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 13th of August 2026. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Nacho Amado sends in his apology, and the proxy goes to Jennifer Chung. 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, to wish you a happy birthday, Terri.
TERRI AGNEW:	Thank you. Ashley Heineman?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Present. Happy birthday, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Volker Greimann? I don't see where Volker is on yet, but we will send him an email to see if we can get him on. Gaurav Vedi?

GAURAV VEDI: Present, Terri, and happy birthday.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Vivek Goyal sends his apologies, and the proxy goes to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Here, and happy birthday, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yeah, happy birthday, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Susan Mohr sends her apologies, and the proxy goes to Osvaldo Novoa. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Happy birthday.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Farzaneh Badii?

FARZANEH BADII: Happy birthday, Terri. And we will make this meeting extra fun for you since you flattered us by taking the meeting on your birthday.

TERRI AGNEW: Aw. But make it a good fun. Peter Akinremi?

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri, and I'm sending my wishes.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you so much. Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Present, and happy birthday, Terri. Even though where I'm living, it's already yesterday.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, no, it's over. Thank you. Benjamin Akinmoyeje?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Present. Happy birthday, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you so much. Bruna Martins dos Santos?

BRUNA SANTOS: Here, present, and feliz aniversário, Terri, which is happy birthday in Portuguese.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, so sweet. Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Present and accounted for. Happy to spend this day with you.

TERRI AGNEW: Aw. Anne Aikman-Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Present. Joyeux anniversaire.

TERRI AGNEW: Ooh. Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present, and I was going to say joyeux anniversaire, but Anne took it from me.

TERRI AGNEW: Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: I am here. Selamat hari jadi, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: I love this. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: Present. Happy birthday, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you so much. All right. We have no guests joining us today. You have the policy team supporting the GNSO, so you have Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Andrew Chen, Julie Bisland, 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. Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once they have set their chat to everyone. Again, we're going to pause. Please change your chat to everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor the chat.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN Multistakeholder Process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest. Thank you again, everyone, for the well wishes. That was very thoughtful. With this, I'll turn the meeting over to our GNSO chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Terri. Okay. Welcome, everyone. It's our 13th of August meeting of the GNSO Council. Does anyone have any updates to their statements of interest? I'm not seeing or hearing any, so that's good. Is there anything anyone would like to add to the agenda? We are adding one AOB, which I'll just mention now because this is going to be Justine's last meeting with us as the ALAC liaison, so we have added something at the end for that. But is there anything else anyone would like to add to the AOB? All right. Again, not hearing anyone, then. I will just note that the minutes from our 9th of July 2026 meeting were posted on the 23rd of July.

And with that, we can move on to the next agenda item, which is the regular review of the projects and action list. So this is our opportunity, and particularly the opportunity for any of our councilors or liaisons to working groups or to IRTs, to flag if there are any particular kind of interesting milestones or any noteworthy updates or anything that they want to bring to Council's attention that they think we should be aware of at this time. So I will just, again, pause and see if we have anything from any of our Council liaisons to note for this month. Okay. Again, not seeing anything. So, that's all good. In which case, we'll move straight on to our next Council item, number three, which is the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 2 draft charter update. And I'm going to pass over to my able colleague, Jennifer Chung, who is leading us on this one. Jen, over to you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you very much, Susan. This is Jen Chung. I guess I didn't put my hand up for any milestones in the previous agenda item since I was expecting to speak now, in any case. But just noting that for PDP 1, we will very likely go into public comment next week. So, with that being said, let's come to PDP 2 charter. Thank you first to all of the councilors that have given us input, comments, redlines, all of that.

A little bit of background. We don't have slides on this. It's really just the document. But we did receive a briefing on the updated PDP 2 charter in our July meeting. We made those changes to reflect what we learned in the whole process for PDP 1. We circulated this draft charter in Google Doc form after the July meeting, and all councilors were asked to seek feedback from their respective stakeholder groups and constituencies. We have received it on the document. We have received some as attachments sent and circulated to the Council list. And so we did say that this is kind of initial feedback because in our July meeting, we did say also that Council wanted to start up a charter drafting effort. So that will be convened after this call. I know that we have sent over on Council list a call for volunteers for that. We do have a list. If you don't remember if you've put your hand up, please ask us. Ten of us have volunteered. There is still time to join. I don't know if staff wants to remind us of the actual list. If you don't remember if you volunteered, you can volunteer again. We'll make sure we catch your name.

We also want to give councilors opportunity to provide feedback right now on the charter and to take a look at the amount of change we really do need to do during this charter drafting effort, and we can plan those calls accordingly. Again, I started this agenda item off with giving that milestone for PDP 1, so that is the expectation. When we go into that period, it will mean that we have a little bit more time, a little bit more mind space to think about the charter for PDP 2. So, with that being said, can we... Oh, we're already in there, which is perfect. Thank you so much, staff. And I see a hand up already. So let's go to Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Jen. My apologies, my camera is off. It's 10:00 PM here and pretty dark. But I just wanted to provide some feedback on the draft charter as you requested. So, yes, we've had some discussions within the BC, and those discussions are advancing. But at the moment, it's pretty difficult for us as the BC to support work around this new draft that we have. The thinking amongst the BC is that, yes, the Council needs to confer a smaller team to work on a draft charter, but that work should reference the initial draft from staff.

While there are quite a number of positives, so to say, in this revised draft, it definitely waters down a lot of areas that we have an interest around as the BC. For instance, to provide some context, we understand that there is a refocus from the safeguards on API to a more broader language, safeguards for access to domain name registration at scale for new customers. But not forgetting that the initial draft language for the PDP, especially the topic, was crafted in such a way as to narrow the focus of the PDP. If we were working off the amended draft, which will mean that we are working from here, this topic appears very broad. In terms of when we're talking about work around access to domain name registration at scale for new customers, it might have to impact reseller systems, bulk registrations, white-label platforms, plug-ins, and other automated provisioning mechanisms, which could really broaden the scope of the PDP and could see this running for quite longer than might be necessary or intended. And so while there are merits in the BC definitely not having any problem with changing the topic, I mean the title, to what is being proposed, looking at the fact that this is also already impacting the nine questions that were initially drafted, quite a number of those questions we find to be very direct and speak to the outcomes of the PDP. So by and large, in order not to keep, and to provide room for others to provide their feedback, the BC isn't comfortable with the proposed draft. And while we should constitute a small team, that small team should work on the initial draft, which stems from the Issue Report.

One other issue of concern has to do also with the structure of the PDP. Because right now, the new draft, definitely we are looking at a representative model because of learnings from the current PDP. But in that model, there has to be some kind of guardrails in terms of, so yes, we have members for the PDP. We're not so sure how the participants, the alternates definitely step in when the members are not there. How should the participants and others engage? Especially for a PDP of this nature that might be of interest to other parties. And finally, the new draft is asking that we provide four seats to the registrars based off what we did with the first PDP. But in this case of API access or managing the technology layer, it doesn't have to do with different business models. APIs are APIs in Lagos, it's the same thing in London or elsewhere. And so it shouldn't give an undue advantage to the registrar block by giving them four seats while everybody has two. I will stop at this point, but there are still some more comments, just in case you want to react or others want to talk.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Lawrence. From what I understand, BC does not support this updated draft at all, and so I take your comments in that vein. But it would also be very useful, understanding that I think you already put your hand up to volunteer to be part of the drafting effort, so I appreciate that. And I appreciate that you will, of course, be very active during that effort as well. But it would be very useful also for Council and councilors to be able to see this kind of input in some way, shape, or form. If it's uncomfortable for BC to be able to put this into a comment on this document, then I advise maybe take a leaf out of the registry's book. We sent in some general comments without redlines as well, so it would be very useful for that. Do appreciate it. I won't react to the other items yet because I think, maybe other councilors, especially those that you've mentioned by name in stakeholder group, might want to react further. But I don't know if you wanted to continue with your points or if you wanted me to go to Farzaneh and then come back to you, Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay, we can take other views, and then I'll react later.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Hi. So I had some feedback on how the Associated Domain Check Working Group went. In general, and we expected that. When you are trying to come up with a policy in a manner that, more or less, they call efficient, what we need to consider is also a matter of how that efficiency affects other aspects of the policymaking process. So efficiency, yes, we can celebrate that we have this policy in a relatively short amount of time, but we have to, as the Council, look at, okay, so this was fast, but what was not considered? And the PDP is doing some kind of review on that as well. But I think it merits looking at how this kind of efficient manner of operating the PDP affected different issues and different concerns.

One thing that I noticed was that the group used this argument that what is being raised by some groups was out of scope, and they did not want to look at it. And "out of scope" became a major argument not to address the concerns that the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group actually raised. And so we have to look at this out-of-scope argument as it plays out in other PDPs as well. And if the charter has told a PDP that you need to address certain conditions, I don't think that we need to tell them how they should address it, if it should be narrow or broad and stuff like that, but it should be addressed. The concept of remedy, when we talked about it, and it is actually in the charter, the group said that, "Yeah, so remedy is out of scope." Maybe that's the wrong term to use. Maybe they didn't mean it's out of scope. But the charter had the question on remedy. What's the impact on the end user? And if necessary, what is the remedy? And so I think that in the future we need to, when we are operating these, when we are managing these PDPs, we need to be mindful of how the PDP is addressing the questions that are in the charter. As to the API charter, we have not yet looked at it. We have discussed it a little bit with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, and we prefer to have a drafting team so that we can delve into different issues. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you very much, Farzi. Appreciate that you looked at it with a broader perspective. I understand, of course, there were a lot of lessons learned, and there are still lessons being learned during the process of PDP 1. I think you do bring up a very good point. I guess first let me also take a half step back regarding this charter. This draft charter and, of course, the draft charter originally for PDP 1, both of them were included in the Final Issue Report. The charter for PDP 1 was a little bit more developed, and of course, the charter for this one was less so. And so, Lawrence, obliquely also addressing some of your comments and issues there too.

And then I do appreciate, of course, NCSG has from the very beginning, even during the small team, let us know there is a focus, there is a big importance that they are looking at, especially regarding registrant remedies and all of that. I also remind us all that it is a gap that was identified in the Issue Report. It is a gap that we absolutely have acknowledged in the small team report back to Council, and it is also a gap that will undergo the second step prioritization when we come to the remaining gaps that we haven't addressed or Council hasn't actually said anything else about next steps in that small team report back to Council, which is included in the Final Issue Report. So with all of that being said, again, just a reassurance to all councilors that we're not dropping any of this. And I actually do want to emphasize, of course, in this draft, and I do see a number of councilors putting in some redlines, and there's some suggestion right now that I see in chat regarding the possibility of looking at the initial draft and putting everything in redline. I think that is possible. I understand we can probably do that, but I also want to point out a big part of why you see this draft in front of you was because the original draft of the PDP 2 charter had quite a bit of redundant language, and we tried to streamline it some more. We also tried to make sure we were more technologically agnostic without naming that specific API term there. But of course, councilors, when we go into the charter drafting effort, we can talk about it more in depth and see how we can thread the needle there.

Yep. I'm taking the notes that I see from Justine in chat. That might be a very busy redline copy. Agreed. I'm sorry, staff. Maybe we can show both when we come to this effort, really, because we want to make sure councilors who are signing up for this effort are able to proceed. We certainly don't want a particular constituency to feel that they cannot put in comments in any way, shape, or form. I'm also wanting to give those who've had a chance to input the space to talk about that some more. If you're not ready to do that, I'm also happy to give a brief overview of what we've received. So I'm going to pause a little bit to see if there are any hands. No hands. Okay. Then you're going to hear my voice a little bit more.

All right. So we received some very, I guess, more editorial comments regarding how to update certain links. Those have been done. Typos, those have also been done. And then there's also a point I believe Anne raised about the human rights impact language from PDP 1 to be added back to this draft charter. These changes are ready to be made, and of course, we should probably wait until we have this charter drafting team convened to update all of this document. These are just changes that I think myself and staff, when we looked at it, did not seem to be overly controversial, but I'm just noting it right now here. There's also a few of us that have noted that some terms have been used inconsistently. We are going to try to make it more consistent throughout. Things like customer, account holder, registrant. Some more neutral language also was pointed out regarding whether the working group can first consider the problem, whether new consensus policy requirements are needed, and if so, what form they should take. So we talked about this during the small team effort and also in the preliminary and final Issue Report. There was a point about the definition of "at scale." I think several comments looked at "at scale" or "bulk," and even within the registries, and now I put the other hat on, we also had some discussion about this terminology as well. I will pause here because I now see a hand from Anne. Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. Thanks so much, Jen, and thanks for spearheading the effort on charter drafting. It's a clarification question. I think I heard you say that issues around effect on registrants, that that's a broader issue that's across the board in DNS abuse and might be the subject of a separate subset PDP, but I'm not sure if that's what you said. Could you clarify that?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sure. Thanks, Anne, for the question. So remedies, that is a gap that was identified in the small team Issue Report, and that very likely will be an effort, a PDP effort that will come out after we go through the prioritization exercise for the remaining issues and gaps in the DNS Abuse Final Issue Report.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay, thanks so much. I appreciate it.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sure. No problem. I don't know if any of the councilors or liaisons that I've very roughly gone over that summary would like to speak up on that, or if I've mischaracterized your concerns or comments. Now is the time to set the record right. I will pause to see if there are any hands. I'm not seeing any hands.

Oh, this is going to be a quick one. Okay. So one more item of note. So the GAC is not part of the charter drafting team, but staff and our liaison to GAC, Sebastien, had a very brief call with the GAC topic leads this morning, because they wanted to talk about their inputs. They will be conveying that and any inputs that they would like via, of course, Seb. I think the same applies to our other liaisons too. Of course, the liaison from ALAC and also ccNSO. If your communities or your constituencies have input, I do encourage you to convey that to them, and you convey those messages back to us, because the charter drafting effort is only for councilors and liaisons. And, yes, that should be clear. I see that there is a question in chat from Bruna. "Can we have a short briefing of what the GAC..." Oh, and the chat is now going too fast for me. One second, sorry. "Can we have a short briefing of what the GAC wants or their main interests since you mentioned the meeting?" It was a very brief meeting, Bruna. It was just to convey how they are able to input to the charter drafting effort for PDP 2, and really the answer was to convey their concerns and input via Sebastien. So that was really it. The second item that you are mentioning is going to be another call with the GAC, with all of the topic leads from Council and our counterparts from the GAC, and that's being scheduled, I think, for later this month. So it was just a very brief call this morning, specifically to do with the PDP 2 charter. Hopefully, that's helpful. Chris.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Just wanted to point out an observation that I've been thinking about in this process. Something that's different than any other PDP that I've read, and I'm not saying that it's bad, but I just wanted to sort of note it for the record. I think that this is an extraordinary degree of prescription for a PDP charter because we're not just identifying a problem and asking a working group to determine whether policy intervention is warranted. But in several places, this charter starts from the premise that new binding requirements should result, and it directs the working group to develop them.

And I get why we're going that way. I think that the small team and Council have done a lot of work to narrow the problem, and there's already a reasonable desire to sort of not reopen questions. A lot of this has already been considered, and so I'm comfortable proceeding on that basis, but I think that we should all take a look at that and recognize that it's an extraordinary approach, and not treat it as an ordinary starting point from a PDP to sort of presume that we're going to get to a point where we are directing that policy intervention is warranted, because it cuts both ways. I think that people who think that it might be too prescriptive, they should recognize the work that's gone into narrowing and defining the intended intervention. And then anybody who believes that the charter doesn't go far enough should recognize that the Council is already going considerably further than usual to signal an expected direction of the policy work. And I just sort of think that we should take a moment to take a look at what's in front of us and notice that it's not like most of the PDPs, at least I've seen before, in that regard.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Christian. Very good observation. In fact, I think this is sort of the premise of PDP 1 as well. In PDP 1's charter, there was the expectation very clearly laid out in the charter that an obligation for the registrars will result from the ADC PDP. And so I guess this is the second of those. And Christian, I know you are not part of PDP 1, so maybe you haven't seen that in detail.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Well, I've certainly followed that, but I was not a part of the drafting of the PDP. And so I'm not certain that I was aware that that was also very prescriptive. I would say that I would have definitely noted it that time as well. Because to me, in general, it is a fairly extraordinary approach, and I do understand why. I just think that it is worth noting.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Christian. I think it's good for councilors also to reflect on this as well, since ADC PDP or PDP 1, however you like to call it, is the first of this very focused PDP effort. And lessons learned again here. This is why we're applying this to what we're looking at now in this charter drafting effort. And I hear loud and clear from all the councilors who've spoken so far that this is something we should apply these lessons to, to see if this is the way Council wants to go, if Council thinks that this is actually a good way for these charters to go for the series of DNS abuse mitigation items and gaps that we still have remaining. I see now we have a queue. I will go to Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. Ashley, representing the registrars. Not nearly as thoughtful an intervention. More of a how do we proceed now on the current draft? Because I heard some recommendations that perhaps we go back to a redline version of the original. Only because the registrars are still... Well, we put together a bunch of comments, and then they all went on vacation and left me. And when they get back, in terms of finalizing it, should we wait to see another version or just keep building off of this one? Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Ashley, for a very good question. I heard the request from Lawrence about rolling it back to the initial version that we see from the Final Issue Report. I didn't see strenuous objection otherwise. So if there is, and people think we should not, please put your hand up or convey that in chat. I think we're trying to make it possible for all councilors to be able to comment. So again, I'm very sorry, staff. I don't know how we can proceed in a way that's not going to be very, very redlined, because we have had a redline from the initial, and then we have more comments and redlines on the redlined redline version. Recursive redlines all around. Yeah. Anyway, so I'm going to pause here for staff to think about it a little bit more, and I'll go to Farzi.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you. So Christian's comment just reminded me that during this ADC PDP, we constantly had to have these disagreements on how should the policy be. And some of the participants said that, "Oh, no, but the charter said this. The charter says that the ADC should start from one abusive domain." Or they would say that, when we said that, "Okay, so we might need specification for ADC," in the executive summary to say what ADC is, they took the charter language and they put it as what ADC is. And I don't think that... We need to be clear what the charter is doing here, and we need to rely on the chair quite a lot to reflect these points. And the next chair of this PDP should be briefed about what this charter is for, what can be done, and what cannot be done. So if there is a question that the charter asks the participants to answer, they need to answer that. But the charter does not set the policy. It's the PDP that sets the policy. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Farzi. Very good general points on the charter itself and how we look at using it, how it defines the framework of what the policy development should be. I think we're a little far from talking about the next chair, but certainly, whoever ends up being the chair of this next PDP will need to have a very thorough understanding of GNSO processes, how we develop the policies, and if they are already taking note of how Council is doing this chartering process, even better, because they will understand what we're trying to achieve here. I see John now, who will now save us from all the questions we have. John, please.

JOHN EMERY: Thank you, Jen. This is John Emery from ICANN Org. I did want to try and make this as easy as possible. As Justine has noted, it might be quite a difficult redline, and I want to see if the BC was perhaps amenable to this compromise. Since the vast majority of councilors have been commenting and have looked at this new PDP 2 draft charter, would it be possible, perhaps through the charter drafting process, for the BC to try and integrate things from the original charter that they feel are very important, and they can raise that and establish that? We can send along the original PDP charter as well if that's helpful, but trying to do a redline between the two could create quite the mess. So Lawrence, if that's amenable to the BC, I'd like to hear your opinion. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, John, for proposing a very practical solution. I will go to Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah. Thank you, John. Okay. So the difficulty that this imposes is the fact that there has been some material change from the initial draft charter and what we are currently supposed to work on. For instance, the draft charter had nine questions. Those nine questions have been repurposed to seven, and they are overly broad.

So, looking at both charters, so to say, the kind of response I would have to provide for the initial draft charter is definitely going to be different from what has now been put in the works. And this isn't the first time we're flagging this. This was flagged up initially, recognizing that we could run into a difficulty of this nature if we continue to work on the second draft that was proposed. A redline, definitely, at a minimum, will be the way to go, because we need to reference, to a large extent, what was in the initial draft, and then we can now work from there. I'm sure, like I said, we see a lot of value in what has been done so far, and that can definitely be integrated into the initial draft, but it's going to be difficult to course-correct certain aspects of the draft charter if we are not working from the initial or from the first draft. So, what you proposed, John, is still going to be difficult, because otherwise, if we can find a way where the comments we will be making are on the first and initial draft, then that works for us. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Lawrence. I'm seeing quite a lot of activity in the chat as well. So councilors, if you'd like to raise your hand to speak more on that, please go ahead. I'm not going to read and summarize the chat for the record. Farzi.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah. I'm sorry, I'm just going to disagree with Lawrence. So, we actually thought that coming up with a draft charter in the beginning based on the initial Issue Report was premature, and we need to work on it, but I don't see a problem with this new charter that considers all the conversations and all the lessons learned from the first PDP to have evolved. And also, if you have a problem, if you think that there is an aspect that was in the first draft that is not being considered, I think that you can do a little bit of homework and see if you want to bring that to the drafting team and say that, "I want this to be put back in the charter," as Anne did about human rights, and we can consider it. But coming up with working on the first draft as opposed to the second draft, I just don't think it's workable. So you can just bring the issue that you think should be put back in, and then we can consider it. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Farzi.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I would like to respond to that, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sure. If it's a quick response, Lawrence, and then we need to follow the queue. Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. So thank you for that comment. One of our requests is to have the nine questions in the initial draft charter brought back into scope. Kindly let us know how that works. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Lawrence. I noticed that there are still two hands in the queue, and there is also a lot going on in the chat. I'll respond very quickly to you and also Anne, and then I'll go to Justine. So Lawrence, the nine questions, well, I'm not going to go into substance of that, but there were quite a lot of redundant questions that asked the same thing, which is why it went from nine to seven. But then, of course, we can talk about it more as we go into the drafting team efforts. I see that Anne has noted, why not give the charter drafting team a redline for reference? Of course, we do have that, and we can also have that circulated once more, especially when we get into the drafting team efforts. Now I'll come back to the queue. Justine, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Jen. This is Justine. Unfortunately, I won't be on the drafting team anymore. But I think it's useful to work with the current draft rather than a redline. I think I can imagine the redline being so busy that I think people will go bonkers looking at it. The other way to do it is to do a comparison of this draft and the earlier draft, and just make sure that we look at both at the same time, and then transpose anything we want to transpose back from the earlier draft to this draft. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Justine, for that. And I'm sad that you reminded us that this is going to be your last Council call, but I will save the tears for later. Steve, did you want me to go to you, or did you want me to go to Samantha first?

STEVE CHAN: I have no preference. I was really just going to talk about the changes to the charter questions and maybe a little bit of context around that. So, as you wish.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay. Then, since you have the floor, please go ahead.

STEVE CHAN: Okay. Thanks, Jen. This is Steve from staff. And I guess maybe by way of background and context, taking us back to maybe the last meeting, for the reasons why we suggested, I guess is a better way to put it, the changes that you see in the draft charter, is some of the things that Jen mentioned, which is trying to remove some of the redundancy and a little bit of lack of clarity, too. But I think one of the biggest things that we were trying to address is that the way that the charter questions were written, we actually purposely made them a little bit more open. And I know that may be a concern or objection for Lawrence and the BC, but there's, we think, a good reason for that, in that the original draft that was included in the Issue Report sort of presumed and answered the questions in the way that they were drafted, and that's just sort of a no-no. That's just not how we generally try to draft charter questions. And you're supposed to let the working group come up with the responses. And so that was one of the really, really important things that we thought was important to address in the updated draft that you see. And so at least from the staff side, we think it's a better approach to make sure that the working group is the one that has the agency to answer the questions, not prescribe them in the charter itself. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Steve, for saying things much more eloquently than I can and giving more context on why we're seeing the current draft. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jen. Hi, everyone. This is Sam. Steve, I appreciate the additional context that you provided there, and I think generally speaking, that is a good direction to be moving in. Right? The charters, generally speaking, should ask questions without assuming the outcome of them. I think we can all agree with that. I think that's even echoing some of the contributions that others have made about this so far.

Generally speaking, I think directionally, the Registry Stakeholder Group did prefer the second version for the reasons that you mentioned. But I will note, and this has been provided on list already, that the registries think there is additional room to remove redundancies even further than what's on here. So I would just suggest that at this point in time, knowing that we are going to convene a charter drafting team, and that we can really roll up our sleeves and dig into the work here, maybe the best way forward is for all of us who are planning to participate on that charter drafting team to review both versions of the document and come at this exercise a bit fresh. Not necessarily start the discussions with the idea of wordsmithing what is on the paper, but really just understand what the purpose and objective of this policy development effort is and bring that into the first discussions as the charter drafting team. And then from there, we can begin workshopping what the actual questions are going to be using both drafts, right, both versions of there, and see what works for that larger objective. So maybe just a word of encouragement for folks to be really thinking about what it is that we're trying to achieve here, and not necessarily getting super tripped up on the drafts themselves, because I think we do have some flexibility to adjust them as we want to, as we really engage in the charter discussions. Thanks, everyone.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Sam. Really practical, good way forward suggestion. I think if we look at it from this point of view, and also taking into account all of the good input that we've heard from the Council so far about the bigger picture, about how Council has been focusing on a more focused charter, I mean a more focused PDP effort, a more focused thing that helps us bring to more predictable and faster... Well, faster in terms of ICANN land speed records, and efficient outcomes.

So, with that, I think we've exhausted the queue. I think it's quite clear that next steps for this is we will have a charter drafting effort. We also want any SGs and Cs that haven't really shared your input yet and still want to before the charter drafting effort to send it over to Council list, to staff, to make sure we have all that collated. Those of us who already have volunteered, the list was posted on the chat. Others have indicated your interest as well. And then we will send out a Doodle poll to the volunteers for meetings that will most likely begin the week of August 24th, when PDP 1 is out for a public comment. I think that is it for me, and I can pass it back to Susan for our next agenda item.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Jennifer. And, yeah, thanks everyone. Really good discussion. Lots of good input. So hopefully, we can get that drafting team underway. And it's clear, I think from the nature of the discussion, that it's a good thing that we're doing this now and we have a bit of time to do it, and we're not trying to rush this in short order, because clearly there are some things to iron out.

Okay. So our next agenda item relates to the review of the GNSO Liaison to the GAC and also an update from the liaison, the liaison being Sebastien, as you know. So the GNSO Liaison to the GAC was a post that was introduced as a pilot initially in about 2015, 2016. And it was to support getting earlier engagement with the GAC in GNSO policy development. Really, it stemmed from a situation where quite often, GAC input would be coming quite late in the process and caused problems, and a general feeling that there needed to be more of a sort of earlier input and more of a sort of dialogue element. And it's really now become something that's a permanent component now of the way that we deal with the GAC. So following an application process and a recommendation from the Standing Selection Committee, the SSC, Sebastien Ducos was appointed to be the GNSO Liaison to the GAC on the 8th of August 2024, which in fact is two years ago. And the liaison serves a two-year term. And they are eligible as a liaison, if they wish to, to serve up to two consecutive terms, so a maximum of four years.

We have a document setting out the role for the liaison, and under that description document, Council is required to review the role and the liaison's performance every two years before we consider to reconfirm the appointment. And so part of that exercise also includes requesting the input from the GAC and/or the GAC Secretariat regarding the GAC's view of the liaison's effectiveness and performance. And that's something that we've asked for and we are expecting to get shortly. And so what we would be looking at would be having a further consideration of this in our September meeting, when we hopefully have that input and councilors have had their own opportunity to give some consideration to this as well. Just reminding that Seb's current term ends at ICANN 87, because that's the 2026 Annual General Meeting. And we would want to review the feedback that we receive from the GAC, if any, and kind of assess our own kind of feedback prior to that. So the idea is we'll have a discussion in our September meeting. In preparation for that, asking councilors really to just review that description document of the role, which is one of the documents that's attached to the agenda for this meeting, so that folks have it conveniently to hand. And then when we get any feedback from the GAC, we will circulate that as well.

And then the other point is obviously it's helpful for the liaison to reflect on their own view of the kind of first two-year term. And so we've asked Seb if he would share with us his thoughts on how the term has gone, and also how he feels that perhaps the liaison role has maybe changed or evolved during the course of his first two-year term. And then additionally, we're also in the process obviously of moving into the prep for the ICANN 87 meeting. And we'll have certain intersessional meetings with the GAC and so on. And so this is also a good opportunity to ask Sebastien if he could give us any kind of insight on sort of current activities of the GAC, areas of interest, how we might expect to be engaging with the GAC in preparation for, and then at, the ICANN 87 meeting. Obviously, we know many of the topics that the GAC is interested in, in relation to the GNSO. They come up regularly. We've got GAC members participating in different PDPs and other efforts. So, we have members of the GAC in PDP 1 on abuse. We've got members of the GAC in the SSAD SRT, for example. And we know that there were certain priorities that were raised during ICANN 86, and I think it's pretty reasonable to assume that they're going to remain GAC priorities for the next meeting. But generally, I think, as I said, what we will do is we'll hear from Seb now, ask folks to look at the liaison role and responsibilities document, and reflect on this. And then we'll come to our next meeting prepared to just have a conversation and consider any GAC feedback that we've had and so on, and hopefully look to be considering the reappointment of Sebastien. Okay. I think with that, I've probably waffled on quite a lot, and maybe I'll turn the mic over to Sebastien now, and we can hear from him, if that's okay with you, Seb?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It is okay for me. So I just wanted to maybe caveat one little reality, which is up until exactly 24 hours ago, my time since the last ICANN was completely devoted to filling and getting applications ready. And so I have come back to this topic literally this morning, but I've had time to look at it. I want to thank John also from staff, who's helped me here. And yeah, and that's that. So, reflecting on the last two years of the GAC role, and I suppose that you all know also that before ICANN 87, I'm actually supposed to formally hand a report on that activity, or the activity of the last year, a written report, which I'm still due to draft.

What I found was that my predecessor had done a fantastic job at upping the interaction and the level of that relationship. But it was essentially a relationship between two individuals that knew each other and knew their groups quite well and were doing a fantastic job. But that felt to me a two one-man team. And the interaction there was great, but greatly also filtered by their own personal views and interests and everything. And I'm not accusing either of them of swaying the discussion or the points of view of their groups or anything like that, but it was very colored by the two personalities. And so as I stepped up to the role, I wanted and I was hoping to be able to multiply those interactions, particularly between topic leads, a concept that didn't completely exist on our side but existed firmly on the GAC side, and they had topic small groups and leads to those groups. But we found that in the GNSO too. We found people that were ready to champion this or that topic, and they're still around. There are still four councilors out there that are each leading one of their topics. The reality on the ground is it probably didn't work as efficiently as I had hoped. It worked really well year one, on the topic of Internet governance. So the first year, two years ago, WSIS was the big topic of the day, and there was ample interaction between the topic leads on our side and on their side. There were meetings at every ICANN. That worked really well. And I don't know how much it played a role in the success of WSIS at the end, but let's say that at the end, we found it was generally a successful interaction.

It's been a successful interaction, I think, also on the topic of DNS abuse. I don't know, again, how much of it is personality, how much of it is the interaction between Jen and the several topic leads there. But it seems to work. They seem to be aware of what we're doing and et cetera. They always want more. Everybody always wants more, but that seems to work. It is, though, the two topics where it did work. Not that it didn't work on the other side, on the other topics, but there was just not much interaction. Some topics we tried. We tried to push them. I'm thinking of human rights and so on. But the reality is that there was very little uptake on the other side, which is a bit disappointing. But it is the reality. What I think needs to happen now, possibly, is without going back all the way to the old model, but certainly reinforce that old model. One of the things that they had that was really working well between them is this cadence of meetings and topics and, sorry, meetings and then review of topics and being able to do that very regularly. Again, in my own humble opinion, some of it may have been a bit colored, but at least it was done. And trying to sort of share the responsibility of that interaction with the topic leads, I think that we need to now pare back that, because where those interactions don't happen, they haven't really been happening either, or only anecdotally between the liaisons. So we definitely need to go back to having that monthly call firmly. There have been a few missed, particularly in the last two months, obviously, because of summer and et cetera. But even right before ICANN, when the GAC decided not to have a meeting with us, the ball was a bit dropped there.

In terms of what the GAC is seeking here, I think that they've really upped their game in terms of participation in our work, in terms of participation in PDPs, in our working groups. All this, to me, is very positive. I know that some may view that as undue influence from the GAC, which has other means of interacting in this community, but I see it as a positive because it's interaction that comes early in the piece. They don't wait until advice. They don't wait until the last moment to shut it down. They interact, they play, and because that's also the reality, they get to hear the reasons as to why decisions are taken in one way or another. It's much easier to criticize something when it's all done. It's a lot harder to do it when you've gone through the process and understood why certain doors got shut and why certain decisions were taken. And I think that having them participating helps. Now, the reality, and we spoke about it today, actually, in our call with them specifically on the topic of DNS abuse, but the reality also is that the GAC is very much a revolving door. And there's constantly people coming in and coming out. The reality is that the small number of GAC members that actually are there long enough, have enough of an understanding, have enough understanding of the topics and the community and the way we operate, they're few and far between. And I think it's worth concentrating on them. It's worth maybe, again, trying to make sure that that liaison interaction happens very much, but try to also enroll them in this, trying to make them better understand how we operate. There's still many questions. I'm surprised to hear the questions that I hear, even by seasoned GAC members, on our operations. We need to continue that education. We need to continue that interaction, explaining to them how we work, and get away from stuff that we've heard at a pretty high level there on the mic, on the recording, such as the fact that we're way too slow, that we're not moving, that we're operationally inefficient and so on and so forth, without understanding the reality of how we work. There's a lot of talk on the chat, but I'm sorry I can't read and speak at the same time, so I'll deal with it later.

One of the asks from the GAC in their participating in our work, this was mentioned again today, but it's not the first time I hear it, is the ability of having a voice to our chartering effort. And I'm not going to open this right now because I know exactly what I'm going to hear, particularly given the discussion 30 minutes ago. But I think that their ambition is indeed in saying, "Well, if we're participating in the work, we want to make sure that we can participate in the charter." But I think that they'll understand that that's definitely a role for Council and not a role for the entire community. We're responsible for making sure that the trains are on time on policy development, that resources are available and so on and so forth. If everybody is in there, it's going to be a mess. I think that is explainable. I think, too, that right now the situation is in these cases, they would come to me and say, "Hey, we're seeing this happening. We're seeing this item in the charter." Whatever, this needs to move or this needs to be, whatever their recommendation might be early stage. Passing it on to me is probably not the ideal model. It's the easy model, but it's not the ideal model. One, because I'm not a councilor. And other GAC liaisons may have had a different view of the role, but I don't see this role as being a role of real input in your work. You're the councilors. You're doing the work. I'm just liaising here. So I don't want to be that. I've seen also a comment before we started the discussion reminding us of the good Rafik Dammak, who has many times said that I'm the GNSO liaison to the GAC and not the GAC's liaison to the GNSO. I'm not there to carry their parcels. So I don't know exactly how that should be done. I think they should be heard early, in exactly the same vein as them participating in PDPs. They should be heard early rather than us having to hear their point of view in a more formal and constraining way, advice, or even issues of interest. But whilst I'm ready to hear it and I'm ready to pass on the message, I don't think that I should be the one defending their point of view on Council. It's not my role, it's not my position, it's not the voice I ever have or I've had, and I don't think it's part of the role. If anything, if that's an idea, that role should change or that roles and responsibility paper should change because it's not the way I read it.

In the meantime, and in an effort to sort of regenerate a bit the conversation, also frankly, in concluding after ICANN 86, where there was clearly a break in communication there between us, with the help of staff on both sides, we're going to re-coordinate, and we're in fact reestablishing a calendar and a cadence of meetings between the liaisons with help of staff and their hand in it. We want to make these conversations with topic leads, and again, I'm reminding you that in the normal, in the classic way we interact when we have those meetings at ICANN, the questions usually come from the GAC or have come from the GAC. I'd love to develop a model where we have questions to the GAC too, but so far, the questions have mainly come from the GAC, and they're issued technically by the topic leads on the GAC. It's not the plenary, it's not the GAC leadership, it's the topic leads that come on each topic with their questions. That process is a bit long on their end. It takes several weeks for them to be able to, or I don't know exactly where that length exists, but between the moment we say, "Hey, we need questions," and the moment we get them, there is usually a month, month and a half that happens. Which means that we end up getting questions maybe three weeks before ICANN, and we're still crossing T's and dotting I's on them two days before we meet, sometimes even the afternoon before we meet, depending on when that meeting happens. So we'd like to also take that much earlier, push the GAC maybe. Again, I haven't identified clearly where the lag happens, but maybe ensure that the GAC engages there earlier, to give everybody more time to answer questions. Sometimes those questions, as it happened in ICANN 86 on the topic of 14 days, sometimes those questions are going to be on topics that we're not technically working on. This is clearly not a topic that was a PDP in the works and we weren't even thinking about it. It wasn't something that we were ready to discuss. I want to make sure that we do have time for that. There was a lot of to and fro about it. I went back to my emails and when I received it, indeed, I did receive an email on the Friday that I didn't forward until the Monday to Susan and her team. But that in itself, that weekend, is not the difference between us having time to pull all the different parts of our community and get answers on what we wanted. Timeframes on this were very short. I've heard from the GAC that this is a topic that shouldn't be novel and that we should have worked on or we should have thought about before, but that's their point of view. But in the reality of things, giving us questions, assignments, or whatever they want to give us three weeks before ICANN is a very, very short timeframe for us to be able to go back to our different constituencies and be able to formulate a point of view. And I think everybody agrees with that.

Sorry, I'm trying to find my bullet points to make sure I'm not missing anything. And again, thank you, John, for helping with this. Yeah. So once we've established the topics, the questions, between the leads, and here I will need your help also, by the way, GNSO topic leads. This used to be very much a conversation between the two liaisons. I still want to move away from this. I still want to be able to have most of those questions actually hammered down way before we come to the meeting and completely avoid this gotcha question situation that we find ourselves, or that we have found ourselves, during those plenary meetings so many times. So once those topics are discussed, and as early as possible, then we want to be able to share them with the rest of the GNSO, the same way the GAC might want to socialize it on their end. And then have at least one Council meeting before, so a whole month before an ICANN, and not just a few days, to be able to discuss these topics, have an item on the agenda, making sure that... And if it's a five-minute item because it turns out that those questions are clear, concise, and exactly what we've prepared, then fine, that's great. But to give ourselves at least the time to be able to do it and not having to rush it during prep days on a Sunday as everybody's just landed and jet lagged. And again, repeating the cadence of monthly meetings. Some of these meetings are not going to be quite as interesting. Probably an August meeting in the middle of summer might not be the one that is the most lively with much news to share, but still have it and still be able to have it.

The last item that I wanted to discuss also, and make sure that you guys are fully conscious of, is on the GAC there's a lot of changes happening right now, both in terms of their management, with Ian Sheldon from Australia stepping up as chair in Bali, but also in terms of their staff, the management of the staff, replacements out there. So there have been a few changes, and there's a number of people that are wanting to look at our relations also in a different way that are interested in what we have to propose. But I think it's a very good time to look at this. And I will push to have as much input as possible for our next meeting. I believe our next meeting is on the 10th of September, so we have time before that to meet with them and hear that. And hopefully Ian will be able to join, too. And, yeah, that's about it. I think I've cleared, I'm looking quickly through all the points, I think cleared all the points that I wanted to clear. But I'm happy to take questions if you have any. Should I run the queue for myself, or do you want to do that, Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Why don't I run it, Sebastien, since I've turned my audio back on. Christian.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thanks, Sebastien, for the work that you're doing on this. Jen put in the chat that it's important for us to have formal and informal mechanisms, and of course, the formal mechanism that we're supposed to be using is the communiqué process in order to have these conversations back and forth. And we'd prefer that to having these random letters sent the week before ICANN. I'm wondering whether a structured conversation with the GAC about our collective feelings about the effectiveness of that formal process might be helpful because it could flag areas where they feel like they can't communicate effectively back and forth through that process. But simultaneously, by having that interaction, we get to basically use it as an educating function for how formal communications, I think, are supposed to be run. Do you think that that'd be a useful exercise to try and go through?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, I'm not quite sure I've fully understood the question. So reviewing the formal side of our interactions, is that what you mean?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I'm saying, like, our formal way of communication. The whole GAC to whole GNSO Council and whole Board, their process to do those kinds of missives is the process of them issuing a communiqué and reviewing that and perhaps sending back our own notes. So that is a formal process that has been in place for a long time in order to do this. A review of that process, even informal review in conversation, could help to highlight what they're feeling they're not getting out of that process that leads them to want to write letters like that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, yeah. I completely agree. We can put this on the table. Personally, I see a massive issue with this. It needs to exist. It needs to stay. It needs to stay the way it is. But in itself, it's not sufficient in the sense that if anybody expects our process to be more efficient and, in the GAC point of view, quicker in getting results and et cetera, having three letters a year to discuss what we're doing is not enough. We need to be able to talk to each other a lot more. We need to be able to exchange a lot more. And I understand that particularly given our community and the visibility and the scrutiny, we can't do that just informally. There needs to be formalism. I don't particularly welcome having to do and deal with a communiqué six times a year, but I think that we need to find another form for the interim of being able to talk to each other and show, demonstrate process, being able to demonstrate that things are moving and being able to hear questions, and so on and so forth. I think that would be helpful. Again, I don't particularly welcome having to go through the exercise six times a year. Three times a year is complicated enough for everybody to have their ducks in a row. But at the same time, for a body that screams at how slow we are and our inefficiency, limiting ourselves to just those three interactions seems to me curtailing a bit what we could be doing.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Just to react immediately, the one thing I'll say is, in bringing up that we're talking about ensuring that we are working on both our formal and informal processes. I think the informal processes and the relationships necessary, that's a different component, one that I fully agree with. The formal processes being three times a year is likely because we're talking about mechanisms that need to reach rough consensus, and it is tough to create documents that reach rough consensus.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It takes them maybe not a week, but it takes them three days of that week to draft the communiqué. Not all of it is for us, but it takes them a very long time to get there.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: And so we do need both. I agree.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. Conscious of the time. Lawrence and Bruna, and I think maybe I'll shut the queue after that. So Lawrence first.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Susan, and thanks, Seb, for all you do on this front. We recognize that the GAC definitely are strategic partners, I want to put it that way, to the work we do. Like it or not, we have to listen and react to whatever concerns they have. However we would do that depends on us. But one key thinking about the role that you play, for me, is one where the relationship between the Council, GNSO Council, and the GAC is better oiled, for lack of a better word. Having sat in this role for two years now, what two to three mechanisms do you think we should be considering as a Council to adopt to reduce the amount of friction we now see or we now experience between the Council and the GAC, because we definitely have to coexist together?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So at half past midnight, I don't have a quick answer for you now, but definitely something I'll take note of and provide before we have that discussion. For me, it's all about additional communication. But there's only so much I can say and scream that we should talk to each other if people actually don't do it. But it is about that. It is about engaging, and there are not that many of them, particularly with those individuals within the GAC who are on top of their topic, able. It's not just being ready, it means also that they have the capacity job-wise to be able to do it, but able to participate, willing to participate, and engage with us. I don't think there's a huge amount to be done to counteract the portion of the GAC that feels like they need to shut us down on the mic and on the recording just because it makes them look good. That part, I don't want to ignore them. They're an important voice within the GAC, and they're part of the game. But there are so many others that we can... But these are more one-on-one, possibly the more informal side of the interaction with members of the GAC that we need to interact. But that means also that we need to go and cross the aisle and have those conversations with them, again, topically to topically or within those groups. I think that it happens in working groups, but I'd like to see it more in general. But again, I'll put a more formal answer to your question, Lawrence, before the next discussion next month.

SUSAN PAYNE: That sounds good. Thanks, Seb. Okay. Bruna, last word on this, and then we'll, I'm afraid, have to close off this topic. But I can see a huge amount in the chat, by the way, which I also wasn't able to keep on top of, but I think there'll be some interesting reading afterwards. Anyway, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks, Susan. I'll try to be as brief as possible. And Seb, thanks a lot for the points on your work. Honestly, it's a good effort and so on. And I just wanted to point out the thing that Christian was talking about, that Farzi had already pointed out on the chat as well about the communiqué. And I think that most of us that try to point out to the communiqué as the kind of official formal mechanism is mostly out of this concern that to the extent that we're opening communications with the GAC, we're also opening avenues for lobbying around certain topics, right? It's not because the GAC is poorly or bad intended, but it's just the nature of things and how things are. Whoever is talking to you will share some interests or will share priorities or concerns and stuff like that. And I think one relevant piece about your role as well is to try to communicate things in a way that Council is also able to filter what's an interest, what's a request, what's kind of, in between brackets, an "order," for that matter, right? So just pointing that out as well, because I think the formality of the communiqué as a mechanism in our letters is relevant for keeping the impartiality around things and also keeping away all those attempts around lobbying or around trying to advocate for certain things and so on. So just re-emphasizing these points.

And on the point that Lawrence was saying, just a quick note on that, I don't see friction, honestly. I see different interests. And a group as diverse as the GAC is, it's really hard to kind of keep in line just one or two priorities, because they're all different governments coming from different parts of the world. And we're also a very different and diverse group as GNSO as well. So it's also important for us to keep that in mind because the homogeneity, there is not a way that the GAC and the GNSO will agree on every single word around every single topic. And this diversity is what makes things interesting and makes us driven around rough consensus for the general point. So yeah, just thanking you for that, Seb, and sorry for taking too much time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Susan, back to you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Thanks very much. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Seb, and thank you, councilors. Really good discussion. I think we all have the same aim. We'd like to see the relationship with the GAC as sort of an effective and useful one, and we really appreciate, I think we all do see the value of the role of the liaison in keeping those lines of communication open, and more communication can only be better. So, okay. And again, just a reminder to folks, take a look at the job description. We'll share the GAC's feedback when we have it, and we'll sort of circle back on the specific consideration of a second term at our next meeting.

Okay. I think we are onto AOB, and just a couple of things to flag. The first is around ICANN planning and the draft GNSO schedule. Just noting for everyone that we have our pre-ICANN 87 Council webinar, which will be on the 1st of October at 13:00 UTC. As you all know, it's a kind of requirement for councilors to attend that webinar. It's an opportunity to ask working group chairs questions, to hear from them about progress, and so on. And it's really a part of our role in managing the PDP process. Obviously, there are occasions when folks can't attend in real time, and if that's the case, we do ask that you do please send apologies so that we know who we're expecting, and catch up on the recording as soon as you can, because it is a really important part of our role. That's the only thing I really wanted to flag on this. I'll just sort of pause and see if Terri or other of our staff support have anything they wanted to flag to us at the minute. Hi, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi. I have lots to flag for ICANN 87. So is everybody ready? Here we go. So our ICANN 87 Annual General Meeting will be held in Bali, Indonesia, at the Bali International Convention Center from the 17th to the 22nd of October 2026, and Prep Week will be conducted the 5th, 6th, and 7th of

October 2026. This is very important. Please, please make sure you register for ICANN 87. If you are a funded traveler, use the link in your ICANN email that Travel has sent you. If you are not a funded traveler, use the link from the ICANN 87 main page. And look, I'm going to drop it in chat really quick. So again, it's super important that you register. In-person attendance registration remains open until the 14th of October. And if you have family members coming, make sure they're registering as well. That's a nice little helpful tip for you. Okay. If you are a funded GNSO traveler, please respond to all ICANN Travel emails. They've given you dates in there. Please be kind and do your part if you're a funded traveler.

All right. Let's talk about this ICANN 87 draft schedule that Saewon has kindly put up on screen for us. GNSO staff has been working with your SG/C support staff to try to minimize conflicts. Once all meetings for all of ICANN 87 are entered, what happens is the Meetings Team then takes a look at all the requests, and then they start coming back to us and saying, "Hey, there's not enough rooms here. There's not enough rooms there." And we have to work with your SG/C support and readjust meetings to different dates and times. The reason I want to mention this is even though we all try so hard not to have conflicts, in order for you to have the meeting that you need, it has to go into a room that actually has availability to you. So that is going to be creating some conflicts that you may not have preferred. I just want to let you know we are all trying our best. Okay, so here we go. There will be four DNS Abuse PDP meetings throughout the week. There will be three SSAD SRT meetings throughout the week, and then in addition to that, the SSAD will be having a day minus one meeting on October 15th.

Running back to Sunday. Sunday is going to be busy for you folks. There will be three GNSO Council working sessions. If you have topics you would like to see on the GNSO Council working session, please send them in an email to the Council mailing list. We are working with the GAC support to get the joint GAC and GNSO Council scheduled. It's a work in progress. Rolling into Monday, you'll have your welcome ceremony, your Dr. Tarek Kamel Award, followed by two community sessions, and at the end of the day, we'll have our GNSO Council informal session, which we invite the SG/C leadership to join as well. Tuesday is your constituency day, but there's going to be some joint ICANN Board meetings, one with CPH and one with CSG. And then Wednesday you'll have our joint ICANN Board and GNSO Council, and then the ICANN Board and NCSG, followed by the GNSO Council meeting part one. This is our normal meeting, part one. Then what happens is we roll into part two. Outgoing councilors will remove themselves from the U-shaped table. Incoming councilors, this is when you're going to be seated, start your new role. It's also when we vote for the chair. So that, again, is our GNSO Council admin part two, so it's really important. That evening, Jennifer Chung, shout out to Jen, is going to be hosting our GNSO Council dinner. Reminder, this is for both outgoing and incoming councilors, again, and the liaisons. We've already sent a hold-the-date invite. More details will come as things become more scheduled for us. If you're not attending this dinner, please let us know sooner rather than later. Otherwise, we plan on you attending. Headcount is important, and also remember, councilors pay for their own dinner, and if you cancel after the deadline, then you are still required to pay for dinner. Rolling into Thursday, it's our ICANN public forum, followed by the GNSO Council wrap-up and a couple other community sessions that you'll see on screen as well.

Closer to the meeting, we will send you a "how to get organized" email. We send it every meeting, and then shortly following that, I send you a list of all of these meetings that I just spoke about so you don't have to memorize them. And then also during the meeting, I continue sending you daily emails to help you stay organized as what's going on that day. That is my big take about that, and I will roll into questions. Seeing and hearing nothing. Susan, back to you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Terri. Okay, that's a lot to take in. But good to know that we've got the schedule, at least a sort of early version, so we can start planning ourselves.

All right. Then we had, I mentioned at the beginning, we have one other item of AOB, and this is the kind of sad part. It's basically a sort of farewell and thank you to our outgoing ALAC liaison, Justine Chew. Obviously, we all know Justine will be joining the ICANN Board at the upcoming AGM, and so she recently informed us that this would be her last GNSO Council meeting as the ALAC liaison because there's a certain amount of kind of onboarding and readiness that a new Board member has to do. And so, we need to give Justine time to get up to speed for her new role. And whilst we're obviously really delighted that Greg Shatan will be taking over this role, and many of us already know Greg. I think he's been listening in to most, if not all, of this call. But nevertheless, Justine's been a really valued Council colleague and friend for us for a number of years and will be greatly missed, I think. Justine became the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council at the end of the AGM at ICANN 72, so that's October 2021. And really on behalf of Council, just wanted to extend our sincere thanks to Justine for her service to the GNSO Council. I would say she's routinely been one of the first people to put her hand up to volunteer for a task or a small team, and she always has an eye to coming up with a kind of compromise or a solution to try and help us move things forward. Her contributions have been invaluable over the last five years in strengthening the Council relationship with the ALAC and also in enhancing the GNSO Council's own output and effectiveness. So really, I think, I'm sure I speak for all of us when I say that the Council really greatly appreciates the time and the commitment and the engagement that you've shown to us, Justine, and that you've dedicated to this role, and we'll really miss your collaborative approach and keen perspective and thoughtful considerations. Obviously excited to see you taking on a new role on the Board, and the Board are extremely lucky to be having you joining them, and we look forward to seeing you go from strength to strength, really, and every success in that new role. But yeah, it's bittersweet that we have to say goodbye to Justine, and so I think that was all I wanted to say, just heartfelt thanks and good luck in the new role. And I'll just pause in case anyone else has anything they want to say. But Justine, thank you for everything that you've been doing. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, I just wanted to sort of echo your thoughts, Susan. Justine, thank you so much. You've been an outstanding liaison to Council and an outstanding friend to all of us. So, the Board is so blessed and so lucky to have you. We're going to miss you, and we look forward to working with you in your new role in the future. So thank you so much.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Damon. Okay. I'm not seeing... Oh, Justine, good.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Susan. Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Damon. I just wanted to express my gratitude for the friendship and the collaboration that you have all shown me, as well as past councilors from previous years. I think it's been my honor to serve as the ALAC liaison to GNSO Council. And I don't intend to be a stranger. You will see me lurking around in GNSO Council meetings probably, and feel free to come up and talk to me. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: I think we can promise that we'll still talk to you, Justine. And those who are remaining on Council will probably look forward to a nice grilling from you in your new role as a Board member as well. But yes, thank you. Thank you very much, and really genuinely, congratulations and good luck with the new role. All right, folks. With that, I think we have come to the end of our agenda, and we have a few minutes left still, but I think for some of us, it's super late at night, and so probably really happy to hear that we may finish a few minutes early. So I think that is probably it for us for our August meeting, and see you all on email and at the 10th of September meeting as well. All right. Thanks very much, everyone.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Thanks, Susan.

TERRI AGNEW: All right. Thank you, everyone, for joining. Have a great rest of your day. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Please take care. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]