for Tapani, please say aye.

JULF HELISNGIUS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. Thank you. The motion passes with no abstention, no objection. Back to you.

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Terri. That's smart. So, I would also like to thank the SSC for their excellent work for nominating Imran Hossen for this. So, moving to item number four is also Council Vote on SCCI

---

recommendation. SCCI was entrusted to review the policy status report that was developed by the ICANN GDS, and this was based on to see whether the consumer mechanism and processes are actually efficient in working.

So, this policy status report was assigned to SCCI for review. After SCCI deliberations on these and they look at the policy status report, they found that this mechanism, which are the processes for the GNSO, mainly the EPDP processes, the GGIP, and the GGP processes are actually working as intended. However, so the SCCI made through recommendations which are minor recommendation to the Council.

And this recommendation has been sent to the Council for review. And also in our last meeting we had, Manju was the Chair of SCCI to present this to us. And this recommendation, one of the recommendation talks about developing educational materials to make people to understand that this process and also to get us aware on this and improve the clarity of these processes.

So, they're making through recommendation to the Council. I will stop here to see if the reactions are coming from the councilor on these before I read the resolve clauses. Okay. I'm not seeing any reactions incoming. That's good. Okay. So, I will proceed to read the resolve clauses for these.

Okay, resolve one, the GNSO Council adopt all three recommendations as outlined in the Final Report. Resolve two, the GNSO Council requests that the SCCI in collaboration with the GNSO Policy Development Support Staff implement all three recommendations as soon as feasible. Resolve three, the GNSO

---

Council thanks the member of the SCCI for its works. I'll then the mic to Terri to move us to a vote.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. Okay. Vote number two, everybody. Also, Peter, Manju would be proud of you pronouncing it correctly, SCCI. It warms my heart when you did. Okay, here we go. This will be a voice vote. 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.

EVERYONE: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Councilors holding proxies, so Julf for Tapani, please say aye.

JULF HELISNGIUS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. With no abstentions, no objection, the motion passes. Back to you.

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Terri. Then to move us forward in this meeting, I will turn the mic back to Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Peter. The time for our Council discussion on the next steps for the System for Standardized Access Disclosure or SSAD recommendations. So, I think most councilors were already on at the beginning when it was pointed out that we've been joined by a few members of the Board, but some people were perhaps still in the process of joining.

So, really just a flag, and again, welcome Wes Hardaker who's the Chair of the Board Caucus on this issue. And we also have David Lawrence with us, and Greg DiBiase has returned to us. It's not long since he left us behind really, but Greg is back with us again to talk about the SSAD.

So, I thought it would probably be helpful perhaps to just sort of introduce the topic if that's okay with everyone. And really a reminder that during our recent Strategic Planning Session, the SPS meeting that we had in January, we did have the opportunity to discuss the next steps for the SSAD recommendations, and we also had the benefit of Greg and Chris Buckridge being with us for that discussion as well.

So, really appreciate that some of the Board members have been able to join us today, and again, really appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion. I thought it would be useful to summarize in a little bit just the discussion that we had during the SPS. And particularly, I think it's reasonable to say that Council aligned on the recommendation that came from the RDRS Standing Committee.

---

That would be recommendation five, which is probably the preferred path for dealing with the SSAD recommendations would be for the Board to not adopt those 18 SSAD recommendations as a package so that Council can then develop supplemental recommendations, which would take into account some of the lessons learned from the RDRS pilot.

And the aim of that would obviously be to have a set of supplemental recommendations that the Board would be able to adopt. I think that there certainly has been a little discussion about sort of internally within Council, but probably also in some of our constituencies about whether all of the recommendations would need to be non-adopted, as in should they be treated as a package?

That certainly was also a conversation that the standing committee definitely had, and this was their recommendation and I think it's something that Council lined behind after some discussion. Probably one of the main reasons being that they were prepared as a kind of comprehensive package, and that when the standing committee went through and looked at each of the recommendations in turn and assessed whether they could stand as they were, the level of perhaps work that might be needed to change them and so on.

There were a very small number that potentially might need relatively little to no change, but generally speaking, even then there would probably be some kind of consequential change that would be needed. And in addition, these are recommendations for the building of a system, and therefore if one or two were left standing or were adopted by the board, it's not as though they can

---

really be taken forward until this other work has taken place in any event.

So that's really, I think that of the main thinking behind the concept of keeping them as a package for this purpose. So, the supplemental recommendation path is certainly is a path that's set out within Annex A of the ICANN bylaws. Annex A obviously is the annex that deals with the PDP process. And the specific section is section nine.

I'm sure our Board colleagues are kind of well familiar with that, but kind of for the sake of the observers and the recording, basically what this says is that where the Board has determined that policy is not in the best interest of ICANN, sorry, the ICANN community or ICANN, it then triggers a process effectively that calls for a statement of a kind of statement as to the reasoning, the rationale for that view of the Board.

And then a discussion between council and the Board after which council either affirms or modifies its recommendations and they have then termed supplemental recommendations and go back to the Board, well, go back to council first of all, and then go back to the Board. And so, I think both as council and within the Board, we are somewhat familiar with this as a procedural path, having used it relatively recently with the non-adopted recommendations from SubPro.

During that process, Council put together what we called a small team plus. That was essentially just a working group. It consisted of councilors who wanted to be involved in the process, and then subject matter experts, a number of them who were selected by

---

the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, as well as some from interested advisory committees, so from the ALAC and the GAC.

And then the small team plus worked through a successful process in producing supplemental recommendations. And during that process, it was greatly assisted by the fact that there was really active engagement by some of the ICANN Board members. And so, it was able to be a very collaborative effort, which I think is viewed as having worked extremely well.

It's also worth just remembering that in proposing this as the path forward, it wasn't the standing committee's intention, and it's certainly not the Council's intention to toss any of these recommendations in the bin. They represented obviously a great deal of compromise and work from community participants. But Council thinks that the supplemental recommendation path allows for important modifications to the recommendations to be made, and where possible keeping as near as is possible to the original intent of what the community had agreed on.

But addressing the concerns that there are with the existing recommendations and taking on board some of what was learned during the RDRS pilot and potentially including some of those improvements to the RDRS that have also been recommended by the standing committee. So, we are aware obviously that there could be some concerns about this path. That there could be the feeling within the wider community of community development recommendations being discarded.

---

And I think we want to give an assurance that as we move forward, Council would be committed to helping to ensure that there's correct messaging and to try to allay any concerns along those lines that might exist. So, we would certainly be happy to work with our Board colleagues and ensure that we can deliver the right messaging.

So, I think that's probably what I wanted to say really by way of introduction, and perhaps this is now the time maybe to turn things over to our Board colleagues and see if there's anything you wanted to add. We understand that you spent some time talking about this in a recent board workshop, and so I think there would definitely be some interest in learning what the Board's thinking is on this and potentially on what next steps might be.

WES HARDAKER:

No, thanks very much. I think your outline of the situation as is was perfect, but I'll add a few little bit. First off, I'm Wes Hardaker, I'm the RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board and the new Chair of the Board State of Protection and Privacy Caucus. And yes, we have been discussing this in a number of places, including in the caucus, and I would say multiple Board workshops for that matter too. This problem has been long coming, of course.

And the Board is actually very pleased that it looks like a forward path to this problem space is finally coming to light as obviously a highly important topic to the community as a whole. And as such, the Board does appreciate the council's recommendation following the standing committee's recommendation to not adopt the SSAD recommendations as they are at the moment.

---

We considered many possibilities of different pros and cons of all the different available paths forward, and there is no perfect solution, but it does look like that non-adopting them as a whole is probably the best path that would allow the easiest and fastest forward progress. So, we'll likely be making a resolution to do that in the near future post this conversation, of course.

And so, by doing so or more accurately by not doing so, I'm not quite sure the number of negatives to put in that sentence, it will trigger the work on supplemental recommendations per the ICANN bylaws. We are hoping that that new policy work can be accomplished as quickly as possible as current approved continuation approval of the RDRS service that we approved last November goes until November of 2027. So, that's not a super long timeframe to consider policy changes.

I'll note that it's also an open discussion as to whether policy and implementation work can be completed in the same time period. So, we are trying to figure out how to deal with the timeline pressures that the community, this has been a problem for a while and trying to best expedite the process of eventually coming into a full long-term solution as quickly as possible. That's a hard thing to do.

The Board does want to request that in the process of working on new policy changes that the Council make sure to consider the advice provided by the GAC and the SSAC in the supplemental recommendations as well. Obviously, I'm sure you're aware both of those two groups in particular have some strong opinions, but of course, the community as a whole will have opinions on the subject. And note that the disclosure policy related to registrars

---

with affiliated privacy proxy services should also be aligned with the supplemental recommendations.

So with that, if any of my fellow Board members want to make a comment, I just would not be surprised if Greg does, who you guys know certainly well, and we appreciate you giving Greg to us. He's been an incredible asset on the Board. I see Greg's hand up. So, why don't you go ahead, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks. Not a whole lot to add. That was a great summary. I guess the one thing I'd add, we are looking closely at the RDRS Standing Committee Report for guidance that came from the community and aligns with a lot of the Board's thinking, which is great for a starting point. And then it also flagged that we are looking at the alignment paper that ICANN put out on how to align certain policies. Wes mentioned privacy proxy, and that's just a good example. We'd like if the supplemental recommendations could align that existing work on privacy proxy with the ultimate SSAD recommendations, that's also an outcome we're looking for.

But otherwise, I think this is pretty thorough. I was like, I want to steal these slides to present to the Board because these are way better than the slides that we had last time. So, great summary and happy to answer your questions.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Greg. I just let in before Ashley put her hand up. So, I will just circle back to one of the things that you said, Wes. You mentioned the desire and the importance of getting this

---

work done as quickly as possible. I think that very much aligns with the conversation that we were having during our SPS discussion.

I don't know that we have a firm timeline, but when we were talking about, I think it even came up during a discussion about our prioritization of workload, when we were talking about this work, we were thinking about it in terms of we shouldn't be spending years on coming up with supplemental recommendations, we should be spending months, and that I think is a fair reflection.

So, somewhere less than a year, we would hope we would have done this work and ideally it wouldn't take us too long. We do also have the tremendous benefit that obviously the standing committee has done an enormous amount of thinking about this already and have made some really helpful suggestions in their report on the kinds of things that they explored. Okay. Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Susan. Ashley, representing registrars. So I guess my question is, well, I appreciate we've had ample opportunity now to discuss this, and we've been able to go back and talk a bit about it with our constituencies. In terms of next steps, what actually triggers everything?

I'm assuming that the Board has to formally non-adopt, I was about to say reject, non-adopt, and then there needs to be a dialogue, and I'm just curious as to the formality of a dialogue just so I can understand. This is not like a process I'm terribly familiar

---

with, and just like, what are the next steps, just so I'm and we can all be prepared. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER:

I don't know who wants to speak to that. I am not the lawyer in the room that knows the bylaws like the back of my hand, but yes. So the next steps on the Board side, we will be most likely passing a resolution in March to not-adopt them. And as I said, that will actually trigger the GNSO Council's supplemental, whatever they're called, supplemental recommendation addition. And I greatly appreciated the discussion around the timeline.

I do hope that this is not a rewrite from scratch, so the time required to make the necessary changes to bring into alignment based on the lessons learned from the RDRS experiment time will make that fairly rapid, and that's fantastic to hear. Beyond that, the dialogue and the formality of such a dialogue, I actually probably can't speak to that personally. I'm hoping somebody else can answer that half of your question.

GREG DIBIASE:

Yeah, I don't think there's anything set out in stone. I think we'd pass the resolution at Mumbai. That resolution would go back to the GNSO to think over, and then I could think whatever mechanism the GNSO decides to start work on this would facilitate conversations with the Board members. But that's kind of a guess.

I think it's up to our discretion on how we continue this conversation. I think we have maybe a template from last time on

---

SubPro where Board members were engaging the Small Team Plus. But I think that's those details of how those dialogues take place. We can sort that out after the resolution, my understanding.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Greg. Peter. Was that in on this point or...?

PETER AKINREMI: Yes.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes, terrific.

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Susan. And thank you, Greg and Wes. Thank you for sharing with us that the Board is actually looking at this closely. Just wanted to hear from your point of view how Board is actually approaching these because obviously, when this is non-adopt or non-adopted, how is the Board, what's their approach in communicating that message or diffusing how ICANN community is going to react to these? So, is the Board actually discussing this?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I can speak to that really quickly. Yes, one of the things that we have been greatly concerned about is getting the messaging around this well articulated so that it alleviates concern

---

so that all the communities, especially, the GAC and the SSAC in particular understand the rationale for doing this. And this doesn't mean as I think we put into the slides a minute ago with the green and red boxes, it doesn't mean that we're throwing everything out.

And so, we've gone back and forth already more than our normal resolution text editing to, yes, that slide exactly, more than our normal resolution text editing to try and make sure that the background, the whereas clauses and the resolve clauses all try to speak to that particular problem the best that we possibly can. But certainly, we greatly appreciate the GNSO Council's interactions with the community to explain it from your perspective as well.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Wes. I'll come to you in just a moment, Volker, but I just did want to note, there's a bit of a conversation in the chat about the concept of using a Small Team Plus. It's not universally agreed, that process. Certainly, there are some councilors who've expressed a bit of concern about that. But I think for present purposes, that's more of a Council conversation rather than a conversation we necessarily need to have with the Board.

I think the point to just note for us all is to remind ourselves that section nine in Annex A talks about this as being a triggering a dialogue between Council and the Board. It's obviously on the board side, the Board can decide whether the whole Board come to that dialogue or much more likely it's a subset of the Board, which seems more likely the Board caucus or some of the Board caucus.

---

On Council side, likewise, if we want to, this can be a dialogue that is with the whole of Council. That certainly would be within the scope if as a group, not everyone wants to be involved in that process. It, can be a subset of Council. And in practice, I think that probably is what happened on SubPro, anyone in Council who wanted to be in the small team, which then became the Small Team Plus was able to do so.

But obviously not everyone had the same level of interest in taking on that piece of work. But I don't think we need to get too bogged down in the sort of minutiae of what that working group looks like. I think the point is that we need some kind of a working group of people with sufficient expertise to take this forward.

But again, and I'm just coming back to that question of what does this look like? It was my recollection as well, I think it's probably shared by some others is that it was a relatively informal kind of process that we had on SubPro, and partly that's because we were already having that kind of dialogue back and forwards about the recommendations that the Board was minded to non-adopt.

And so, once they were non-adopted, that conversation effectively continued, but in a slightly bigger group. I think that's probably all I need to say on that. Volker, sorry. Apologies for making you wait.

**VOLKER GREIMANN:** Not at all. Absolutely perfect. As a member of the original working group on the EPDP, that came up with these recommendations. I think the approach the Board is proposing of

---

non adoption is the right one for this one, and then we can look at the consequences.

The reason being that the recommendations that we came up with were ultimately a very negotiated compromise, and it was, I think even part of our recommendations back at the time that they shouldn't be subject to picking and choosing and plucking apart because if one element falls away that basically was part of the compromise to make one group decide to support the whole, then the entire compromise would fall apart.

So ultimately, the decision I think that we are taking is the right one, and now we have to pick up the pieces and see how we can move from there.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Volker. Perhaps I will quickly chip in as well just regarding the next steps. As I'm understanding from you, Wes and Greg, what you're anticipating is probably a Board resolution and that you are considering that you would probably be making that resolution at ICANN85. Do you feel that you need anything from Council before that, such as a letter from us or something to that effect, or in fact, do you feel that the kind of conversation we're having here, coupled with knowing that there is that sort of standing committee set of recommendations, which Council has accepted.

That's not to say that we've turned them into Council recommendations, but do you feel for your purposes that that's sufficient or do you feel you need something more from Council in

---

order to feel that clearly the Board can make whatever decision it wants to make. But I suppose I'm just asking do you feel that you have enough from us in order to take that forward or is there anything that we can assist with when it comes to that kind of messaging?

WES HARDAKER: That's an excellent question and I wish I had a perfect answer for you. I will certainly say that anything that shows that the Board is actively listening to the rest of the community, including the Council and that the dialogue is sort of being accepted by all parties would be highly helpful. So, whether if there's a letter that could be easily drafted to saying such, that would be great. Is it critical? Probably not. And I think Greg might have more information. So, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: No, I was just gonna say something. If you wanted to write a letter, that would work, but I don't think it's strictly necessary. I think from this conversation, the Board has a sense that at least this path is the right path. There's details to figure out after the resolution, obviously, but I don't think it's strictly necessary.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks for that. Then we'll take that on board and I think we may well sort of discuss and perhaps put together a draft letter, and if the Council generally are on board with it, we could consider sending something if it seems that might be in any way helpful at least to show that kind of alignment of thinking. I will just pause

---

and see whether there is anything else anyone wants to add at this point or any other questions for Board members. Any questions from you that you have for us at this point?

WES HARDAKER: No, I don't think so. I greatly appreciate the time today. So, it sounds like we're in good alignment.

SUSAN PAYNE: Excellent. All right, one last chance, if in case anyone else has any burning questions or points they want to make, otherwise, I think we can let our Board colleagues leave us unless they would like to stay, but I imagine they have better things to do. Thank you again, very much for your time and the opportunity to have this conversation, and obviously over the coming weeks, I hope we'll have many more such fruitful discussions on what happens next.

WES HARDAKER: I look forward to more interaction. That would be wonderful. So, thank you all for letting us come today.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Okay, all right. In which case, I think at this point then we can move on to our agenda item six, I think. We are countering through our agenda this evening. Agenda item six is a discussion on our ICANN85 GAC and GNSO bilateral proposed agenda for the upcoming, did I say 86? I meant 85, for the

---

upcoming meeting in Mumbai. And I'm gonna, I think, hand this over to Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You kept me a bit surprised because I thought they were gonna discuss that for the prep week, but it's all good. So, I have liaised with my colleagues on the GAC side, Manal and Rita, to prepare on the topics for -- now, I'm getting confused too about ICANN84 and 85. So essentially, we have a session for, I want to say 75 minutes, an hour and a quarter, which is a lot longer than last time. Last time we ran out of time and were pressed for time, I think that we had 45 minutes or just under an hour.

So, we did initially reduce the number of topics that we wanted to talk about until I understood and found out that we had a bit more time. So, I personally think that we have a slot for more engagement. The topics are the topics. The topics are the discussions that are ongoing. So, we keep on coming back to the same topics. There's not great changes there.

What I would like again to work on, and I've spoken or written to leadership about it, is the way these sessions happen. Again, I've said this many times, but moving away from the GNSO reporting to the GAC on our activities, the GAC has now for a number of years, been participating in the work.

They've been quarterly invited to our PDPs. They're present, they're active. I don't know that we need to report to them. I think that we should have and pivot those discussions into actual

---

conversation and engagement about the work that we're doing, inviting them to join further to participate.

But I keep on having these visions of school principal. We're not checking on our grades. So, part of the exercise here, because the way the format works normally is they draft questions, send us questions a bit in advance, so two, three weeks in advance of an ICANN. We prepare for them. We have been preparing for them in the past in our session on Sunday, but now the GAC meeting is also on Sunday, which means that we either have very little time to prepare or we arrive unprepared.

The Sunday's also a bit unfortunate because this is before we've had any of the meetings during the week. And so, we end up reporting to the GAC that we're about to do this and about to do that which is a bit unsatisfactory. This time last year we got a bit pinch for it, so we don't want to do that.

Thus the spending maybe a bit time preparing for those questions once they arrive during prep week. We don't have them yet. But the other exercise is also for us to engage with the topic leads. And when I say we, I mean topic leads on our side. DNS abuse, it would be Jen. RDRS, I guess by default, we haven't nominated anybody from Council yet, but I'm happy to stand it. Urgent request is a bit of a different topic because actually most of the news will come from them.

So, I'd like for them to tell us what they're doing, PSWG in particular. There's a slight complication there because the discussions about this topic have been actually off, well on mic, but off the record, off the recordings because law enforcement

---

doesn't feel like divulging through the rest of the world, the way they're gonna operate to recognize each other, which is fair enough.

So, we'll see how much they can talk about it. So, I would want to engage with the topic leads on the GAC side. I have prepared very succinct bullet point briefs to go and share with them. And I'm hoping to be able to do this after this meeting, getting a green light from our leadership to do so. As you can see, there are two topics that are in gray which I personally think that, particularly HR. Accuracy, I don't know that we have that much to report since last time.

But HR, it was a conversation that we tried to have there and had to be adjourned for lack of time. And so, I'm personally in favor of putting on the agenda again because it was shortcut last time. I would though encourage then, whoever is the topic lead on our side to the same way we've done or have tried to prepare for DNS abuse and RDRS to prepare a few bullet points to sort of send them first feel or what we would want to talk about. I don't know if I'm running the queue, but I can see Bruna's hand up.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Yes, I was waiting for a green light from Susan as well, but thanks guys. No, Seb, you've already touched on the reason why I raised my hand up. It was really to reinforce the request, we had shared on the list for human rights to be part of this conversation, and not just because it's a relevant topic, but also because there was a sign from GAC the last time that they would've wished for not only the conversation to have happened, but also to continue engaging

---

with us on this topic. So, just adding that to the record and putting that request forward again on behalf of NCSG. Thanks a lot.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just Bruna, if you've raised your hand, can I ask you to just send, and I can send you a little template, but put a few bullet points for me to go and share with the team on the other side. Again, I'm not sure I should be running the queue, but I can see Peter, and then Farzaneh, and then Bruna waving in and out.

SUSAN PAYNE: Shall I just say, I'm very happy for you to run the queue, Seb, but if you'd rather I did it, then I will do.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, no.

SUSAN PAYNE: I was leaving it to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I was waiting for you to tell me.

PETER AKINREMI: Okay, awesome. Thanks, Seb. So, what I wanted to touch on is what you talked about, about how to make this meeting participatory not just also reporting to the GAC. And it'll really be a good way in way of us dealing with the GAC, because most of the

---

time, it seems that we are only reporting and how can we actually ensure that GNSO and the GAC are actually discussing the topics that really matter and not us bringing and just updating the general GAC and also putting ourselves in a position where people will be asking us a lot of questions about our processes and procedure.

I guess that's where we need to look at that and see how we can improve that and make that happen. It will really, really help us to help our relationship in communication with the GAC. But how we need to do that, we might need to look at different way, and it might also rest upon the people that will be facilitating the conversations and the how that we put in on whether we are reporting or we actually engaging with the GAC. Thank you, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Well, first of all, let's be clear, the GAC has no issue whatsoever with finding themselves in a position where we're reporting to them on our activity. They find it very comfortable, and as far as they're concerned, we should continue going like this. I think that in order to get out of it, again, it's the way the conversation is running, which is essentially they've asked a bunch of questions and we're answering to it.

So, if we are participating in the question drafting, if we are having our questions, if we pivot that into a debate or a discussion, I think it would be more comfortable. Again, these reports trace back from a time where the GAC was by and large absent at least as the GAC, maybe some members were absent from the PDP.

---

In the meantime, we've invited them. They're very present, they're part of our work. If they need to report to themselves, I'm sure that they have members on each of our PDP that could do that much better than us. Again, standing in front of the headmaster. And so, participating in breaking a bit that format of questions and answers, and that's why I am talking about the bullet points to deliver also our questions on what we want to talk about and what we're ready to talk about.

I think the other thing is to make sure, they're usually the topic leads on the GAC side are pretty aware of what's going on, but just to make sure that they have the latest and the greatest of where we're at. For example, this discussion that we just had with the Board members before, that they wouldn't be privy to. And so, informing them of where we are before, well, before they start asking their questions, so we don't get any gotcha questions on the day would be a bit better. I'll take Farzaneh and then Lawrence, and then there was a question from Samantha that I can answer to. Go ahead, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Yeah, thank you. So, I think the questions Sam's raising in chat is very important. So, do you need leads for these topics? And I want to suggest that Bruna be the lead for the human rights conversation, and the conversation that we are going to have about human rights is not gonna be anything extraordinary. We had this conversation, we had a question to the GAC last meeting that asked them, so how are you considering these human rights in your work? And they got back to us with an answer.

---

And they said that they want to see human rights to be done like in PDPs and stuff like that. So, now, we are gonna continue that conversation based on their answer and talk about, for example cover what has been done in Latin Diacritics, but also ask them for their ideas, for their consideration of human rights, and also like we can have a chat with the human rights working group, whatever, like working party they have.

And we can frame it like that so that we can also like help later on our development of these human rights checks for PDPs. Thank you. And oh, yes, I said this, but I suggest Bruna to be the lead for this topic.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you noted. And Bruna, I'll send you whatever. There's not a template for bullet points, but I'll let you do that. Lawrence, I see your hand up.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you, Seb. And please pardon me, all. My camera will be off. It's close to midnight here. So, on the issue of urgent request and LEA authentication, I very well agree that we should, based on how this has been run by the PSWG group, that we should be getting feedback from the GAC on what's developing or evolving in this space and how things are going.

But recall that at the last meeting we had with them, we also posed a question around jurisdiction and how that could affect ongoing work. And so, while we are expecting updates and response from the GAC, that aspect of the work that we have post

---

questions to are still open, and I'm sure it's still relevant to try to seek feedback in that particular regard.

A second issue is around accuracy. As it stands today, we have very, very little to report around this particular subject, but I presume that in the days ahead, we might have reasons to account for work in this regard. And so I think this, besides the GAC presentation, this goes to the larger Council that we fashion a way around how to progress the workaround accuracy to the point where we can not only have something to report when we are asked for the feedback, but where we can actually close out this action item. Thank you. That will be all for me.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So, to go back quickly, and I guess that'll be my last point, to Sam's question, and I'm trying to find it quickly. So, are we looking for leads on RDRS CD and the urgent request? So, for RDRS, I had offered myself, but I think it's more appropriate for a councilor to take that lead. So, if you want to, raise your hand, I'm more than happy to pass you to the baton.

For the urgent request and law enforcement authentication, yeah, it would be great to have somebody too. Again, I would not force, but I would push for that conversation or that part of the updating the community to come from them, but that still means that we should have a topic lead on our end and expert. And there was a few of us on those calls. So, if any of us wants to do it.

As to the last one, accuracy, again, for you guys to decide if we bring it or not. But Lawrence, if you wanted to take the lead on

---

that one, well, you guys to decide. Again, what I'd like then is in a matter of a few days, possibly let's say, close the business Monday, to have on all of those topics, a few bullet points of what we want, what we would suggest to talk about so we can send it back to the GAC quickly before they come up with our end questions and we find ourselves too late for it. No, Sam, I have no toes anymore, so you're good. You're not stepping on those toes. Susan, with this, I'm pretty much done.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you, Seb. And I think we did have a volunteer in the chat as well for the urgent requests. Ashley, I think has volunteered. I know there are a few folk who've been participating in that. I don't recall, I don't know what the group is called, but the sort of urgent requests slash law enforcement group. And so, yes, hopefully that we have someone who is keeping on top of that.

But it would certainly be good from my perspective that we hear from the GAC on progress in so far as they're able to tell us where this is going and what they're envisaging in terms of their timing and that kind of thing, rather than us always reporting on what we are up to. It would be good to hear a progress report on that. Practitioner group. Thank you. Thank you. Peter.

PETER AKINREMI:

Yes.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Oh, sorry. Did you want to? Yes, sorry. Apologies.

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Susan. So, Seb, thanks for coordinating with the GAC. So, are there any topics that GAC is actually discussing that is of interest that we need to know? Because we've been checking, oh, this is the topics that we're discussing and we're checking with them, they're interested. Are there any potential topic or issue that they're discussing that we need to know?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: At this stage, it was only those top three on the right column. They had no particular question, but what I'm doing now with you, they were about to do on their end. So, there might be other things coming up that I don't know of yet. But as of two weeks ago when I had the conversation with them, it was only those top threes.

So yeah, the one last thing, sorry, Lawrence, I do remember indeed that we asked a question on that call, but because there's no recording or anything like that, if you could help jump my memory, maybe if you remember better how it was worded, I would really appreciate having a bit of wording on it.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry, is this with regards to jurisdiction?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, jurisdiction and law enforcement, yeah.

---

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay, I'll get back to on that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Well, thanks very much for this, Seb. Okay, so hopefully, those who've put their hands up to be the topic leads are aware that that's what they've done. And as Seb is saying, he's looking for some preliminary suggestions, a few bullets for your topics by Monday was the date, wasn't it, Seb, just to allow some time for that to be pulled together and then for him to have his next conversation with the GAC leads. Okay.

And again, a reminder, we will have sometime during our session on the 19th, which will enable us to do a bit more sort of that preparatory work that we generally would probably have be doing on the Sunday so that we go into this meeting having done some of that discussion on points to make and so on and get ahead of that before we are traveling to Mumbai.

Okay, I think we are then on our next Council discussion item, which is item seven on prioritization of work. We are running a tiny bit ahead of schedule on our agenda, which is unusual, but not a bad thing. So, I'm gonna pass the mic to Jen, who I think is going to take us forward on this. Thanks.

---

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Susan. Hi again, this is Jen. And now we are on the topic about prioritization of work. Just a brief reminder for Council and also those who are kind of tuning in, we actually had a really good discussion, preliminary discussion at the SPS last month on this. Council has discussed this topic a few times already. We looked at the tools that we have.

So, one of the tools we do have is the action decision radar. It's a good tool that we use to assist what we are having to make decisions on, but of course, it's flexible, but it's not an actual prioritization tool. It has helped us to look at what the different work efforts are needed, especially ones that are coming up. If you've taken a look, hopefully you all have. Before this meeting, you will have already noticed that there has been some updates to the ADR.

You already see the lovely little icons that indicate what is coming up for Council vote. So, we've already been updating these tools. So, we talked about how the Action Decision Radar can coexist with a Council prioritization framework, but of course, it's different functions and they serve different things. So, we asked staff to update the prioritization document, which also has been circulated. It is in the background documents for this particular meeting.

There's been a timeline that you see at the very top. It is all updated with all of the items that are coming down the pipeline as well. So, the goal now is to discuss and agree on how we're going to look at the prioritization element, how this can be added to the Action Decision Radar, and how that will inform what we're gonna do going forward.

---

So we had three general ideas that were raised and discussed briefly during the SPS. The first is having the ADR include a timeline of all the active work, so the active PDPs, EPDPs, all the policy development work so we can have a snapshot of what the current projects are scheduled to complete the timeline, the timing, and where there might be capacity to take on extra work to sign on sequence things where it's more effective.

The second idea that was raised and also discussed was to have the ADR contain a parking lot of items that are still important for us, but these potential topics may not be at the very top of our list. So, they are priorities, but they don't currently fit in a sequence that we look at right now because the ADR, again, as all of us know, after Council Jeopardy, it is just for this calendar year.

And then part of that, I guess the potential future topics, and another reminder, if you haven't taken a look at the prioritization document, I would advise you to take a look at it. You can see it -- oh, I thought we would see it on the screen, but it's okay, we don't have to see it on the screen. There's several of them. The first is the RPMs phase two.

So, the UDRP, we have committed to the work, Council has committed to this work, and we deferred due to other priorities that have been cropping up since 2023. So at this time, we have also noted that we can begin work when RPMs phase one is fully implemented, and that is scheduled to complete in April. This is potentially something we can look at once the LDPDP wraps possibly.

---

The second piece is on next round and moving from rounds to an open process. This potential topic was suggested by the team that's implementing next round for the Council to consider. Next steps for this is Council's gonna receive a briefing from org to understand what the scope of the change might look like, potential solutions, and have that discussion further. So, that's the next steps for this one.

Third one is the expiration policies. We've already listened to the briefing from GDS staff about this. They present to the policy status report on expired domain deletion policy, expired registration, recovery policy. Looked at some potential ambiguities that could be cured, and this was already last year.

During the November meeting, we were asked to reach out to our respective SGs and Cs to see if we think this should be prioritized. We haven't received anything that indicates we should move this up on the priority list, but we are going to probably keep it on our radar, keep it in the parking lot for us to not forget this piece of work.

Two more. There's a Transfers Policy Final Report, the recommendation for GNSO to request an issues report on a potential dispute mechanism for registrants to dispute improper inter-registrar transfers. We've heard from NCSG, they've noted that this is a priority, but of course the report itself hasn't been adopted by the Board. We have heard from them that they anticipate that this will probably be done quite soon, possibly in Mumbai. And the last piece, we already know, we love very familiar, DNS Abuse Mitigation.

---

We've had the final issue report. The PDP on ADC is going to be kicked off in Mumbai. So, all of these are the topics that you can see in the prioritization document that's been updated right now. All of these could be integrated in the parking lot. So, that was a second kind of suggestion and idea that we talked about during the SPS.

And then finally, there's been a suggestion from councilors about really looking at a very simple voting and ranking at the SG and C level. We can adapt this ranking as a ranked choice voting. We've also heard some concerns about this, but those are the three ideas we talked about and discussed.

I think the floor can now be open for further discussion. I don't know if councilors have any further thoughts on this, any further thoughts on the three ideas that we've raised? And yes, now we have the documents, the prioritization document on the screen right now. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL:

Thank you, Jen. So, quick question, are you looking feedback on which method to adopt to prioritize these things, or are we now suggesting which of these do we wish to prioritize? What feedback are you looking for?

JENNIFER CHUNG:

So first, the prioritization method, once we know how we want to do this, then we can of course look at how to prioritize. I think that's the first step. And the second step is looking at the actual topics.

---

VIVEK GOYAL:                   Okay, thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG:             Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:           Thanks, Jen. Going off sort of the three different possibilities that you went through, the voting and ranking from the SG level seems to make a lot of sense because it's kind of ICANN telling us what is most important. So, I personally like that one as far as the method of prioritizing work. And I think that's probably what we've been doing so far, just maybe not as formally as you're suggesting now. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG:           Thanks, Damon. And I think we heard from several counselors about that as well during the SPS. Any other thoughts or we probably want to think about this some more. Steve.

STEVE CHAN:                 Hi, folks. Thanks, Jen. This is Steve from staff. And I just thought of an idea, which is maybe just sort of an adaptation of the idea of ranking. And it's taken actually as an inspiration from how the SSC operates or the Standing Selection Committee. And so, maybe potentially one adaptation is indeed to rely on voting, but have it instead of being the final and absolute result, it ends up being an input to the Council's decision making.

---

And so, maybe that is a way to sort of make sure that the Council's able to hear from all the different groups but also have the flexibility to maybe course correct if that's not actually the way that, for whatever reasons, things should actually be prioritized. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Steve. Very constructive suggestion of a hybrid way of doing things and explaining how the SSC has done it. I think we also employed this method in the DNS Abuse Small Team. When we looked at it, we asked our own SGs and Cs about the priorities, and we kind of looked at it when we had a fuller discussion. Peter.

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Jen. What I wanted to just say is a ask for these three mechanisms that we're talking about, if we can have these circulated, except we're making a decision now or we still want a conversation on that, if we can have a document circulated on the Council list to further look at these through mechanisms that we were discussing so that SG and C can take it back and look at it and discuss that with their respective community, will be good.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Peter. Great suggestion there, too. Susan.

---

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yeah, thanks, Jen. So, I like that that drawing on that SSC type operation that Steve suggested. That does seem to make a great deal of sense to me. It allows the groups to feed in their rankings and then it does allow for that, okay, now we've got the rankings, let's have a conversation and perhaps allays a little bit some of the concerns that were expressed about people just voting and that might advantage or disadvantage any particular group.

It would hopefully help with that. I noted Farzaneh's cheeky comment in the chat about we should ask the GAC, and I know that was a joke and I'm not about to say that we should go to the GAC and ask them to do our ranking for us. But I think as we are working, at least in our groups, and certainly if we do bring this back for a conversation, I think it would be naive of us not to take into consideration what the wider world wants from ICANN the organization and the GNSO.

The organization has spent an enormous amount of time talking about its legitimacy in the context of the WSIS effort that has just gone on. And one of the key messages was how do we demonstrate that we have legitimacy? Well, it's we get the work done and we address the problems that people are saying exist. And so, we may not always like that we do some work on a particular issue, and doing work on an issue doesn't presuppose the outcome. But I think it's naive of us if we think that we can operate in a vacuum, and I personally believe we should be considering what the wider world is telling us they think we should be prioritizing. But that's just my soapbox. Okay, back to you. Sorry, Jen.

---

JENNIFER CHUNG: Not at all. And I think Farzaneh is also reacting to that a little bit. I think it is naive of us to imagine that when we're talking to our SGs and Cs, when we're looking at that other outside influences and considerations are not also being considered when we're looking at this. Peter.

PETER AKINREMI: Thanks, Jen. Thanks, Susan, for that. I'm just curious as how do we follow that? What general community or ICANN community and outside of the community that actually want to prioritize. So, just like thinking, should we rely on staff on that or how do we gather them? Because obviously we need to prioritize what this general community want to prioritize not looking at what it is that we think it is essential. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Peter. I think we're coalescing on a twofold approach, something that starts off with a ranking and then moves onto more substantive discussion. And I do note that I'm gonna say of course on the record, even though it's already in the chat, that we had one councilor who was quite against the numerical ranking because of some disadvantages about that. But hopefully we'll be able to assuage some of the concerns when we bring it back and have some discussions about it and hope that he will also be able to articulate to council what the concerns might be so we can actually address it as well.

So, perhaps, I think we can probably start and draw a line here. The next steps for this is, I guess maybe, Steve, correct me if I'm

---

wrong here, leadership will go with staff to put together this first cut suggestion for the next steps for prioritization. And if that's not the case, Steve, please correct me. And I think with that, we might be finished with this particular item, and I can hand it back. I'm sorry, Farzi, please go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Hi, I just wanted to say that I totally disagree with Steve and his idea of having the SSC for prioritization. Most of the time, they rank the candidates and they have discussion, but I think that, and then when they bring the result, and they do a good job, to be honest. And we look at their decision and we never say no. But that mechanism is not really suitable for prioritization and for ranking as Tapani said, and we support to them, we don't think ranking by us. And then it can be like a good prioritization mechanism. So, needs further discussion. I just wanted to tell you that we don't like it.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Farzaneh. Well noted. We also look forward to NCSG articulating on the list about some proposals about this. We could, of course, carry on as we've been carrying on with not actually having a formal prioritization and we'll use the ADC the way we've been using it. It's not that everything is going to not work, we'll still be working, but if we have something that we can try out, we certainly encourage NCSG to send some suggestions to the council list.

---

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Jen. So, Farzaneh, I just wanted to circle back to that. I don't think Steve's suggestion was that we set up a committee like a version of this SSC to do this job for us, and then we take that input and we rubber stamp it. I think he was more suggesting that rather than we literally go on numerical ranking and we go, okay, this one got 10 votes, this one got eight, this one got five, those are the three we're taking forward, rather than doing that, we do that exercise, but that is an input then into a discussion rather than the final word on the outcome.

That was, I think what Steve was meaning like the kind of way that SSC works, which is they do some a polling and then they have a conversation and explain why they voted the way they did and try to talk people around to their way of thinking effectively. I don't know if that makes a difference to your comment.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

The short answer is no. The longer answer is that we can discuss this, I'm not blocking anything. But the thing is that most of the time, ranking topics and stuff like that without having -- let's discuss this a little bit more. We want to have ample time for conversation and giving our input and make the groups to think about the issue at hand. And when you give them this ranking thing and they said, okay, so here is our ranking, then we are not gonna give it further thought, and that's my concern and I said it in chat, especially for a group that is time constraint. So, let's think about how we can overcome those hurdles as well so that this ranking doesn't become de facto voting.

---

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Farzaneh. I'm trying to think of what constructive next steps we can take. Maybe we can also, and I'm reading the chat as well, we can come up with a proposal for next steps and there can be reactions to the Council list because further discussion is all well and good and I absolutely agree we need to discuss and agree on how we're going to do this.

We will have time also when we all meet in person, and of course those who can't meet in person will be remote during Mumbai, but having something to react to might be better than having nothing to react to unless specific SGs and CS or people who are very passionate about prioritization work and mechanisms want to propose.

So, if there is no objections, I would like to see if leadership and staff can come up with some proposal for next steps, and then councilors are very welcome to react and opine further on Council list. Is that okay with everyone? Is there any objections to this next step? I'm hearing nothing. So, with that, I will hand it back to Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. Thanks very much, Jen. Okay, we are sort of countering through our agenda here. We have agenda item A is AOB, but there are a couple of items on here. And so, I think I'm handing over to Terri for this first one on the update on ICANN85 planning and so on. Is that right, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: You are right, Susan. Thank you so much.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: All right folks, ICANN85 chitchat time. The GNSO Prep Week webinar is taking place next Thursday, the 19th of February at 2025, I'm sorry, February, 2026. Ignore the chat. I put 2025. We all know it's 2026 at 1300 UTC. Reminder, GNSO Council members will be panelists and you are expected to join unless apologies are given in advance. Questions will be taken from the GNSO Council only, but observers are welcome and will be in listen only mode.

In the chat, I also dropped the Wiki agenda page, so if you want to take a look at the agenda, it is there for you. In addition to that, ICANN85, the schedule is published. Let me quickly. There you go. I dropped that in chat as well for you. As a reminder, prep week will take place virtually the 23rd through 25th of February, 2026.

ICANN85 is taking place in Mumbai, the 7th through 12th of March, 2026. The ICANN85 schedule is now published and you received a, I call it 'how to get organized' email from Julie Bisland. She did send it to the Council mailing list and other mailing list as well. Please take a look at that email. It is super helpful. Lots of great suggestions in there. One of them is also how to get your meetings from ICANN schedule to your calendar, which help you stay organized when you're remote or in-person. So, super helpful.

---

Also really, really important, and please share this with your groups. The deadline for in-person registration is the 6th of March, 2026. Please make sure everybody has registered that needs to register. There is no in-person registration, so the 6th of March folks is your deadline.

Funded travel hotel confirmations, reminder that's typically get sent out about a week or so. Maybe sometimes we get a little lucky a little bit before that, before the meeting starts. So, if you're a funded traveler, just be patient. It's still coming. In addition to that, our GNSO Council dinner is now going to take place on Wednesday the 11th of March.

Reminder, this is for GNSO Council and GNSO Staff only. I did send a hold the date invite. In that invite, I had put some further instructions. Please confirm it back to us no later than Friday the 27th of February if you are not attending. Again, if you're remote, I already know you're not attending, but please let us know.

The reason that is, is we have a set amount and before we can quote price per person, we need to know how many are attending. So, if you unfortunately do not let us know after the 27th of February, payment is still going to be due. So, thank you for your understanding in that matter.

Also, if you've already provided to me in the past some dietary restrictions, I have that noted. But if you've not provided that, please just go ahead and reach out to me. This is Terri Agnew, and I'll go ahead and add you to the list of dietary restrictions. Also Vivek, thank you so, so much. He is planning such a special evening for us on Wednesday. He's getting everything worked

---

out. Payment will go to Vivek, how much and how we're going to pay him, all work in progress. So, please be patient with us, but Vivek is our gentleman in this area. Yay.

Okay, let's see. Shortly, I will send out an email to the GNSO Council members all of our GNSO Council sessions. You will be busy a few days. We did go over that on the last meeting. I don't think we probably really need to take time and go over it again because you're all going to be getting an email shortly of all your expectations of what you'll need to be joining for ICANN85. That is my update. All right, I'm not seeing any hands. Quickly looking at chat. So, Susan, back to you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Terri. And I suppose this probably relates to this item as well, actually. Just a kind of reminder that obviously we have a bunch of meetings while we're in Mumbai. We'll have a normal Council meeting, our monthly meeting. So, actually we'll have our March meeting following quite closely behind this one just because of the way the timing is working.

But as always, there's a running Google doc for people to propose items for the agenda. The earlier obviously within reason and depending on how things come up, obviously the earlier something goes in there, the better it is just in terms of finding the time and scheduling.

But do also, if you have views on things that you feel we really should be discussing during perhaps our more informal working sessions, do please share them and we'll take that on board and

---

we are basically working on -- ah, there you go, we are working on agendas in the coming week or so, undoubtedly to try and do that.

I know there are a couple of things that have been flagged already. The item that Farzi put on the list regarding PDP participation, I think we will try to find some time for a discussion on that, which I think will be perhaps a better discussion if we're doing it with as many of us as possible face-to-face.

But do feed in, and I can see that that Terri has dropped into the chat, the Google docs and so on. So, it's just a reminder and a plug that we are working on a generating for ICANN85 now, so do let us know. And our other -- oh, sorry, Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI: I'm just wondering, Susan, what sort of information do you need from us when we put these topics in the agenda just to provide you more background and understand what you need to consider in order to include and help you with your decision to include it in the agenda or not?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks for that. I don't think there's a hard and fast rule. I think there may be cases where we've been talking about something or it's come out of a discussion in a PDP and people are aware of the issue, and then sometimes a simple one or two words is probably good enough. But there may well be times where it helps to have a bit more information to properly understand is this an issue that needs a discussion or is this an

---

area where someone isn't aware of a procedure that exists or whatever. I'm trying to talk in really general terms.

I think if we would need more info, one of us would probably from the leadership team or one of the staff team would reach out, but timing can be an issue there. And so sort of the more time there is if something goes into the Google doc quite later on, we obviously have a 10-day deadline on agendas.

So, it can be the more information, the better if it's something that's quite last minute because it makes it a bit difficult to agenda. But I don't think there's a hard and fast rule, but I think sometimes it can be helpful to have a bit more understanding of what the issue is that someone wants to discuss.

Oh, and someone is also saying if there's an estimated time, it's also to give that, because that's probably Terri telling us that. Yes. Because just so that we can see if we've got the time for it and that kind of thing and how to organize the agenda and the ordering of things and so on. I hope that helps. And thank you.

I know you've made a couple of suggestions, and they're not intentionally being ignored. I hope that we will be able to circle back on them. And as I say, one of the discussions about participation in PDPs, it is something we will have that conversation in Mumbai about. Okay. All right.

Okay. all right. And then, the second thing to flag from the AOB list is really just a short one. It's just a reminder to people that the Latin Scripts Diacritics PDP, the initial report, as we know is out for public comment. Just a reminder that public comment is

---

closing on the 23rd of February. So that's little under a couple of weeks' time now. Hopefully those who want to put in comments are beavering away on that, but it was just a reminder that if your group is planning to put a comment in, time is moving on. Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, just wanted to add that, Susan, this is the first PDP that has done human rights check, and I monitored it and I believe it's quite good. They used a template that the Council had approved, and I think that I want to suggest that the councilors go to back their group and specifically also look at that human rights checklist and make comments on what can be improved and what they like about it.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks for that, Farzi. That's a really good reminder. And I think we've also talked about the fact that it is a good opportunity for us to use that PDP to get some learnings from it in particular about how that human rights assessment is done and once the work is concluded, for us to really be able to see whether it worked or not and what feedback there has been. That's a really good reminder. I hope people will take that back to their groups and ask them at a minimum maybe if they can take the time to take a look at, that would be really useful.

Okay. I think that's all I have. I'll perhaps see if there is anything else anyone wants to raise before we wrap up. We are wrapping up a little early, but I don't think that's a bad thing. And I say that when -- and it's 10:40 at night for me, so it's in fact a good thing.

---

Anything from anyone else before we wrap up? All right. Well, thank you very much everyone. Oh, Peter.

PETER AKINREMI:

Yeah, sorry for bringing us back. So, just wanted to touch on the mail that Steve sent to the Council list talking about procedures that the RDRS actually discussed there. There are a couple of problematic with the procedure in terms of when ICANN Board not adopt PDP recommendations, that there are a couple of conversations that RDRS committee had on that.

Just wanted to like see how is it possible that we can look at that and see how we can improve that process, or is there nothing to do in that regard? So, just wanted to see if there is some things we could look at to further improve that process, because if that procedure is problematic and there is there is no way we need to find a way to improve that because it'll leave the Council to actually go back to initiating supplemental recommendations and PDP recommendations if Board non-adopt any PDP recommendations.

I'm looking at it in terms of is there a way we can further improve that or something just that crossed my mind when I was reading that I was like, maybe I need to raise that if there's anything we could do to improve that process.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Peter. I'm not sure if I'm understanding entirely, but is what you are saying that you feel that that section nine process is not particularly clear or perhaps has some problematic elements

---

to it, and you are suggesting, is there a way that that process can get expanded or elaborated or changed in some way? Or is your question something different?

PETER AKINREMI:

Yeah, my question is in that line, but what I'm saying is because if we get into any situations where PDP is being non-adopted by the Board, then we cannot actually use that particular instrument in terms of maybe reconvening EPDP or PDP team, because we know that usually PDP team would have been disbanded.

It depends on when this is approved by the Board and we cannot reconstitute PDP. Is there a better way we can improve that process because they are concerned with some certain group of people in the committee, especially with the NCSG talking about Small Team Plus making recommendation, and this is a consensus that we need to address and see how we can balance it especially if that particular procedures cannot be initiated by reconstituting PDP to look at previous PDP recommendations that are being rejected by the Board.

If that particular procedure is problematic, because now we could see that we cannot initiate that, that process because there is a lot of -- but I don't know the context to how the RDRS actually discussed that. But if there is a challenge with those processes, then we need to look at it and see what it is that we can see to improve that process. I don't know if you get what I'm saying, Susan?

---

SUSAN PAYNE:

I'm not entirely sure I do, but I do think there's kind of two different elements here. One is that there is this this section nine process that can be used, and as we've discussed, it talks about this concept of effectively having a dialogue Board Council dialogue and sending it back and further work being done at the Council level to develop supplemental recommendations.

And then there's perhaps a slightly separate conversation, which we did start to have at the SPS and it wasn't really appropriate to have that conversation with the Board because the separate conversation is how does council want to handle the work? What structural mechanism does it want to use?

Whether that is a small team plus or some other grouping of people to perform the work. And I think we don't seem to be entirely all aligned on that idea of a small team plus. I think we'll have to, by the sound of it, talk about it a bit more. I would say to my mind one could call it a working group, and perhaps it would be easier if we did. It's not that small.

If you select a certain number of people from each group, it becomes no different to a group that we just selected to do a PDP on DNS abuse or whatever. But we can talk about that, and I think that's a different thing to -- how we Council want to do the work, I think is a different part of the conversation. I don't know if that helps at all. And I'm not sure if that's a new hand Peter or an old one. I'm gonna come back back to you first. Thanks.

---

PETER AKINREMI: Okay. Yeah, thanks, Susan. So, I wasn't talking about how the Board is gonna do that. So I'm raising a question about the process because if there is a particular process that is not effective or problematic in such a way that we cannot initiate that, then we should find a way of having a conversation and improving that process.

So, what I'm talking about is how Council can actually look at that and see, or maybe like if the current status is good, then we can leave it that way because it leaves the Council to actually initiating supplemental procedure or recommendation when ICANN Board reject any PDP recommendation. So we need to look at that process and see if there is something that needs to be improved. That's the way I'm looking at it. I just wanted to raise that. Sorry for my rant. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: I did see another hand, but it seems to have gone, so.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Oh yeah, I'm sorry. Yeah, Susan, I was just gonna -- this is Christian for the record. All I was going to say was, I wanted to jump in to see if I could interpret what I thought Peter meant, but I think he rightly explained himself well. I think anytime a PDP fails, can we take a look at it and can we see what learnings we can take from it to improve the process of designing the next PDP better such that we don't have to lose the work. That was my understanding of what the original question was.

---

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you. And I really hope that we've certainly done some of that. That seems to echo very much that Board readiness piece, but also work that happened previously in PDP 3.0, but it's an unfortunate case. And there have been a few of them, that work on the SSAD recommendations now is relatively elderly because of how things have gone subsequently.

There was then subsequent -- after the PDP closed, there was an operational design assessment that looked at could those recommendations be operationalized and what would the cost of them be? And I think that's where this then got stalled.

And so, we certainly have within the Board readiness work people from the EPDP on this were interviewed and did give some feedback. But I absolutely agree that we must always keep at the front of our mind what can we learn if there are failings or a PDP falls apart or recommendations are not adopted. I think we always have to keep at the front of our mind, what can we learn from that and what can we do better?

Absolutely. Okay, I think maybe this is a good time to wrap this up for now, but I'm sure we can continue that discussion as we need to. I'm seeing some -- oh, don't take Farzi on in a darkened corridor because it sounds like she's a dangerous woman.

Enjoy your class. I think thank you everyone for a good meeting, and well, see you all on the mailing list and then see as many of you as possible quite shortly in-person. So thanks very much, everyone, and have a good rest of your day and we can stop the recording.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. As you heard, the meeting has concluded. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care, everyone. See you soon.

GAURAV VEDI: Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**