

---

ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council

Thursday, 16 April 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.

The audio is also available at:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/u6nSfjNa9GIHr0hh7-QbsneQkLmabdzfw26nClxyx40u4Axlqozo-ZMs82NxOd2NjxKnfoVRvN8IRR7E.kZz-s5A6jMLVCNXp>

Zoom Recording:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/hKTcbagcogYoeivmAj02xRrn6aw5jPNma6sqDSvj7p6PgfMyQjkQBA3behCJszk.DFe2XvjVmUhKog1F?startTime=1776373309000>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

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

List of attendees:

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

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Volker Greimann

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz (apologies, proxy to Samantha Demetriou),

Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav Vedi (apologies, proxy to Anne Aikman Scalese)

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal (apologies, proxy to

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts) , Osvaldo Novoa, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne, Susan Mohr

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius,

Peter Akinremi, Tapani Tarvainen, 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:

Sophie Hey GNSO representative to the Review of Reviews

Greg DiBiase and Wes Hardaker - ICANN Board

---

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

---

ICANN Staff:

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

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

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) (apology)

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on Thursday, the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2026.

Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you.

Nacho Amadoz sends in his apologies, and the proxy will go to Samantha Demetriou. 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?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Ashley Heineman?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Awesome. Volker Greimann?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Happy to be here.

TERRI AGNEW: Gaurav Vedi sends in his apologies, and the proxy will go to Anne Aikman Scalese. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

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

---

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Vivek Goyal sends in his apologies. The proxy will go to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. 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, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR: I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here with an ample supply of coffee.

TERRI AGNEW: I hope it's a good stuff. All right. Farzaneh Badii? I don't see where Farzaneh has joined. We will go ahead and reach out. Maybe by the time I finish roll call, we will have her on. We shall see. Peter Akinremi?

PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Present.

---

TERRI AGNEW: Bruna Martins Dos Santos? Actually, I see where Bruna just joined. So, Bruna, I just sent you the additional panelist to be moved over. Bruna, I believe you now have mic availability.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Yes. Present, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Christian Dawson?

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

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Anne Aikman Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm present, Terri. Thank you.

---

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: I am here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. All right. I don't see where Farzi is on quite yet. We'll continue to try to reach her.

Our guest today will be Sophie Hey, GNSO representative to the Review of Reviews, and Alice Jansen, ICANN Org support. In addition, we'll have Greg DiBiase and Wes Hardaker from ICANN Board.

Policy Team supporting the GNSO, you have Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, 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're in a Zoom Webinar Room, and councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat. Please change your chat now 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 ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply the Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning Statements of Interest. With this, I'll turn the call back over to Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Terri. Hi, everyone. Welcome to the Council meeting for 16 of April 2026. I'm just noting in the chat for you, Terri, that Farzaneh and Bruna are in the same location, so she is also present.

Okay. Before we begin, does anyone have any updates to their Statements of Interest? Okay. Not hearing anything.

Any amendments proposed to the agenda for today? Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. Susan, I don't know. I think this is an amendment, but just under Any Other Business, I do want to give an update. And my role is the liaison for Curative Rights IRT. There's an update I want to give, so please clue me at the end, please. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks for that, Damon. Yeah, we'll make sure to add you in AOB.

---

Okay. Then I would note that the minutes from our last couple of Council meetings, so the one on the 12<sup>th</sup> of February were posted on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of March 2026, and the minutes from our last Council meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> of March were posted on the 29<sup>th</sup> of March 2026. So, with that, then we can move on to agenda item two, which is the Review of the Projects and Action Lists.

I think everyone probably is very well aware and recalls that we've discussed how the GNSO Support Team updates and distributes the projects list and the action decision radar approximately 10 days before the monthly Council meeting. So it's a task for all of us to be sure to look at those materials as we're preparing for the meeting. Before we get into the Consent Agenda, this is the opportunity for any of our other Council liaisons to notify if they have an update they want to share. So we've already heard from Damon and he'll share at the end. I understand that we also have some time in AOB to hear from the liaison to the SPRIT. So, if there's anyone else who needs to flag an update from there, from their work as a liaison, this is an opportunity to do so. Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hi there. I am currently the liaison to the PPSAI RT, and I don't have a huge update, but I did discuss this with some of the ICANN staff and figured I just mentioned a few things. The PPSAI IRT has been meeting to progress the work. As the Council liaison to the IRT, I would like to thank the GNSO Council Small Team's work for the answers they provided to the threshold questions posed by the IRT quite some months ago now. These answers have worked to guide the IRT

---

discussions on the issue and have been invaluable in the deliberations. So that is it. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Ashley. Good to hear. All right. I also have Christian with a hand up as well.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Yes, just a very brief moment to let you know that on the Latin Diacritics PDP, we're basically monitoring a situation where we're trying very hard within that group to square away the recommendations that have been made during the Public Comment period, particularly those from ICANN Org. There's a struggle between leadership and the Org in trying to figure out a path forward to address the concerns that might take us off schedule. We had a meeting today where we were working on potentially bringing in Board liaison and me as Council liaison, to try to find a path forward, to try to figure out how to address them. Nothing substantive to report as of yet, but a possibility of getting off schedule if we can't resolve things quickly.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. Thanks, Christian. Is there anything that we can do in Council to help at this point?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: It's a great question, and it's a question that I've posed to the leadership of the group as well, to figure out how we can get defined questions

---

that we can tackle as a group. So it is something that I'm pushing for. I haven't gotten a distillation from leadership sufficient to be able to bring back concrete questions to Council, but I'm hopeful that that may be a path to resolution if we can get them to do that as a next—

SUSAN PAYNE:

Okay. All right, thanks, Christian. Keep us posted. Maybe we'll see if we maybe can circle back at the next meeting. But obviously, if something comes to light before then that you can share on the mailing list, or indeed, if you want to raise something with leadership and talk it through, please do. Thanks for the update. Thank you.

Okay. Unless I have anyone else, and I don't see any hands, so then I think we can move on to item three which is our Consent Agenda. I'm going to hand the mic over to Peter to take us through this.

PETER AKINREMI:

Thank you, Susan. For the Consent Agenda, we have two items which was shared previously on the mailing list. And thanks to those reviewing and giving their feedback.

The first item on the Consent Agenda is the GNSO Review of the GAC Communiqué, which those, the councilors, the volunteers review the ICANN85 GAC Communiqué. Based on the GAC Communiqué, so the review of that and response to that, show how we review of that. And the second one is the confirmation of Chris Buckridge for the Board Seat 14 for the Non-Contracted Party House.

---

That said, I don't see there's any hands. Any comment on this? If none, I will give the mic to Terri to move us to your vote on this Consent Agenda.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much, Peter. Just for documentation, all councilors are present unless they previously sent in their apologies and gave us a proxy. So 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?

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies please say aye? So Lawrence for Vivek and for Gaurav and Sam for Nacho.

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

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

---

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Terri. Thank you, councilors, for this straight one. We move to item number four, and I'll give the floor to Jennifer to move us forward.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Peter. Now we are on item four. This is our discussion on the proposed process to unadopt approved GNSO policy—thank you, Terri—recommendations.

Just brief kind of context. Last year, we talked about and agreed to the placement in the PDP and GGP manuals before suggesting this path to the Board during our bilateral meeting with them at ICANN84. At that time, Board also indicated to us that they agreed with the placement of this process in the PDP and GGP manuals. Then we, together as Council, reviewed the initial drafts and agreed to the proposed edits before these drafts went out for public comment. We've had the public comment, and also during the last ICANN, which is ICANN85, I think, we spent some time going through the proposed edits to the updated PDP and the GGP manuals. There were some edits that were proposed by support staff, which I think all of us has reviewed. It was highlighted in yellow, and that address some of the public comments we have received during that comment period.

The reminder is that these manuals are updated to address the procedural gap, specifically the lack of the defined process for the Board to reconsider and adopted GNSO policy recommendation. So these updates from the public comments are pretty minimal. Again, I think all of us have looked at it multiple times. They were pretty clear. There was

---

in yellow highlight in that document, and we reinforced the clarifying aspects of it. There were some questions about it that were part of the original redlines that were reviewed by Council before the publication for public comment.

So, in that we found the majority of the commenters agreed that it is this proposed process want to be used in truly exceptional circumstances. And I think the Board also have communicated the same, they are in agreement with that. We did have—thank you, Damon as well—noted the additional feedback from the IPC that was sent to the list. The IPC noted the concerns that the PDP and GGP manuals are not the appropriate places to house this process, and specifically they suggested that there needs to be a Bylaws update. So part of that rationale is the delays that are involved in getting recommendations to the Board, that there are delays getting these recommendations to Board and also for this to be then implemented.

I do not believe we have received any other feedback from any councilors from their SGs, Cs, or any other messages regarding that. I know, Damon, you have provided a lengthy e-mail on that. I'm just checking in with staff to see if we received anything, I guess, last minutes. I don't believe that is the case. If that's the case, I don't see any hands from staff to add any more context on this.

So the proposed next step would be for us to vote on these updates at the next meeting. But I'd like to open the floor specifically, really, first for Damon and other councilors if there's any questions. I see Damon's hand. Please go ahead.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Thank you so much, Jennifer, and thanks, everybody else. I did circulate the IPC's concerns with this process, and I think there's a couple of main things here. I mean, with respect to the Bylaw's amendment, we think that's necessary because then the proposal that's been sent forth, there's a change in voting thresholds. All of a sudden, there's a supermajority required. Well, that's really not in the Bylaws. We think that's probably misplaced and pretty significant.

The other real concern the IPC has with this is that, just as sort of a general policy here, when the GNSO comes out and with PDPs are gone through and made and created, and we get to this, we get policy outcomes, then to unadopt them—well, these things are unadopted for a couple of reasons. One, they've just sat around for so many years. They become stale. That's not a good thing. And then also, at certain times, I know certain groups have felt that people that weren't happy with the policy outcome then try to go back and have kind of a second bite at the apple. It's not really the proper venue to do that.

Our comment kind of speaks for itself. We had submitted. We do have significant concerns about this, and that's our position. So thank you so much, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Damon. That's pretty clear. I'm wondering if there are any other councilors who have specific concerns or questions, or perhaps maybe even questions for Damon in understanding the concern raised by IPC. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Jen, I guess it's more of a question. When this came up in Hamburg, it was a reversal or non-adoption of a Cross-Community Working Group recommendation, and then actually the community rallied because ICANN had said, "Well, we're really not required by Bylaws or anything else to come back to a CCWG when we reverse a recommendation which we've adopted out of a CCWG."

One thing I wonder about this is whether it's comprehensive enough. I've noticed a tendency to not want to use the CCWG framework, but we keep coming up with new working guidelines for different groups that we're now calling CCG, and then the Review of Reviews. I don't know what we're going to call it, but we're supposedly drafting new guidelines. So part of me thinks that addressing this in PDP manual doesn't really cover those situations, and that we haven't really addressed them because this is about PDPs and EPDPs, and nothing else that's going on that's wider in the community. Where in the case of Auction Proceeds, we had to organize, and a great cry went up, and then the Board backed off. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you. Yes, indeed, when we started discussing this, I think it's in the last year's SPS, maybe it was 2025 SPS, this discussion item did come out of the CCG. And we're looking at GNSO processes, and that doesn't encompass a cross-community groups or groupings that brought this up. That is indeed the case. Ashley?

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi. Thank you, Jen. Yes, Ashley representing the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I just wanted to note that from our perspective, we are good with what's come out of this. We think it certainly reflects what the Registrars had commented on. We feel reassured that it's intended to be limited to very extraordinary situations. And from our perspective, not entirely sure. I'm curious if Damon has additional words to say about how his concerns seem to be or his group's concerns seem to be focused on, basically, somehow this being used to game the system, second bites of apple and the like. But the way it's set up, it really seems to be done in a way that wouldn't open itself up to that kind of bad gamemanship, and that all of Council would have to agree, or the Board would be—I just don't see how this would permit a particular group to have a second bite at the apple, but I'm happy to hear some additional feedback on that. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Ashley. I see Damon's hand back up, I think, in response to your question. So, Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Thank you very much, Ashley. Again, the IPC's biggest concerns on this are the Bylaws issue, and then also having a built-in mechanism that goes in and then undoes policy that's already been set forth. I did mention in my comments in front of a second bite of the apple. I do think that happens. It's probably more of my own personal concerns. I don't want that attributed to the entire IPC.

---

I think the bigger two things are the Bylaws, that also just the fact that we shouldn't be adopting policy, having it waiting to implement it for years on end, and then have a built-in approach to go in and unadopt it. I just don't think that's a wise thing. I think a better approach is go through the policy development process, implement it timely, and then as facts change, as things change, if we need to change a policy, let's do that, but let's do that within the Bylaws and let's not create stuff that we're not going to use. Thank you very much.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Damon. I hope that answers part of Ashley's question. And I actually have some questions, too, I wanted to raise. I think in your e-mail, of course, also IPC's public comment, and then your explanation earlier in the call, you mentioned something about changing voting thresholds, and that's something that piqued my concern as well. So I don't know if you wanted to explain a little bit more on that.

The second thing is I think leadership had a small discussion as well about this, and we were trying to find the procedure part of it as well, as in the fact that if we were to vote on these changes to the GGP and PDP manuals next Council meeting, it also doesn't preclude us if we do find that we do need to take further steps to address this procedural gap to take further action that is necessary. So I guess maybe just that brief question about the voting threshold that maybe I'm not really clear about. Thanks.

---

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure, Jen. That's a good question. I'm just going to kind of read directly from our comment. This is on page two. I think it's the third full paragraph down. Basically, just as an initial matter, the ICANN Bylaws under Article 7, Section 7.17 provides the Board decisions are taken by a supermajority vote thus otherwise set forth in the Bylaws. And then the proposed GNSO process would instead require a supermajority vote of the Board in certain circumstances and mandate specific dialogues, documentations as a condition to reversing policy recommendation.

I think, with that, you have a potential change in the voting thresholds, and that was one of the concerns, and it's spelled out in our comment.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Damon. I encourage other councilors, if you had the same question as I did, to take a look at that Damon also attached in his e-mail to all of us.

I am taking a look to see if there's any hands in the queue. I don't see anything else. So, I think the proposed next step really is for us, us as in leadership and staff, to take this back. We'll be preparing for possibly a vote for these updates during our May meeting. I'm going to pause one more time to see if there's any hands or any questions or concerns about this, or if staff wants to come in, if I've gotten the process incorrectly. I don't see anything. So, in that case, I think we can move on to item five, and I'm going to hand this over to Susan.

---

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Jen. Yes, so we are on agenda item five which is relating to the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations: Team Composition and the Draft Assignment Form. As we all know, we've been discussing in Council what the next steps are for the SSAD recommendations for several months, and we've been moving forward on kind of practical steps for starting the work on developing supplemental recommendations.

As we know, we had advised the Board—advise is probably not the right word—had communicated with the Board the view of Council that non-adoption of the 18 SSAD recommendations would be the path to follow since that would trigger this procedure for developing supplemental recommendations. And we also know that the Board has then followed that suggestion and passed the resolution at ICANN85 to non-adopt those 18 SSAD recommendations. So we now have to kick off that process for developing supplemental recommendations, as we all know, but just for the record, it's set out in Section 9 of Annex A of the Bylaws, and it sort of describes how this process works at a very high level. So we're joined here today by Greg and Wes from the Board who have kindly joined us, in case anyone has particular questions for the Board while we're having a discussion on this.

But in terms of progressing things now, we have spent some time talking about sort of team composition and we have kind of discussed what that team should look like. There were some questions and concerns raised by the NCSG, and leadership have hopefully done what we can to respond to those questions and hopefully address them. Following on from that, we haven't had any other specific comments on the composition. And so hopefully, I think we're hoping that this signals

---

that the composition element of this is now something that people can get behind and that we can move forward as has been proposed.

Subsequently to that, I circulated a further e-mail with a link to the proposed assignment form that would sort of set out in the terms of this work and endeavors to kind of articulate the scope of what the Supplemental Recommendation Team would do, and also to articulate some guardrails for how that group will work. And again, there have been a few comments in the document, particularly the last day or so.

So we had comments in particular from Farzaneh and from Anne, which I hope have been addressed, where when needed by some revisions and sort of small edits and tweaks to the wording. I think one of the main concerns perhaps that was expressed or has been expressed when we've been talking about this process is about what are the safeguards there against creation of new policy? So, I wanted to just remind everyone that the supplemental recommendation work involves modifying the existing policy recommendations that have been made pursuant to that Bylaws process. So, given that that's the case, the modifications are effectively limited by that previous work. So by the existing policy recommendations, which are the ones that have been non-adopted, and some of the work surrounding this such as the RDRS Standing Committee's report, and to some extent the Policy Alignment Analysis that was also conducted.

So it's not the case that that Supplemental Recommendation Group can have carte blanche to just kind of create any new policy at once. It is founded in this work that's gone before. But in order to hopefully help address that concern and reservation, that is why some language has

---

---

included the draft assignment form to the effect that to refer back to Council if there's sort of strong support. I think the original proposal we had in the assignment form was for there to be a consensus to refer something back to Council. And that really was based on just the sort of somewhat similar to the concept of where we have something referred to Council from an IRT. We talk about the IRT liaison assessing whether there's a consensus to bring it back to Council. But it was based on not really much more than that.

I think the suggestion that a single member of that group should be able to refer something back. Certainly to the leadership's mind, it seemed perhaps to be too far to the other extreme. I think it would be unfortunate if a single member in that group who had no support from anyone else were able to basically hold the work up by referring something to Council that no one else was supporting. But some sort of level of support that's more than just a single person. But having said that, a reminder that, of course, many of the people on that Supplemental Recommendation Team will be councilors, and any councilor can always ask to put something on the agenda for a Council meeting, and any councilor can always raise something on the Council mailing list. So we're not seeking to remove that from that right that all councilors have by this wording in the assignment form in any way.

So, I think, again, hopefully that goes to address the concerns that were expressed. This is, I think, also why there's some language that's been added in there that were identified by the Board in Tripti's letter for inclusion in the supplemental recommendation work. And just included some language, again, as a fairly recent amendment, that if a view has reached in the Supplemental Recommendation Team, that any of those

---

items are outside of scope, then obviously that would be something that they would refer back. Ideally, we would hope that perhaps they would make a recommendation on how else it might be addressed if it couldn't be addressed through the supplemental recommendations.

Undoubtedly, that's one of the issues that I'm sure the team will want to discuss with our Board liaisons. I think it may indeed be something that we want to have some quick discussion now with Greg and Wes just in terms of perhaps what the intent was behind Tripti's letter in those four items, particularly in terms of whether Tripti and the Board were endeavoring to be sort of prescriptive there, or whether it's open to Council to conclude that one or more of those items is out of scope for this work effort. I can see Wes is volunteering to talk to that in a minute, which I appreciate that, Wes.

Then just finally, again, the objective here, really, is to try to finalize any concerns, if we can, so that we can put the call for volunteers out in order to be able to take advantage of the opportunity for face-to-face time in Seville. We do need to get that call for volunteers out if we still have some, perhaps, elements of the assignment form outstanding. It may be that's something that can be resolved after the call for volunteers has gone out, but really, at this point, looking for sort of any questions and comments, and I got a few hands in the chat. I don't know whether it would be beneficial to have Wes answer that early question first. Would there be an objection to that, Bruna?

---

FARZANEH BADI:

Hi. I'm sorry, it's not Bruna. It's actually Farzaneh. We are in the same place. Her phone is in German, so I'm doing some clumsy things here, because I don't understand her phone.

Basically, yes, one point was actually about the Board, the four items that they requested. We have doubts that all of those four items were recommendations by the SSAD. So we want to make sure that they were, and if they were not, unless some of them are not, we should not consider them. But I look forward to hearing from Wes.

There was another point that I wanted to make about—it's good that you actually address this problem of, if there is a Council member on the group that can actually bring the issue of, if they think that, okay, this is like going into the territories of policy, just for Council's information, they should not block any kind of progress, but they can, in parallel, just bring up the issue to the Council. I want that kind of language that you put forward in the assignment form. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Farzaneh. Volker, would you be happy for Wes and Greg to talk to that Board question first? Thank you. Okay. So I'll turn to Wes. Thank you.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

If there are questions, so go ahead.

---

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, great. I think that I can probably shorten the conversation by going first a little bit. First off, thank you for letting me speak, and then thank you for inviting us here to join this conversation.

First and foremost, the Board's intent was to primarily communicate what the outstanding issues raised by the community were that the Board had to consider and ensure that the GNSO is aware of those four items. Now, clearly, this is something that GNSO Council is already, of course, aware of, but such as the way of getting duplicative but necessary communication written out. But most importantly, the Board has no desire to impede the bottom-up process that the ICANN is founded upon and thrives on. It is really up to the GNSO Council to determine the process that you use for considering and refining the recommendations as necessary. The Board does continue to listen to the needs of the community about the importance for both fixing the recommendations or amending and augmenting them as needed, as well as doing so in a timely manner, which I also recognize as a statement that's almost at odds with itself, because doing things right and doing things fast is often you have to find that balance.

But I think you get my point that the Board, if the GNSO Council decides that some things are out of their scope or need to be done in a different way for one of the items versus the other three, or whatever that might be, the Board is not trying to suggest any sort of mandate or structure. That's up to the Council, in our opinion. And I think Greg probably wants to follow me along as well. Thanks.

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Wes. Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Wes. I think you could think of these as the Board thought it'd be productive to say what our views are and what we're hearing from the community. So looking at the RDRS report, looking at the alignment analysis, things that items that stood out as kind of open issues that could be efficiently addressed within the supplemental procedures and were within scope of the supplemental procedures. So that's kind of our thinking in laying this out.

To reiterate Wes, what is within scope of the work, that is the GNSO decisions. This is just giving our feedback as to how we're viewing this and how we're thinking about issues that could be resolved in the supplemental recommendations within the policy recommendations that exist. So maybe just going through these real fast, to give an example.

Mandatory registrar participation, I feel like that was with the RDRS. There was a difference in that it was voluntary because it wasn't policy. However, in general, Consensus Policy is different than a trial like the RDRS, where it is binding on all parties. So, basically, what we're saying is reiterating that whatever mechanisms are developed by this group, participation would be mandatory by registrars simply because that's how Consensus Policies work. If there's a policy that is adopted, it's binding on contracted parties. But we don't want to dictate exactly what that mechanism is or how it would work, just that everyone's on the same page.

Going to number two, we're looking at the recommendations around disclosure, noting that since these recommendations were adopted, work on privacy/proxy has progressed. So we're just noting this may be a place to align those policies, or at a minimum, give feedback to the community how they can be aligned, how we're thinking about that. SLA agreements, those were also a part of their original recommendations. There was some SLAs in the recommendations. And so the thought was to build upon those and decide if or how those should be modified. And similar, in number four, there were, I don't know if it was called authentication mechanisms, but validation of certain parties, and we saw a parallel to that with the authentication mechanism, and maybe that would be a place to build out detail here to kind of efficiently align the policies.

So those are our thoughts on where this work can be done to align and clarify ICANN policies, but these are just our thoughts. And ultimately, that the scope of this project is within the GNSO Council's decision, and we're here to discuss.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Greg. Thanks to both of you for that. I think that's definitely helpful there. There have been some reservation expressed, I suppose, that perhaps the Board was seeking to kind of constrain how the GNSO and helpful to get that understanding that indeed, no. Ultimately, it is for the GNSO to determine whether we can use a supplemental recommendation process for those items, but they are just being drawn to our attention as ones on which you're encouraging

---

---

us to look at. Thank you for that. I'm hoping that that will have addressed that concern. Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Thank you very much. I think a lot of what I was trying to get at with my point that I'm going to raise were already taken care of, but there might still be room for a little clarification here. My concern when reading this document at the point and the task that's basically going to be provided to the small group is that it reads, in a way, that it presumes an outcome or that at least we presume that the Board presumes a certain outcome. When it says that the Board expects that the team will incorporate the following four elements, and then later on it says that these four elements are expected to be implemented or addressed, then, to me, that reads as you shouldn't decide whether you should decide how, and I think that may not be the right approach for the small team. That may be too constraining to us. I really feel that the text and the task should be phrased in a way that absolutely gives the small team enough way to consider the merits of whether these questions should actually be incorporated, not just how they should be implemented. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE:

Can I respond, Susan? Is that a yes? Thanks, Volker. I think that makes sense, and maybe I'll take the liberty of emphasizing that we expect these broad areas to be addressed. These are open issues that we think can be resolved in this process, as opposed to trying to dictate an outcome. So I think that's the Board's intent here, and that coupled

---

with the recognition that it is ultimately the GNSO deciding what is in or without a scope, hopefully that addresses that concern.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Yes, absolutely. That was my expectation, and I hope that we can maybe amend the language in the assignment that it reflects that. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Volker. I guess what I will say is the language at the moment, I think, it's effectively a quote from that letter from Tripti, but I think we can find a way to sort of tweak that language a bit that makes it a bit clearer. Certainly, the paragraph that comes after is intended to help give that assurance to folks that it will be for this Supplemental Recommendations Team to consider whether and how they can be addressed, rather than to just make that assumption that they will be. But we can maybe see if we can make a slight amendment to the text to make that even clearer. Okay. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE:

Thanks so much. It's been a really helpful discussion. I appreciate the Board reps coming and talking further about it. First of all, certainly the call for volunteers definitely, Susan, go out as soon as possible.

Secondly, I do think that as we read the Board's letter and the Council having been quite concerned about the issue of Board readiness over the last year or so, even with the summary that we've been given, I have the impression that the Board point of view is, "Hey guys, there's a

---

lot of this that's within scope anyway." We'll discuss that further in the discussions that are upcoming.

The third thing I would say, though, is that to the extent that we identify and separate out items within this, we need to be careful with respect to the risk of creating something that is no longer a package, because we've been so insistent the SSAD recommendations are a package, they're to be non-adopted as a package, presumably supplemental recommendations are to be developed as a package. And in terms of organizational efficiency, I would hate to see us end up down the road where we say, well, because X, Y, and Z has to be separated out from the supplemental recommendations process, this is all no longer a package. So if we can stay aware of that risk, that would be good. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks for that comment, Anne. Lawrence? Sorry, is my mic a bit sketchy?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, you're kind of phasing in and out.

SUSAN PAYNE: Sorry about that. I'll hold it nearer to my mouth. Apologies. I just gave the floor to you, Lawrence.

---

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:           Sorry. Thank you. I didn't hear that. Thanks for doing that. So not to belabor this point any further, I believe that the four focus areas, to put it that way, that was in the Board letter, which now forms the core of the work that the team needs to focus on, basically will also help us a lot not to sway into territories of creating new policies or not. They are indeed very helpful and grateful to the Board for providing that level of guidance with what the Council has done so far. The BC definitely is very much in support of all the actions taken by leadership, and as much as possible, we will encourage that we stay within the guardrails that has been developed so far. Not only will this help us maintain the outcomes that are expected, such that the recommendations can not only be adopted, but will improve those areas where the needs were carved out from, but definitely this will help to keep the group focused on getting the required outcomes. So, thank you, not just to leadership, but also to the Board for the guidance provided.

SUSAN PAYNE:                           Thank you, Lawrence. I would just flag that although those four items are ones that the Board has asked us to be sure to have in our consideration, then they aren't the only elements. We do have the full suite of the yes, the recommendations that we need to consider and determine whether we need to modify them. But I know you understand that, so I just wanted to make that for the record.

---

WES HARDAKER:

I think you may have cut out again, possibly while calling me. So I'm going to assume that you were going to call on me because I was the next hand up.

Let me just conclude by saying that the Board has to consider these points, because based on the feedback received during both an implementation of the recommendations as well as during the trial period of the RDRS system, we received a lot of feedback, as everybody here knows. And so regardless whether the GNSO Council succeeds in taking on these four items, the Board really has to figure out what we want to say and also, as my colleague just pointed out to me on the side, and also the information we received from the Standing Committee.

So I would recommend you change the word expect in your wording. There's no reason why you need to exactly copy the wording that came out of Tripti's letter into your working document for defining how the small team is going to take place. So change it as you feel need. Just recognize the point that if these four items aren't addressed at some point, the Board will have to decide what to do one way or the other. But we're not trying to say, "If the GNSO Council doesn't do this then everything's off the table." That's not the case.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you for that. Thanks for that, Wes. Bruna?

---

FARZANEH BADI:

Sorry, Susan. It's Farzaneh again. Thank you very much for this conversation. It's very informative. It's just that I truly feel uncomfortable with mandating the small team to come up with something that led to address the Board, like the issues that the Board wants to raise and include that in their conversation.

So what I suggest is coming up with another mechanism, perhaps we can see what is actually in these SSAD recommendations. For example, I think that binding our registrars to opt in to SSAD is actually in the recommendations. And a few others' asks are actually in the recommendation. But there is the privacy/proxy that I'm not very sure. So I think that this is the Council's job to actually go through those four items and decide which ones we have to discuss as the Council what we want to do and are not delegated to the small team.

SUSAN PAYNE:

I guess the only point I would say is does it make any difference? Given that all councilors can participate in the small team, or Supplemental Recommendation Team, or whatever we're calling it, and given that really a large number of councilors have volunteered for this effort, if work is to be done to look at those four items, what is the difference between whether we have the full Council do it, which will inevitably require a group of volunteers to then take that task on, we won't do it en masse versus having this small team who are going to be steeped in this work anyway, look at it themselves. I would question why that would be a concern. Anne?

---

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks, Susan. First of all, I did want to say that I really appreciate the Board clarifications. Although folks may not like it, if the Board's communicating so directly with us, I honestly think that, in the long run, it's much better because it leads to this sort of dialogue, and it leads to issues like Board readiness, and it leads to things like communication from the Board that, "Hey, guess what, guys, we have to address these things." So it really improves organizational effectiveness within ICANN for these kinds of conversations to occur and for this direct communication to occur, so I'm grateful for it. This is not a small team, by the way. This team is not small. It is a Supplemental Recommendations Team. Sam was the first one to point that out.

And these four things that need to be considered, I think they are most appropriately considered by the expertise that is already enrolled, really, it's the Council Supplemental Recommendations Team. And there are a lot of interrelated issues going on here in terms of how, as Farzi said, notes that it relates to the SSAD recommendations that were rejected. So two separate processes for examining those, I think, it's very inefficient. So with some of the wording changes that have been proposed and can be accommodated, I think we would be going down the right path, and we can send out a call for volunteers, then we can get our noses to the grindstone and get working.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you, Anne. I have Bruna, who may well be Farzi, in the queue. I'm also conscious that I think Greg has to drop off at the top of the hour, or may indeed already have dropped off, but I'm also conscious of our timing. Farzaneh/Bruna?

FARZANEH BADII: I'm sorry. My hand is not up. It's just that my German is so bad. Ignore me if my hand is raised because I just don't know.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. All right. Well, I think we've had a good discussion. We have, I think got a much more clarity now on the intent from the Board regarding mentioning of those four items. And I think we have an understanding now that if those four items do actually fall within the scope of this, what the supplemental recommendation task is, then it would be appropriate to address them. If they don't, then it wouldn't. I think that seems something that we can reflect more clearly in the assignment form. And hopefully we can we can, in fairly short order, move forward with having a version that everyone can feel comfortable with. But I think we have a sort of a good enough document as it is for the purposes of putting out the call for volunteers. And we can have something that we can fill, we have an assignment form in a kind of finalized form certainly before that work kicks off. I think leadership team and staff have our instructions, as it were, for some changes that we should make to this assignment form, and then we can move forward with this. So keep an eye out for the call for volunteers, obviously. Within Council, we've all been volunteering anyway already, but I think this is the time now to remind your groups that they should also be identifying their participants.

Thanks very much. I think Greg has dropped. Thanks very much to both him and Wes. Wes, is there anything you wanted to say to wrap up?

WES HARDAKER: No. Just thanks very much for the opportunity to join. And as Anne said, it's always good to increase communication. It makes things go faster and it causes less friction. So feel free to reach out to us at any time if you have further questions, and we'd be happy to help. I strongly suspect that Greg and I will be the liaisons to the not small team as well. So I look forward to it. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. I think that's our hope and expectation as well. Thank you very much.

We are actually now going to talk about urgent requests. I don't think you're required to stay on, but you're certainly welcome if you wanted to do so, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Considering that topic, I probably will stay and listen, at least. It's certainly in my charter for my work party.

SUSAN PAYNE: Indeed. Thank you. All right then. So our next agenda item then is the next steps on the urgent requests. Actually, I think I'm initially going to hand this over to Caitlin who just has a small number of slides that will give us a reminder of the background. Is that correct, Caitlin?

---

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Yes. Thank you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you. So this is a topic that, as we all know, we've talked about for quite some time. We thought having a visual to outline what is completed, what is awaiting further feedback from Council, and what is underway could be helpful in setting up this topic. But as usual, I just wanted to provide a quick recap of where we were, what happened at ICANN85.

So you all likely remember that we had—both Wes and Greg joined the first GNSO working session at ICANN85 and to provide an informal update to the Council regarding urgent requests. At that time, the Board noted that the Public Comment period on the timeline for urgent requests had recently concluded, and that based on the comments received, the Board and Org noted that the comments largely aligned on the proposed timeline and also on the associated policy language. So, in light of that, the Board noted that ICANN Org is prepared to include the updated policy language in the Registration Data Policy, but the Board had approached the Council to discuss an outstanding question regarding authentication that it wanted to flag to the Council for further feedback.

So, specifically, with respect to the question, there was generalized alignment in the community that in order to respond to urgent requests

---

in an appropriate timeframe, authentication of the individual submitting the request is critical. However, the policy recommendation, specifically Recommendation 18 from Phase 1, made no reference to authentication. And then separately, in parallel, the PSWG has been working on authentication mechanisms, and some councilors are part of that group.

So now to get on to the gap that you see on the slide, the slide shows a visual of what's complete, what's underway, and what's missing. In other words, what is the Board asking for the Council's feedback? As I just noted, there is generalized community alignment on the timeline, and Org plans to publish the policy language as an update to the Registration Data Policy. That's why there's a check mark under item one.

Under two, the second element is incorporating authentication into policy requirements. That's currently missing because, as noted, there is no reference to authentication in Recommendation 18. That's why there's a question mark there.

And then lastly, there is community work on an authentication mechanism. That's number three. That shows that that's in progress. However, we did want to note that during ICANN85, there was some community feedback on the fact that that current work isn't transparent or open. So there's been a request from some in the community that rather than have a PSWG-led group, this work should be led by Org so that there's more transparency and opportunities for community input. Saewon, if you could? Yes. Thank you.

This circle shows where the gap is, as noted, in order for there to be an enforceable timeline, once there is an authentication mechanism in existence, there needs to be some sort of language around authentication. So if we can go to the next slide, please.

At ICANN85, the Council aligned on the timeline being complete and confirming that Org can proceed with publishing the updated policy language in the Registration Data Policy. But in terms of the further feedback, the Board had outlined three potential options of how to get that missing piece, which is there's no writing about authentication.

There were three options, the first option being that the Council could clarify that authentication is part of fully implementing Recommendation 18, and accordingly, additional work on authentication can be clarified in implementation rather than further policy development work. And just noting that if that were the path pursued, the Council could provide some further guidance about that work is expected to be Org-led rather than PSWG-led, and that there would be a request for greater transparency and community consultation.

The second option is the Council to note that further language or clarification on authentication could be handled as part of the supplemental recommendations on the SSAD. And the third option would be for the Board to unadopt a subsection of Rec 18 to allow the Council to develop a supplemental recommendation which would add language around authentication to Recommendation 18.

---

---

So the Council spent some time talking about these options and socialized them during ICANN85, if I remember correctly, at the time. The alignment was around option two, noting that the Council would confirm that Org could publish that timeline, and the Council could confirm that additional language around authentication is needed, and that could be included as part of the supplemental recommendation work on the SSAD recommendations.

I don't believe I saw anything come through on the list, but I may have missed something. But I'll pass it back over to Susan now to see what the current thinking is, in hopes that we can come to a decision during today's meeting. Thank you. Over to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Caitlin. Again, I think when we posted to the Council mailing list the reminder of these three options, it also flagged that we seem to be coalescing around that option two in the middle, the one that was originally suggested by Samantha. More or less, the expectation was that if folks feel differently and are actually not aligning around option two, it was time to flag that to the rest of Council.

I think I agree with Caitlin. I don't recall having seen particular feedback to the contrary. So I think this is just a kind of final opportunity to see whether there's strong disagreement with that. Otherwise, I think we are coalesced around proceeding down that second option path. I'm just pausing to see if there are any hands, and I'm not seeing any. So I think this is our decision then. We'll proceed down that second option

---

route, and that's the one that Council feel most comfortable pursuing. I think at that point, we can close this item off.

I'm not quite sure what I need to do for next steps. I guess we probably need to formally notify the Board of that, although I can see Wes is there nodding, that he obviously is here, still listening in. But I guess we should make some formal notification of that. And so that's something that we'll take on after this call.

WES HARDAKER: We would appreciate knowing what you decide, yes.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. Okay. Thank you very much. All right, and then with that then, I'm really pleased to say we've caught some time back up. Volker is asking if we need to confirm this by a vote. I'm not sure that we do. I'm going to look to Caitlin or a colleague to put me right if we do need to vote on it.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Hi, Susan. I think the intent similar to some of the other policy interpretation issues the Council has written to the Board in the past and/or written to Org can be handled via a letter that the Council reviews, and it can be sent if there's no objection. If there is an objection or if there is a concern, we can certainly move to a vote. Or if that's the Council's preference, we could also prepare a vote. But the thought is this could be communicated in a letter to the Board.



---

but I do want to say thank you very much for giving us the time to come in and give you an update. I will also start off by saying this is very hot off the presses. There's a reason why the slides were so late coming to Terri. We had a call that was scheduled to finish about five, six hours ago as a last minute one. So this is about as quick as you can get it.

Okay. In terms of where we're at and our work, the last time we were talking, we were in Phase 2. We were seeing the five different buckets that were being shopped around at ICANN85. Now we're very much in Phase 3. We're steaming ahead, moving ahead at least anyway. Trying to refine based on the feedback that we received and heard at ICANN85 and try and put something together that's a bit tidier and cleaner and consumable ahead of ICANN86.

What does our refined proposal actually look like? As I said, last time we spoke, we were talking about five different buckets. Since then, based on the feedback that we heard, we're trying to remove the bucket terminology and try and make it a bit more formal. At the moment, we're looking at three different types. Accountability and Transparency, formerly known as Bucket A; On-Demand, formerly known as Ad Hoc; and the Structural Review, which has not changed its name, so we've got some consistency in there.

Underneath each of these, you can see that—what I've done is I've set out the sort of scope of what these reviews would be covering. So, Accountability and Transparency about how ICANN is executed on its mission and Bylaws. On-Demand, you can see that there's two different ones there. There's some special topics, which I've capitalized, and I'll come to that in a moment, and also emerging topics. And then for the

Structural Review, this is intended to be sort of a big picture assessment of the SO/AC community structure conducted in three phases.

Before I go into a little bit more detail on each of these, I'll quickly say that the idea is, because one of the challenges we had with the review program coming in to this exercise and prior to this exercise was the sort of pile up. And so in an attempt to try and rationalize and make sure that we don't end up with that, what we're sort of envisioning and the current thinking of the group is that the Accountability and Transparency and On-Demand Review would sort of sit under this umbrella Review Scoping Group that would be responsible for overseeing the scoping of reviews within this remit to make sure that the reviews are nice and tightly scoped, which is something I know that GNSO Council has worked very hard on trying to do themselves with PDPs. So wanting to make sure of that, have an understanding of what the resources required for the different topics would be in a review as well before that review team is actually formed and starts work, as well as having buy-in from the community.

So I'll start with that on Accountability and Transparency. So this one, the current thinking is that this would probably happen once in a five-year planning cycle at ICANN. So they'd be scheduled for roughly one every five years or so, with the option to defer or cancel for that planning cycle. So if the community said, "Nope, we just don't have capacity. This isn't a priority for us in these five years." That wouldn't remove the review itself. It would just mean that, "Okay, for this time, we don't think we need to do that." And there could be different reasons. Having said which, so we're sort of thinking about a threshold for that, roughly four out of seven SOs or ACs having to agree to that.

---

The idea is, for the actual scoping of this work, that SOs and ACs would submit suggestions. There'd be cross-community discussions to sort of swap notes, see if there's any alignment.

I'd point to for those of you that have done any ICANN meeting planning process, deciding the plenaries for that, how there's those discussions in the lead-up using the similar kind of approach in terms of trying to scope the review. And then part of that exercise is assessing what resources would be needed for the review before it's kicked off. Again, having that community buy-in as well with that four out of seven is what we're thinking at the moment for the charter before the work starts.

The On-Demand is meant to be a bit more exceptional. There's two parts of this, so the special topics that were flagged here. These were called out both at ICANN85, and you might see Review of Reviews that was formerly its own bucket that's now been merged in here, that it's sort of on a set cadence that all could ask the community, "Hey, do you want to do a review on this?" and the community would go, "I don't know. Maybe yes, no." But there would be a threshold for agreement.

The other side of that is the emerging topic. So the community goes, "There's something really big and important coming on," or actually, when we were doing our scoping for Accountability and Transparency, there was something else that we thought, "Oh, that maybe needs its own separate review off to the side." Or even something potentially that an ATR might have suggested have a separate review on it as well. But the point is that it would be something that is more exceptional, rather than something that's occurring frequently on a predictable cycle

---

like Accountability and Transparency. Again, recognizing that this would be built around consensus and meeting that higher threshold. The current thinking is that for an idea to get traction, there'd need to be two out of the seven SO/ACs supporting a proposal, and then the threshold would be a little bit higher than the Accountability and Transparency support, and so five out of seven SOs or ACs to move it forward.

I want to emphasize that this is our refined proposal. And as you'll see when I move to the next point, well, the next slide rather, there is time built in for this, for the community to say, "Nope, we don't like that."

That moves me, finally, on to the Structural Review. We had a call on this earlier today. So what we're thinking at the moment is this would be conducted in three phases. The first phase would be, as we've got on the slide, an external landscape assessment, so looking at what is actually happening in the environment generally. Are there alt roots going on? What's happening with Web3? What about AI? Who are the different stakeholders that are impacted?

Then, once that work is sort of settled, then there'd be a community group pulled together to go, "Okay. Is there appropriate participation representation? Are the groups working as we would want them to?" Then suggest, "Okay. Are there suggestions about how we might need to change?" There would be a time for groups to go, "Yes, we like this," or "No, we don't like this for the recommendations," and then move into the third phase of, are there any changes that would need to happen to reflect if it's new or even the same structure or knock on impacts to things like the Board or Empowered Community or

---

---

NomCom? So it would be quite an extensive exercise. The current cadence for that, the thinking is about once every 15 years.

Now, I will also say I want to—sorry, just going to my other notes on this. There are obviously open questions, and this is not the full detail of the proposal. So there's still the status of within the Structural Review, or thinking about to what extent, if any, be reviewing ICANN Org in that discussion. And there's also another concept, a Band-Aid review. So if there's a review of individual SO or AC, that might come up at some point. They're still sort of looking at a home, potentially somewhere at the moment, they're floating, very interestingly, between On-Demand and Structural. So, yes, there is that. Okay. So that's the overview of what we're looking at.

In terms of next steps, what happens? I want to also emphasize that this is a best case scenario timeline, and some of these exact dates may change a little bit. The reason I say that now is the first date on there is tomorrow, 17<sup>th</sup> of April. Groups get to provide input on a refined proposal while we continue to work on incorporating the input that we receive. So, to a certain extent, this is a little bit business as usual as we have with the important reviews mailing list. We can write in at any time. But I don't want to promise when this refined proposal is going to be published, so I'm going to stick with soon, so I don't unduly pressure staff and the co-chairs.

The other one that I really want to call out during this time is there's a plan to have community webinars on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May. So there's currently plans for two of them. You'll need to register. I've got the link on the slide where you have an opportunity to provide feedback. The

---

idea is roughly around the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, an actual Public Comment period will open based on the stabilized proposal that we've pulled together based on the feedback we receive from the community between now and the Public Comment period opening. And then there's also plans for Prep Week session ahead of ICANN86. And then also, though a session during ICANN86 with the Public Comment period planning plan to be closed roughly around the 10<sup>th</sup> of July.

So I appreciate that this is not as concrete as it could be for the proposal and the update for this, but we were aware that going into this with the timing and the plan to have something published tomorrow, that it was going to be a little bit touch and go on how firm things were. But as with most things ICANN, there's always a chance to provide feedback and tell us what you think about it. I see Lawrence has his hand raised.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Sophie, for your brilliant presentation. Two questions come to mind. But before I ask those questions, please kindly clarify that the date, 10<sup>th</sup> of July you spoke about, is public comment for the entire work, or is it for some sections of the work?

SOPHIE HEY: It's going to be for the proposal that we put out. My understanding is that is the end of the work. But again, I don't want to say that definitively as I'm not a co-chair.

---

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:           Okay. Thank you. That helps. To my major question, the main crux for this particular intervention and engagement was to find a solution around the build-up we've had with reviews. At this point, how comfortable can the team say that we have a resolution in view? In other words, we've had the pile up of different reviews, and we had fallen due of quite a number. Is there a way forward with the current state of play, mitigating all the reviews that need to be done, and means of having a smooth flow thereafter?

Secondly, while we were in Mumbai, and leadership and your team addressed us, they touched on the fact that for there to be any work around reviews for the GNSO, it has to be triggered by the GNSO. I think they should fall under the Structural Review, which is the third bucket. Will there be clear guidance on how this process is triggered and how long? I know you mentioned about 15 years. Hopefully there will be some prior guidance. Is this to be expected by the July date or earlier? Thank you.

SOPHIE HEY:                               Okay. Thank you. Those both are really thoughtful questions. So first up with the pile up of the reviews point. At least in part, this is intended to be addressed by having the Accountability and Transparency and the On-Demand, so the idea of having the high thresholds built into the On-Demand Reviews to happen. There are also discussions going on at the moment in the group about whether there should be any kind of rules about how many reviews can be happening at a given time.

For instance, I've suggested potentially within a five-year planning cycle, well, we've got the one Accountability and Transparency, but maybe there's only one On-Demand Review in that cycle. Alternatively, it could be there's no more than one review team working at a given time, so you don't have more than one to try and limit and prevent it, and also that resource assessment as part of the scoping work. So that's how the pile up point is intended to be addressed in terms of GNSO structure and the mechanism to look at that.

In terms of a clear mechanism, whether that will come out of this, that's, very unhelpfully, that's a to-be-continued discussion in the group at the moment. The current label that's being applied this week, Band Aid reviews, so plasters, depending on where in the world you are, whether it's Band Aid or plaster. Personally, I grew up with Band-Aids. With that, the idea is that there's some kind of scope for an SO or AC to review itself in its own structure. Having said which, coming into the exercise roughly 12 months ago, I think there's very much an understanding that an SO/AC can already decide that they want to undertake some exercise of review for themselves.

I can see Osvaldo has got his hand up, and so I hope Volker's okay with me passing—thank you, Volker—to Osvaldo to chime in.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Volker, or do I? Okay. Just to clarify that right now we are still defining the currents of the reviews. The structure of the proposal is 15. Some of us think it should be less than 10 years between Structural Reviews. Also, as Sophie said, each SO, AC, or NC can initiate its own review if a

---

---

member of it thinks it needs to be done. Also, we are evaluating, or haven't yet evaluated, the resources need for each type of review so that we can condition the cadence and the quantity of review that can be done at the same time. Thank you.

SOPHIE HEY:

Okay. Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Thank you. This interests me a lot because I like this concept of more fluid approach rather than the structured approach that we had, so reviews as needed, that's very much to my liking. I just wondered you said the word resourcing, and that also raises the question of how those may happen/may not happen reviews are going to be funded? Will there be a budget allocated just for the purpose of there might be a review that might happen over the course of the next budget period? Or will they be budgeted ad hoc? And what would happen if a review didn't happen? Would that be put back in the reserves, or is there any planning for that already? Was this too far ahead thinking?

SOPHIE HEY:

Thanks, Volker. It's definitely helpful. Again, I could give you what I would like to see happen, which is not necessarily what the group will come out with, but at the same time, it is something that is being factored in and considered within the discussions. Again, that goes to some of the cadencing questions and the timing of the review. So it's annoyingly, as I'm sure you can appreciate, a little bit chicken and egg,

---

but it does tie into the scoping work and trying to work out. I think part of what comes with this approach is trying to work out. Okay, well, how do we as a community actually start planning our activities and the work that we need to be doing? So I think there's a certain learning curve that's going to come with that. But again, that might be the kind of question that it's worthwhile sending in and sharing with the group over the next couple of weeks to go. Can you please factor this into what your proposal looks like would be my suggestion.

Okay. I don't see any other hands. I'm very sorry I cut into extra time for people, but I really appreciate all your questions and the time on this. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Sophie. Really useful presentation. We'll all, I hope, look out for what comes next and make sure that our groups engage us, as needed.

Okay. I'm conscious of our time, so I think we'll move straight on to the Review of the DNS Abuse PDP 1 Work Plan. I'm going to hand this over to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Susan. Hopefully, we can do this quickly. I think there's just a few slides. I'm going to run through them quite quickly because I think we've heard quite a lot about this.

The first thing I wanted to say is all PDPs, all PDP working groups are required to develop a timeline and work plan to send to Council. And

---

this is usually done as AOB, so this is actually out of the ordinary that we're using this time as an agenda item. But of course, given the high interest in this particular topic, and also recognizing that Council has a high interest in this, I wanted to give us some update and also an opportunity for councilors to ask questions if there are any. So let's go on to the next slide.

You can see that we had the initial draft plan which was presented to the working group in Mumbai, and then we had community feedback. The working group itself did look at it, reviewed on how we could look at some efficiencies, and how we can look at sequencing its work, and these adjustments have actually reduced the overall timeline by approximately four months. This now means that this working group anticipates delivering its final report to Council around May or June of 2027. So you can see there, there's been a shortening of four months. Originally, I think it was all the way to October, November. We can go to the next slide.

Also, another brief update. I think the working group actually has achieved quite a lot of work in its time. We've already had seven meetings. We looked at completing the leadership team. We have a vice chair for the working group, it is Nick Wenban-Smith. We have agreement on the work plan and the timeline, which now was sent to Council.

I am not going to go through the Smartsheet, which is actually attached to our agenda and also on the working group wiki. But if you are really interested in the specific dates for everything, you can go ahead and click into that.

We have a Collaboration document where this working group is actually using it quite efficiently. There is straw people text on discussions on Charter Questions 1, 2, 3. There are numerous comments both in this document, as well as a very lively mailing list that kind of talks about and talks through a lot of considerations that working group members, participants have been talking about. We've received early input from all the questions as well. And we've also looked at the early input on Charter Questions 1, 2, 3, and we've looked at the straw person text for Charter Questions 1 and 2.

So that is the conclusion. The working group is on track. We will be advancing the work in the coming months in line with this updated work plan. I think we can go to the next slide. Okay.

Again, in numbers, I don't really want to talk through what it is, but there are six more working group meetings left before the Seville meeting. We are anticipating to do a run through of a discussion of Charter Questions 1 to 6, and have some straw people text to look at as well. We will be looking at all the early input received from SO, AC, SGs, and Cs for these questions. We will be developing some straw people text as well, but it won't be final. We like to call it or our working group chair Paul likes to call it stable but not final, and we will proceed from there. Next slide.

Then finally, there's no further action really required from Council, other than the acknowledgement that the work plan has been received. I, as our liaison to this working group, will be giving periodic updates. I also believe there is a Prep Week webinar that will be separate from the

---

---

Council one. So, I guess stay tuned on the date for that, but I'll now open the floor for any questions from our councilors on this. Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Thank you. Another question, just an observation. We have a very ambitious time plan, and I fully support going for that. However, there is one uncertainty that was not on the timeline that you showed, and that's what happens after we are done with it as a GNSO Council. As we have seen in the past, the Board has been dragging its feet on some of the PDP recommendations that we have made in the past. I think the Transfer Policy has still not been approved by the Board. I just wonder if there's anything that we can do as a Council to make sure that the Board is speeding up on not just this PDP but other PDPs as well and gets around to adopting them in a more quick fashion and a more expedient way. I know this is a high expectation, a high priority topic for the Board, but it's not the only one. And hopefully we will see a faster turnaround this time around.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks so much, Volker. Yes, absolutely. Well, this is the timeline and the work plan from the working group. Of course, after it comes to us, we as Council can also be ready for receiving these recommendations from this working group. When you're talking about whether or not Board is ready to receive and move expeditiously, again, I think, Council we've been doing quite a lot of work on Board readiness. I know Greg and Wes, they're not specifically on this topic, but they've also impressed that the Board itself is also looking at communicating with

---

Council and reducing friction. So I think all of this will probably contribute to them looking at this when we are done and when we actually send the recommendations over. I hope that is what they also will be doing after May/June of 2027. Sam?

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Hi, everyone. I want to preface what I'm about to say with a few points, which is, first of all, I really appreciate that staff and the working group leads took the time to go in and review the timeline and tighten up the second phase. We'll look at the second half of this graphic here by those four months. I think that's amazing. I think that was a great thing to do.

Also, it seems like, according to what Jen has reported and what I've heard from others, that the group is proceeding very expeditiously and they're doing really great work so far. So, everyone, just to be clear, I'm very happy with the way that things are going right now. That said, we made such a huge effort as a Council to keep this scope of this PDP very narrow in the hopes that we would get it done in a timely manner. And I know we had some conversations at ICANN85 when folks were in Mumbai about we don't want to necessarily get into the weeds of micromanaging the PDP, but I think it bears noting that saying that we're going to scope something narrowly and get work done quickly, and then targeting almost a full year before we can deliver an initial report, guys, I just think it's too long. I just think it's too long. And more importantly, I think this group is capable of doing the work faster. And I think Paul is an excellent chair, and I think he is capable of driving this group to do this work a bit faster.

So I don't know if there's a possibility of doing this, but I would love it if we as Council could just try, just do an experiment, ask the group to move that timeline up by three or four months. See if we can get the deliberations and the initial report done in 6 months, as opposed to 11, and just see how well we do. I think there's a good chance that we could surprise ourselves as a community. There's a lot of energy around this topic. Folks are putting in the work. I want to throw that out there for folks' consideration if we think that there's room here. Like I said, we are trying to break out of old working methods and do things a little bit differently to meet the moment here, and I think this is a real opportunity for us to meet the moment and set a high bar for ourselves.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Sam. Feedback noted. I'm really happy to take that back to leadership staff and also the working group. I will say that staff leadership and the working group did quite a lot of work and a big effort to look at being able to sequence the work, being able to cut off the time that we can, and there is timings that we actually have—it's a set piece, right? The Public Comment periods are set pieces. So I think what we can do is we trust in the expertise of the working group now. I think there is very good will from all involved in this working group to get the work done correctly as well. I think that we're doing it in a sense that is it is expeditious, it is efficient, but also we're trying to make sure we do it properly as well.

So I think speed is not the only factor here. We do need to do the work properly. I think this is one of the first PDPs where we're looking at a very tightly scoped, very focused work plan and structure. So I have

---

---

every confidence that this working group will deliver. And, of course, as liaison, I will keep us all posted.

I don't see any other hand, and I'm looking at the timing as well. Yep. So there's nothing else for Council to do. We have acknowledged the work plan, and I think I can now pass back to Susan for AOB.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Jen. Yes. We've got a handful of AOB items, so I'll just hand straight over to Terri, I think, who's going to give us the ICANN60—

TERRI AGNEW:

All right. Thank you very much. Here we go. Lots of word, folks, but a lot of this will be sent to you via e-mail over and over again. So ICANN86 Seville, Spain is at the FIBES Conference and Exhibition Center. It'll be taking place from the 8<sup>th</sup> through the 11<sup>th</sup> of June 2026. The main schedule will be published on the 11<sup>th</sup> of May. Prep Week will be conducted on 20 and 21 of May of 2026, and the Prep Week schedule will be published on the 27<sup>th</sup> of April. Pre-ICANN86 GNSO Council webinar will take place on Thursday, the 28<sup>th</sup> of May, at 13:00 UTC, and councilors are expected to attend, and the calendar invite has already been sent out. Again, please look at your calendars. Make sure you see that, Thursday, May 28, at 13:00 UTC.

Please make sure you have all registered for this meeting. Funded travelers, you should use the link in your e-mail from ICANN Travel. All others, if you are not a funded traveler, please go to the main webpage

---

and register. It's super important. If your family is coming, make sure they go and register. Register, register, register. In-person attendance. Registration remains open until the 7<sup>th</sup> of June, and onsite registration is not available. So make sure you do it before the 7<sup>th</sup> of June.

Okay. there are going to be conflicts with the schedule that you're seeing. This is just our GNSO schedule. We worked closely with SG, C support staff, we try to minimize it, but it's not always possible. There are going to be conflicts.

Reminder. GNSO gets one larger room and all the other rooms are going to be smaller. Please go back to your groups and set expectations so everybody is aware. I find if expectations are set in advance, it really just helps along the way.

Here's our schedule. On Tuesday, the 9<sup>th</sup>, we'll have one GNSO working session in the morning, and then later in the day, we'll have our GNSO Council informal, it's a closed one, for councilors and SG, C chairs to discuss matters on the Council agenda. ICANN Board will host a reception at ICANN86 during Tuesday's Networking Cocktail and invite the chairs and vice chairs of the current working groups. And the objective is to recognize the hard work of the leadership of the current working groups. GNSO has a lot of names we put forward, so let's show up for them. They've done a lot of work, so have you on all of the groups. But anyway, let's show up. Let's show pride.

The GNSO Council meeting will take place on Wednesday, the 10<sup>th</sup> of June, and the Council Wrap-Up will be on the 11<sup>th</sup> of June. There will be

---

no joint GAC GNSO meeting. And Seb will be reaching out to topic leads if engagement is needed ahead of ICANN86.

GNSO Council dinner, we have sent a hold the date for Wednesday, the 10<sup>th</sup> of June. That evening, Wednesday, the 10<sup>th</sup> of June. More information to come. So please stay tuned there.

As time gets closer, as I'd mentioned at the beginning, we will send e-mails to Council how to get organized, what sessions you're expected to attend. That one generally comes just before you start to travel. And also, of course, the daily e-mails to help keep everyone on track. Any questions, concerns at this time? We have 11 minutes left. Susan, I'm turning it back over to you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you very much, Terri. Okay. I'm thinking we had two items that councilors were bringing up here in AOB, first being from Lawrence regarding the SPIRT. And then after that will be Damon on the IGO/INGO Curative Rights. So about five minutes each, folks, maximum, if that's okay. Over to you, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

I'll try to do a good job in that time. Please, you might need to make this a bit bigger, the text on the screen.

So the SPIRT is a group convened by the Council, and basically, they cannot adopt work by themselves. They need to be directed by the Council before they make a decision to start talking to ICANN Org about any issue that comes up with regards to the next round for the

---

Predictability Framework to be applied. Before us is a proposal that seeks to define how the SPIRT gets that directive through. And hopefully, by the time we are through, we might be able to reach a decision going forward.

I also want to quickly state that aside from the SPIRT being able to come to the GNSO Council to trigger it to start discussing the application of the Predictability Framework by ICANN Org, there is also the other track which is that the SPIRT can also be directed by ICANN Org or by the ICANN Board. But the preference, because we oversee the SPIRT, will be for the Council to direct them on what to do.

So to this end, there are two processes that the SPIRT that we're proposing that Council adopts. The first is the standard process where the SPIRT brings to the notice of the Council through the liaison to the SPIRT, which currently is myself or any other person who takes up this role in future, the SPIRT brings to the attention of the Council the fact that there is an issue affecting the forthcoming round that needs some mitigation. We know that where this issue is first of all introduced to the Council agenda and discussed, it is hoped that by the next Council meeting, which usually is a month after the first meeting, that a vote is cast to determine if the SPIRT Team should go ahead to talk to the ICANN Org, that staff, with regards applying the Predictability Framework on that particular issue. This isn't mitigating the issue. This is just starting to do work on that particular issue. And because of the unique way the Council operates, if the GNSO councilors will need to confer with their constituencies, it might mean that that request is deferred by another month and would require three months in the least for the SPIRT to get a directive from Council to even start its work.

---

So to this course, we propose that there should also be an expedited process. The expedited process is one where the GNSO leads on to the SPIRT. Haven't been told that there is an issue that needs mitigation from the SPIRT drops this issue on the GNSO Council mailing list and giving context on why it should be expedited, and by so doing, also invite the chair of the GNSO to institute a 72-hour no objection process. So, if within 72 hours there is no objection from any councilor to the SPIRT interacting or interfacing with staff further on this issue, then the process for SPIRT to engage ICANN staff to apply the predictability test and mechanisms is triggered. Where there are objections to that particular issue on the mailing list within the 72-hour period, naturally, the item will fall into the agenda of the next or the following Council meeting, such that there is room for more discussion and resolution whether it should move forward or not.

Now, as I said earlier, there is—okay, because of time, two things have basically come up since this proposal. First, I thank Justine for her question on what can be determined as a timely request, and a time-sensitive request was taken to the SPIRT Team for a lot of robust discussions. And after explaining how Council does its business, a number of the SPIRT Team members definitely disappointed that it could take almost forever for them to even start working on a process, possibly now look into the route of ICANN staff being able to trigger them applying a predictability test. This might not be a very good part because it cuts the Council out of the process. But in the immediate, what is required is for Council to adopt this particular process. Where the process is adopted, staff will work on further language and put this

---

into a draft document that will be presented back to Council for adoption.

I will stop at this point, knowing that I went past by minutes, for any questions that anyone might have or yield the floor back to Susan. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: We've got one hand up. Super quick, Anne, if possible.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yes, very quick. Thanks, Lawrence. I do need to take a deeper look at all that's been proposed, and the cleaner document, I think, is available in Andrew's e-mail in response. One thing I will note is that the form that's to be used asks what is the nature of the request to Council, and one of the boxes that can be checked is a policy box. And I have concerns, in the case of a request to Council in a time sensitive manner that has a negative response time of 72 hours, that the policy box should not be applicable in that situation. Thanks. But I'll obviously take a deeper look.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Anne. This is noted. Susan, back to you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks so much. And thanks. I realize it's a bit speedy. Damon, I'm afraid you've only got a couple of minutes. So, over to you, if you can do it in a couple of minutes.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

I absolutely can, Susan. Thanks so much. I just wanted to pass along an update from the IGO/INGO Curative Rights Implementation Review Team. A little bit of review, and that kind of feeds right into the update.

Basically, IGOs typically cannot litigate in front of a court. And so when there was policy created concerning the UDRP and the URS, when IGOs and INGOs were parties to that dispute, there was an idea that came out of the PDP for a special arbitration proceeding, which would allow them to participate in the UDRP without the fear of being dragged into court afterwards. An issue came up as to when that arbitration proceeding was going to be available. Did you have to wait until the end of the UDRP or URS, or could you just sort of start at any time?

Council, I brought this issue to you in January, and we passed a resolution basically saying the intent is you can go ahead and you can use this at any time. At least my thought being, well, it will harmonize kind of the UDRPs with IGOs and INGOs with kind of regular old UDRPs where you can pretty much get into arbitration anytime you want.

Apparently, the IGOs do not like that resolution, and they still feel it's a reading that is against the PDP outcome. They also are concerned that the resolution basically talks about arbitration at any time, but not necessarily tied into the UDRP or URS approach, and you could just do it even outside of that entire scenario.

There is a lot of discussion on the list. People are working to try to find a compromise, but that's the update. I realize I'm out of time, so that's what I have. I just want to give you that update. I sent an e-mail. And I

---

know you asked a question on that, and I will get back to your e-mail on that. So thank you very much.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Damon. I think this is one, hopefully, it will be resolved in the group, and if not, I'm guessing you will be bringing it back and keeping us updated.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I surely will. But hopefully—

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Yeah, hopefully not. All right. Thank you very much, everyone. We are right at time. Thanks for a really good meeting and for—I can't believe we're finishing on time, actually. So, thanks, everyone. We can wrap this meeting up, and have a good rest of your day or a nice sleep for those of you who are going to bed now.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Thank you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**