

---

**ICANN Transcription**

**GNSO Council**

**Thursday, 21 May 2026 at 05:00 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/0I\\_D5\\_51Ct1L6JDgdBaD2Jj2nKW7aE-CLsDfmL8XXB\\_uO65ky1tJV6odklNgHCyYD1RMI8j\\_PbYOSxky.kQd57\\_7z9co7bU3U](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/0I_D5_51Ct1L6JDgdBaD2Jj2nKW7aE-CLsDfmL8XXB_uO65ky1tJV6odklNgHCyYD1RMI8j_PbYOSxky.kQd57_7z9co7bU3U)

Zoom Recording:

[https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/0Xvu2U\\_oyuJm4M-x-SSOx3HCib93LvdXAppYqaX1qxg2uija0KbhXmVsVvPuxmsCEZG9TDsCrG-3OKm6.H7j1TFGaZE\\_pUUBU](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/0Xvu2U_oyuJm4M-x-SSOx3HCib93LvdXAppYqaX1qxg2uija0KbhXmVsVvPuxmsCEZG9TDsCrG-3OKm6.H7j1TFGaZE_pUUBU)

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

Page: <https://gns0.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 (joined after vote), Ashley Heineman(absent), Volker Greimann

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

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav Vedi

Non-Contracted Parties House

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

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

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

---

*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.*

---

Guests: none

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) (apology)

Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO) (apology)

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) (apology)

Devan Reed - Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO/Programs and Operations) (apology)

TERRI AGNEW: The recording has started, and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on the 21st of May, 2026. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Nacho Amadoz?

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

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Hong-Fu Meng? I don't see where Hong-Fu is on, but I will send him an email once this roll call is over. Samantha Demetriou?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Ashley Heineman? I don't see where Ashley is on, but I will send her an email shortly after the roll call to see if we can get her on. Volker Greimann. Volker, we are seeing you connected on Zoom, Volker, but you're not accepting the additional Zoom prompt, so we will work that out shortly. Gaurav Vedi?

GAURAV VEDI: Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present.

---

---

TERRI AGNEW: Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Susan Mohr?

---

SUSAN MOHR: I'm here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Julf Helsingius? Julf, are you still with us? Can you hear us?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, I just had trouble unmuting, but I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. We did receive a proxy for Julf, but that was in case of connectivity issues, and he is on. But just in case there are any, the proxy would go to Tapani Tarvainen. Farzaneh Badii?

FARZANEH BADI: Hello.

TERRI AGNEW: Hello. Peter Akinremi?

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri.

---

TERRI AGNEW: Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje? I don't see where Benjamin is on, but we will try to get him on shortly after this roll call. Bruna Martins dos Santos?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I'm here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Anne Aikman-Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos?

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

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: I am here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: I'm here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Volker, I did give you access as an attendee to talk. Did you want to go ahead and see if we can get that to work since the Zoom prompt is not working for you? So Volker, you should be able to unmute at this time. All right. We will still work on that. We have the policy team-

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Thank you. There is a problem with the browser version of this thing because it does not let me be a panelist. I am installing the app right now.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay, great. Thank you, Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN: And I am going to be dialing from my phone.

TERRI AGNEW: Lovely hearing from you.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Sorry for that.

---

TERRI AGNEW:

That is okay. The policy team supporting the GNSO is on, so you have Steve Chan, John Emery, Andrew Chen, and myself, Terri Agnew. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking, as this call is being recorded. A reminder that we are in a Zoom webinar room, and councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once they have set their chat to everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest. With this, I will turn the call back over to the GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you very much, Terri. If my audio is not too good, maybe I will go on headphones, so someone just let me know. But for now, I will try it like this. Welcome to our May meeting. If anyone has any updates to their statements of interest, now is the time. And I see a hand, which is always a very exciting moment in these calls. Jennifer?

---

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Susan. This is Jen for the record. I have a small update to my statement of interest. I have just recently been appointed the Chair for the Multistakeholder Advisory Group for the IGF, so I have updated that. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you, Jen. Maybe a small update to the SOI, but not small at all. Well done. Congratulations.

Okay, anyone else? I am not seeing any more hands, apart from clapping hands, which is entirely appropriate. Okay. Does anyone have any proposed amendments to the agenda? And I will flag that we did add a handful of AOB items. There seemed to be a bit of a flurry of stuff coming up in the last week or so since our agenda got finalized. But is there anything else to add to that? Or indeed, if something occurs to you as we are talking and you realize it is not covered, we hopefully should have a bit of time in AOB.

All right. I am not seeing anything else at the moment. So just to note that the minutes from the 11th of March meeting were posted on the 29th of March, and the minutes from the 16th of April meeting were posted on the 30th of April. And so with that, we can go on to Agenda Item 2, which is our review of projects and action items list.

---

Again, this is a sort of regular opportunity to check in, particularly with our liaisons to working groups and to IRTs, but also to anyone, if there is a kind of issue that they want to flag on one of the current pieces of work. Again, there is no obligation to bring something up, but if there is anything going on where you are the liaison and you feel it is worth giving Council a heads up, this is the time. And I guess I should also make that reminder. We all will have obviously checked our projects list and action items list before we came on the call, but just a rolling reminder that that is something that we should all be doing on a regular basis because we do not spend time on the call actually going through that.

All right. I am not seeing anything, so I think we can... I know you do, Farzi. I think we can move on to Council Agenda Item 3, which is our Council vote on board and adoption, and that will be Jen who is going to lead us through this.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Susan. This is Jen again, going to bring us through our Item Number 3. So this is about our Board un-adoption process in the updated GGP and PDP manuals. This is a Council vote, and we have talked about it, I think, in our previous meetings. The most recent time was during the April meeting, where we heard some concerns brought by the IPC. We have not actually received anything further from any other Councilors.

As a reminder about how we go from here, this discussion started during our SPS last year, actually, so 2025, where we noticed a procedural gap. Specifically, there was a lack of a defined process for the Board to reconsider an adopted policy recommendation. And during that SPS last year, we agreed on a general process for this Board reconsideration and un-adoption, which highlighted this exceptional nature of this process. We also noted the need for transparency, of course, and consultation, and balanced this with the Board's ability to act in its fiduciary role.

During our bilateral, the Board and the Council bilateral in ICANN 82, we suggested that this process could be captured in the operating procedures for GNSO, and the Board did not object to this suggestion. Following this, we had some edits that our support staff helped us do. We reviewed them, and then we published these proposals for public comment, and we got some community feedback.

We then looked at the feedback we got and reviewed this updated process. There were some additional edits to incorporate this feedback, particularly highlighting—as several Councilors as well as the public comments have also mentioned—that this process is designed to be very rare and only used in exceptional circumstances. So before I move us over to a vote, I would like to open the floor to see if anyone has any more questions,

---

---

comments, or statements they would like to make. The floor is open. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Jen. So this is a general comment about the process when we actually ask for public comments on something. I think it is quite okay to say we received a bunch of comments and we addressed them, but it is nice to, at some point, go through them and say, "This is how we addressed some of these comments, and this is how the document has been changed." At the end of the day, we are asking the community to provide feedback, and they put a lot of time and effort, and they should know how we have incorporated them. This is not just for this, but for any other process where we ask for public comment. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Farzaneh. Agreed. We should be very open and, of course, transparent with how we review and respond to these public comments. I am sure we have all seen the red-lined copies of these proposed edits to the GGP and PDP manuals. I am sure we will be able to capture this going forward in a more open and also, I guess, recorded manner. I do not know if staff wanted to weigh in on how this was captured for this particular process, but I do appreciate Farzaneh making that general comment on how

---

Council should treat these public comments. Before I... Oh, okay, Steve. Sorry, Damon, just for Steve to jump in really quickly.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Jen, and thanks for the comments, Farzaneh. I actually did not manage this process myself, but I think I know enough to speak on it. Generally, at a high level, the public comment summary and analysis is one aspect in which the comments are discussed and how they might impact the relevant document. That is where at least part of it is captured.

But I think the more direct way in which the impacts of the comments were captured was actually in a presentation to the Council. I do not remember exactly where it was. I believe it was in Mumbai, and I think it was Caitlin, if I remember correctly. She went over the additional suggested edits that stem from the public comments. So I can probably dig that up and share the link with the Council, but I think that is how we provided a little bit of extra transparency into how the comments impacted the drafts. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Steve, for reminding us. Hopefully that answers part of your question, if not all of it, Farzaneh, and I hope that Councilors are also aware. I will go to Damon. Please, go ahead.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Thank you very much, Jen. The IPC Councilors, Susan and myself, will be voting no on this motion. We do have a statement to read into the record. Would you like that now or after the vote?

JENNIFER CHUNG: For procedure, I am turning over to staff to see when this is most appropriate. Is it better to have them do it now, or shall we move to a vote and they can do that during the vote?

TERRI AGNEW: When we vote, I will ask if there are any objections or if anybody abstains, so at that time, you can do it. Also, Damon, this is Terri. If you could please send that to us at [gns0-sec@icann.org](mailto:gns0-sec@icann.org), we will get that linked on the resolutions page as well.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Will do.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Terri, and thank you, Damon. So I think you will have a chance to do that once we move over to the vote, if that is okay with you.

---

DAMON ASHCRAFT: That is fine.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you so much. All right. I do not see any further hands, so I think now is the time that I go and read our resolved clauses and turn it over to Terri. So, resolved, the GNSO Council adopts the updated GNSO PDP manual and the updated GGP manual. The GNSO requests that GNSO support staff publish the updated manuals in the appropriate places on the ICANN website. Handing it over to Terri to take us through.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. This is Terri. And just a note before we begin the vote that Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, and Benjamin Akinmoyeje are absent from this vote, but Julf Helsingius is present for this vote. So here we go, folks. One moment, please. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say "aye." Hearing none, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say "aye."

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Aye.

---

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And would you like to share your reasons at this time?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure, Terri, I am happy to. While the IPC respects the votes and opinions of all Councilors, we will be disappointed in today's result if this motion passes. As we have noted in our comments submitted on January 26, 2026, the process to un-adopt GNSO policy recommendations has two fatal flaws. First, it supports the notion that ICANN cannot accomplish tasks in a timely manner, and second, it is contrary to ICANN's Bylaws.

A constant criticism of ICANN is the perception, and often reality, that the organization and community as a whole simply cannot get things done. This is not a meritless critique. We on Council have dealt with several key issues over the past few months that are a decade or more in the making. Yes, they are stale and at times no longer fit for purpose, but the reason for this is that ICANN simply took too long to implement them. Council should be encouraging the Board and ICANN Org to expedite Council policy recommendations. Any yes vote today does the opposite, as it builds in an off-ramp when no action is taken, and in fact, encourages inaction.

---

More troubling, though, is that the revisions we may approve tonight are contrary to ICANN's own Bylaws. As the IPC mentioned in its comment, the Board's voting threshold for these actions has changed from a majority, as specified under the Bylaws, to a supermajority, which, frankly speaking, simply is not a change that could be validly achieved through the GNSO Operating Procedures. This type of change needs to go through the Bylaws amendment procedure, and it did not. What that means is that any future decision the Board purports to make under this process, which someone objects to, is at risk of being overturned by the court. This creates uncertainty, opens up ICANN to legal costs, and undermines its credibility.

The IPC appreciates ICANN staff's revisions to the proposed changes, but they simply do not address the IPC's concerns. The IPC is ready and willing to work with Council, ICANN Org, and the ICANN Board to improve the procedures and processes used to implement Council recommendations. Thank you for your time.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Would all those in favor of the motion please say "aye."

JULF HELSINGIUS: Aye.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Yay.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Aye.

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Aye.

FARZANEH BADI: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We have no abstentions, we have two objections, and we have three absent. Even with all of that, the motion still passes. Back to you, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Terri. Thank you also, Damon, for reading out the IPC statement. I do see that there are some questions in the chat about whether we provided an answer to the IPC comments or not. I do not believe we have done so. I am not sure if we do have a process for that. But in any case, there are many things that were in that statement that I am sure Council is taking note of.

---

---

Previously, in our meetings, we have also said that with these changes and updates to the GGP and PDP manuals, it does not preclude any further action taken by any stakeholder group or constituency individually, nor does it preclude Council from needing to take any steps that it deems necessary in that case. So, that is what it is. I think I can now pass this on to our next person. I am not really sure what our next agenda item is. I think it is back to Susan. Back to you. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yes, it is. Thanks, Jen. So, our next agenda item is about the Council process for forwarding an issue to the Spirit, or SPIRT—I will call it SPIRT. We had a proposed process for having items referred to Council to, effectively, request permission to work on them by the SPIRT itself. And there was extensive and really engaged and thoughtful discussion on that. Thanks to everyone who did that, and particularly to Farzaneh and Anne, who really dug in, and also to Lawrence, who, as the liaison, brought this matter to Council.

As I said in my email, the SPIRT is continuing to establish itself, and the purpose of it is to try to ensure that the 2026 New gTLD application round operates effectively. But there have been some moving parts to coordinate, and I think there are issues about how change requests are raised and referred to the SPIRT. Having had all that feedback, and basically in coordination with the SPIRT

leadership team, Council leadership have come to agree that this SPIRT alert process item was premature for a vote at this time. In addition, from discussing with the SPIRT leadership, they also decided to drop this item, and instead to seek more general guidance from Council on how Council plans to forward issues to the SPIRT.

So, that is the purpose of our current discussion. There are a few slides, which maybe we can start with. Hopefully, I will remember to change this when needed. Essentially, I think we probably are all aware it was chartered relatively recently. The SPIRT was chartered by Council, and its role is to utilize the predictability framework. That is something that was developed in the SubPro PDP and is outlined in the Applicant Guidebook for the New gTLD round.

Its role is to collaborate with ICANN Org on all non-minor changes, and those are two different types of changes. Type 2 changes are ones which are not relating to policy matters, and Type 3 are ones relating to things that will require a policy change. The idea is to collaborate with Org when those kinds of issues come up that might need some kind of a change or a course change, either a non-policy or a policy one. How they do so is dealt with slightly differently under the SPIRT charter, and there are different obligations about coming back to Council and consulting. But essentially, that is the role.

---

---

Obviously, the hope is that we will have a smooth next application round, as smooth as possible given all the work that has been done on implementation, and therefore, this process hopefully will not need to be used that regularly. But obviously, the SPIRT is there to try to provide an efficient process for working out issues if they come up while the program is underway.

Council is responsible for oversight of the SPIRT, and the SPIRT cannot directly refer something to itself. That is set out in its charter. This actually was a conscious decision that was outlined in the SubPro report to try to avoid lobbying efforts, and so to have the SPIRT only take up issues that have been vetted through Council, through Org, or through the Board. If the SPIRT wants to work on something, or if something needs to be worked on by the SPIRT, let's put it that way, Council must first request it, or, as I say, it comes from Org or the Board, before it is empowered to work on such a change. What it would then do would be, if something is referred by Council, it would inform Org about the change to the program that is required, and, if applicable, there is then a discussion about what the change might be.

I think maybe it is worth going on to the next slide, although it is horrible to read. But there is a sort of collaborative process. What we are talking about here is kind of how we in Council will work on what our process will be when we become aware of an issue and we want to refer it to the SPIRT. The SubPro final report does

have some timelines specified in the general sense, in that it says that every item that is referred to the SPIRT should contain an expected turnaround time in the referral request—allowing for certain items to be handled in an expedient fashion when required and others to have a longer timeframe where speed may not be as needed.

In terms of what we do when we are referring, and I think this came up during the email discussion that we had, there was a fair degree of discomfort in us doing something outside of a Council vote and having some kind of expedited procedure, particularly if that expedited procedure was via a sort of non-objection process. So, I think our proposed path from leadership would be that wherever possible, we should try to refer items to the SPIRT via a formal vote—ideally in a meeting where that is possible—and we would then inform the SPIRT that a change is needed and that they need to work with Org and apply the predictability framework and so on.

This is not, for the avoidance of doubt, talking about what the change will be or what type of change it is. This is more just about the process of how we get something from Council to the SPIRT. Particularly, obviously, we already have a SPIRT charter that talks about how it handles the different change types, so this discussion here is not to circumvent any of that. It is not trying to change how the SPIRT handles something when it gets to it, but

---

---

more just about what the expectation is on how Council will deal with it when we are forwarding something on.

As I was saying, and it was probably on the previous slide, the expectation or the preference, taking on board all the feedback that was received earlier, is that we should strive to do this in a formal vote and do it during a Council meeting where possible. But obviously, every issue is going to need to be reviewed on a kind of case-by-case basis. They might require different turnaround times from the SPIRT, and we will have an obligation to tell the SPIRT that and tell them how quickly we want them to deal with it and so on. But there could also be some issues which, if they come up and it is clear that they are urgent, we may have to do something slightly less formally outside of a Council meeting. For example, we could utilize email voting if we need to.

I was trying to think of an example of where that might be. For example—and this is purely hypothetical—if an issue were to come up next week and it was something that was clearly impacting the information that an applicant had to submit during the application window for the next round, that application window is only open until early August. Clearly, that would seem to be a case where Council, and subsequently the SPIRT and Org, would need to work expeditiously and probably outside of a regular Council meeting. If we were to have a discussion in June and then a vote in July, that just is not going to meet the timeline.

---

So, that is the kind of idea. But still, the idea is to try to strive wherever possible to have a vote, whether in Council meetings after good discussion if possible, and to still have some kind of formal voting process by Council where at all possible when we are passing something on to the SPIRT.

I am not sure—I have got a couple more slides, but I am not sure that there is much more I need to really say on this. This is really an opportunity to see whether that strikes the right balance with Council. I want to see whether Councilors, and particularly those who have been very engaged on this, feel that that kind of utilization of a formal Council resolution is the way forward. Assuming that we do reach agreement on that, we would probably be asking Lawrence as the Council liaison to let the SPIRT know that, and that that is how we will strive to forward things as and when they come up, hopefully not very often. All right. I have done a lot of talking, but I will just pause now and see if there are any hands or if anyone wants to comment on this. Farzaneh, thank you.

FARZANEH BADII:

Thank you, Susan. This looks good, but what are we voting on for the formal vote during the Council? Are we voting on the issue to be discussed, or are we deciding on the issue? I am not so sure what we are voting on in this process. Are they going to submit

---

the issue to us, to the Council, and then we vote on it, and then it goes to the SPIRT?

SUSAN PAYNE:

As I mentioned at the beginning, what we had been talking about was a way for the SPIRT to refer things to us and ask us to refer it back. This is not what we are really discussing. I think we have come to the conclusion that perhaps it is unnecessary for us to have a process for that. It is not expected that the SPIRT will refer things to us. Indeed, that was kind of deliberate. There is an issue that is kind of live at the moment to do with the RSP program, and the SPIRT was wanting to refer that to us. But really, there is no need for that. It is an issue that the Registry Stakeholder Group is very aware of. If anything, I think they probably took it to the SPIRT in error, thinking that that was what they should do with it. But in fact, there is no reason why the Registry Stakeholder Group cannot refer that item to Council. Indeed, we will have that as one of our AOB items. We will be getting that introduced to us.

So, this is about the ordinary course of events, when something comes to Council's attention, which is probably going to be brought by one or other of the stakeholder groups or constituencies, but it could come up in some other way. It is just what we will do in terms of deciding that we are going to send it to the SPIRT to get them to work on it. We are not here talking about what we think the change should be or asking them to do

---

something specific. It may be during the course of our discussion that it is really clear to all of us that it is an operational change or something like that. But this is just us triggering the SPIRT to work on it.

FARZANEH BADI:

Oh, okay, I get that. I am comfortable with this process where the stakeholder group can come directly to the Council, submit an issue, and then we discuss and send it, because I think we set up the SPIRT for that, to consider this.

One thing—what is going to happen with the issues that the members of the SPIRT bring up and submit? Are we going to ask them that if they want to submit an issue, they should just go through their stakeholder group and not use that process from now on? The Registry Stakeholder Group thought they had to go through the SPIRT, so are we now going to make it clear to the SPIRT that if there is an issue, just tell your stakeholder group to come to Council and then we will discuss it? Something like that.

SUSAN PAYNE:

I think that would be the preference. I am all for us not ignoring an issue that has come up. If it is clear that we should be looking at something, I would hate us to build so much process that we are ignoring an issue. But I think if there are members of stakeholder groups and constituencies in the SPIRT, and

---

therefore, if they cannot get their stakeholder groups engaged on this sufficiently or they do not think it is an issue, then perhaps it is not an issue.

It feels like it should be something that a part of the community feels needs to be worked on. That goes back to the idea that that is why the SPIRT was set up not to be able to refer things to itself. It should not be just one person who has a bee in their bonnet; it should be something more than that. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Thanks so much, Susan. First of all, this is Anne speaking. I do want to recognize all the work that Lawrence did. I do believe that in that liaison role, he was making a great effort to be responsive to some concerns that were expressed, in particular in relation to time-sensitive matters. One of the reasons that I engaged so much on the list about this is because I was the Council liaison to the SPIRT charter drafting team, so I was trying to be responsive to the motion that was made. But honestly, I think you are absolutely correct, and leadership is correct, that it was anticipated at the time of the charter drafting that when an issue arose that was not raised directly by ICANN, the ICANN Org, the Board, or the Council, then it was supposed to be the stakeholder group or constituency that raises the issue at Council. It is really quite consistent with the charter, what you have suggested.

---

I have noted in the chat that folks have talked about whether or not, when Council ultimately does refer an issue to the SPIRT, Council wants to see the proposed solution back again. That, I think, is a topic that can be addressed at the time of the vote. For example, if Council determines that the nature of the issue is such that Council should see it again, then it would be part of the authorization to the SPIRT to say, "Please bring that back to us." If it is not that complicated, or if we see that it can proceed smoothly through just the SPIRT and ICANN Org, then Council can say that at the time of the vote.

These issues do strike me as things that will probably not be that frequent, hopefully, and that do need to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis. I would, again, want to commend Lawrence for the work that he did here, and everyone who did engage on the topic. Yet, I am certainly in agreement with the approach that leadership has proposed. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Anne. Lawrence, before you start, I would just echo as well that I really appreciate you in your liaison role. You had to handle quite a tricky issue, which looked simple and then once one dug in, seemed less simple. So, thanks for all your efforts on this. I do not think any of that was wasted because it has allowed us to have a really good conversation about this. Anyway, sorry. Over to you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Susan. And thanks also to everyone who has engaged on this particular topic. The SPIRT at its first meeting actually identified a gap in the process leading to how issues were to be referred to the SPIRT. At that point, it started working on a process that could bring issues to the attention of the Council, with the hope of getting a referral to really look into the issue and discuss it extensively, invite ICANN and other parties to provide further insight, and possibly come up with a solution. The SPIRT has also been very clear in terms of its mandate, knowing that where an issue comes to the SPIRT, one of the first things it has to do is determine the type of issue it is. Where it is a Type 3 or confirmed to be a Type 3 issue, which is policy, it will definitely defer or refer that back to the Council as the SPIRT does not have the remit or mandate to do anything around policy. That informed the creation of an internal process by which SPIRT members could bring up these issues, and they were depending on the Council to also formalize its own process. What you described, Susan, which is a very standard path, formed the standard process that the SPIRT proposed to the Council, knowing that an issue will have to come to the Council's attention. By the next meeting, which is the next month, hopefully there will be a vote to refer the issue to the SPIRT, which definitely will mean about two months at the least will be taken for that purpose. And so, the SPIRT thought about

---

the expedited process, which is what we are now talking about, taking issues on a case-by-case basis.

From what has been done so far, I would kindly request that we more or less have a formal process of some sort. Formal in the sense that what the SPIRT designed was an intake form that could analyze the issues and help know if it is something that should even be addressed at all. Where the Council's process will mean that members of the community or any member of a group will have to come to a Councilor, the way the information is also received and processed to be submitted might be one thing that the Council might want to look at further. The expedited process or the case-by-case process is also very necessary, from what I have seen in the short time working with the SPIRT. We have before us now a case with the RSP, and there was another issue that came up where we requested the person who brought it up to go through a Councilor. It is taking quite a bit of work to be able to make them understand why we have to go that route, since there was already a formal process. So, there might be some work that we will still need to do in terms of making the community and the stakeholder groups aware of how this process would work and assure them that where an issue needs urgent attention, it will definitely get one. Thanks, Anne, for all the contributions.

---

While there is appetite and a good desire that when we refer an issue to the SPIRT, we would want them to come back to talk about the resolution and how it is going to work out, two things are clear. One is that there are also other paths by which parts of the community can refer an issue to the SPIRT. One is through ICANN Org, and that process has been tested already with the work that was done around the ASP adjustments. At the end of the day, that did not need to come back to the Council, and the SPIRT was asked to ratify that decision made by staff. So, it could be a confusing part where one aspect of the work that needs to be done has to go directly to ICANN Org for implementation, and then another aspect has to come back to the Council. We really would not want the Council to look like it is micromanaging the SPIRT because it referred an issue to it. I will stop at this point, just in case anyone has any other information to bring up. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Lawrence. Okay, I have got two more people in the queue, and we may have to close the queue at this point. I think we are sort of coming up to time on this issue, but Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Susan. This is Justine. I just want to make a comment that I think what is being proposed going forward seems sensible, or is

---

sensible, in my opinion. I do think it is necessary, although I think most Councilors think that this might be a very rare mechanism that would be used. But I do think it is necessary because remember that the SPIRT has open membership. So, there could potentially be members of the SPIRT who do not belong to any SGs, Cs, or even At-Large, for that matter. So, there has to be some mechanism by which a member of the SPIRT can raise issues. And then it is for the SPIRT themselves to determine whether that is something that needs to then be referred to the Council, or potentially ICANN Org might say, 'Okay, fine, we will take it up,' and then it goes through ICANN Org. So, potentially, those are the paths. But my point is there still needs to be something like this to be made available for any member of the SPIRT to raise something so that it is taken into consideration by someone.

And I think, as far as going forward after these things happen, this path is exercised. There are already, as Lawrence mentioned, steps that are built into the SPIRT Charter as to how to handle these things. So, we should not put another layer on top of what the Council thinks should happen, and so forth. I think we should just respect the SPIRT Charter and use the SPIRT Charter as much as possible without creating confusion. Now, I know that some people are concerned about Type 3 issues. I think it is really up to the SPIRT, and ICANN Org in particular, to determine first what type of issue that issue falls under. Somebody may put in an alert

---

thinking that this is a Type 3 issue. ICANN Org looks at it and says, 'Well, actually, we could probably fix this within the current policy recommendations.' Then it would not be a Type 3 issue anymore. So, I think we need to allow that to happen before we start taking an interventionist approach. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Justine. I do not think that is what this is intending to do either, just to be clear. This is really only about how the Council will get something from us to the SPIRT. We are not looking here to add any layers or to change the SPIRT Charter. I completely agree that the process is set out there. So, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL:

Thank you, Susan. Vivek Goyal of the BC. I would urge all Councilors representing SGs, Cs, and the ALAC to give a heads-up to their respective constituencies and groups so that if a time comes to make a decision on a SPIRT issue, they know that a SPIRT issue has come up, and they need to make a decision quickly. They cannot wait for the next meeting where everybody is gathered to make a decision, so it should not come as a surprise to the members that suddenly a decision needs to be made on an email list. Giving a heads-up, especially since we will all be meeting in June in Seville, will be good and avoid any surprises to members. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Vivek. Yes, absolutely. I think we are going to have to do this on a bit of a case-by-case basis. We are going to have to think about the impact of an issue if it comes up. It's probably going to need to be dealt with reasonably promptly, and in some cases, there will be a real time sensitivity. And so, we absolutely need our Councilors and our SGs and Cs to be on the ball on this. Thank you.

Okay, I think perhaps I am sort of hearing general support for striving to do this via referral by vote, and so on. I think perhaps the leadership team will just huddle after this, take this back, and coordinate with Lawrence to get that message to the SPIRT. But no doubt this will not be the only discussion, and indeed, if it becomes clear that the process is not working as we are expecting it to, nothing prevents a course change. Okay, I think I will wrap up the discussion on this item at this point, and we can move on to our prioritization mechanism and discussion Item 5. And I think I am handing this one back to Jen, who gets all the fun topics. Thanks, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Susan. We are tag-teaming. Let's all agree to give you all of the fun topics during our next call. But we do have a very fun topic coming up, and this is, of course, our work prioritization. We

---

---

also have an exciting set of slides, but just to give you some context before we go to that. Very recently in January, when we were all in lovely Barcelona during our SPS, we talked about how we can prioritize our work. There is a bunch of work that is coming down the pipeline for the Council, and we recognize, of course, we have our existing Action Decision Radar, the ADR, that we always look at and read every single time before our meeting. But this is really a sequencing and visibility tool, and it is not really a prioritization mechanism. So, there is a strong need to actually look at something that will complement the ADR with a dedicated prioritization mechanism and approach, and this was an action that came out of our SPS.

We looked at a few things. A range of potential models was explored, and I think Councilors also had a pretty good discussion during that SPS about simple ranking methods and looking at more structured hybrid scoring approaches. And also, of course, we had some views from Councilors about perceived weaknesses of certain models. And also, I think Tapani very kindly took an action to come forward with additional concerns and proposed an 'Option Zero,' as we called it, in April. I think he sent it over to the Council in early April. So, I believe staff also sent over this updated document, this proposed mechanism, with that updated text in green. I did not see any further discussion before our meeting now, but obviously, again, just stressing that no single model is perfect. I do not know if we want to go over to the lovely slides

---

that our staff team has meticulously prepared. I think I have already gone into a little bit of that. So, yeah, this is the fun bit, I think, that Susan was referring to. I think we can go all the way to Slide 3. I think I might have covered Slide 3. That is right. Okay. Yes, and we were asked to review and propose a way forward. So, the email that I just referred to, which staff kindly circulated, also contains the revised option that Tapani very kindly proposed to the list, and that was in green. I am sure we will be able to show that a little bit later if we want a revision or a review. It is also on our wiki if you want to look at it right now, if you did not get a chance to look at it before that. Let's go to the next slide, and the next slide as well. Yes, I think I covered this already about the ADR, which is useful, but does not give us the prioritization mechanism we actually need. And I think one very particular point, the third one here on the slide, is important because we do not want something that is cumbersome. We want something that actually helps the Council prioritize. It should be light enough for us to be able to move our work forward. If we are bogged down by this mechanism and it creates more work than is necessary, then it is not achieving what we need this to do. I am looking at some of the chats. We are not blaming Tapani at all. So, Tapani, please do not feel the pressure at all. Let's go on to the next slide.

Okay, let's look at the options. All right. So, just to recap for Councilors, because it has been a little while since we talked

---

about it back in January, we had the simple ranking approach. Of course, this is easy, but it flattens decision-making and it does not really capture any specific reasoning, especially if we are doing it by SGs and Cs, right? The second one is about the scoring models, where we have multi-criteria and weighted scoring. This is a lot more robust, but also could be a little bit cumbersome because we also need to look at the criteria for specific scoring models. And also, if we are doing weighting, we might also need to consider that as well. And I think during the discussion we had in January, some Councilors thought that this was a little bit cumbersome. And the third one is the hybrid approach. If we try to balance all of that, having a filter with the priorities, but then we also add steps that encourage and make sure we have full transparency on how we are looking at these models, I think this is something that is more desirable and ideal for us. Let's go to the next slide.

Proposed way forward, all the way here. Okay. So, given that Tapani did spend some time and sent this email to us, we definitely took that into account. Leadership actually took a look at this as well, and we discussed a little bit more about how we can offset and mitigate some of the concerns and weaknesses that Councilors have mentioned before. So, we are looking at this hybrid model now. It is going to be something like a multi-criteria scoring. So, if you have looked at the document, and we will show that in a little bit, there will be certain criteria where you are

---

asked to score, and then, of course, we are going to have that coupled with a ranked discussion model. This will be a starting point for the Council to discuss. We can take that, of course, substantively, and talk about it and talk it through during our meetings, and of course, on our mailing list as well. And then this is something that we are hoping to do as a pilot.

I think it is really important for the Council to be able to do this, to have a mechanism to prioritize work, especially given all the work that is coming through—a lot of the policy development work that we know is in the pipeline. And of course, in a lot of our bilaterals, we have talked to many other SO/ACs and also the Board, and they have also been quite interested to know how the Council is able to prioritize. So, let us hope that we are able to create a lightweight mechanism that is effective for our work forward. Let's go to the next slide.

Oh, I think this is going to be something fun for the wee hours of the morning for those on the East Coast, and of course, wherever you are, it could be still fun as well. Let's go to the next slide. This is something that we are just using as a lighthearted way to show how this pilot can go about. There is a situation here where there is a bear family who is trying to decide on what pet to get. They are choosing between a dog, a cat, a rabbit, and a fish, and of course, everyone has opinions. And in the past, these decisions have turned into very circular debates, and nothing really gets

---

resolved. There seems to be an overall preference for a dog, but one parent notes that dogs are very demanding. Another parent notes that the fish seems to be a very easy pet to take care of, but not everyone, and in fact, maybe not a lot of the people, are actually excited about getting a fish. So, there was an older child who looked at weighing through all of this. It says, the dog scores very high on how much it is wanted. Everybody really wants the dog, but it scores quite low on time and effort because it is a demanding pet. The fish, after it was pointed out, seems to be very easy but not very exciting, and the other two options, the cat and the rabbit, sit somewhere in between. Let's go to the next one.

So, I think I mentioned this as well, and if we are looking at striking a balance, the child was saying that the cat is the most reasonable, not too expensive, and still something that everyone likes. Let's go to the next one. I think people are getting dizzy. Multiple pets: fish and a dog, or two dogs? Okay, so based on the discussion and understanding of this rationale, the family goes and adjusts the scores, not so dramatically, but looking at all of the discussions and the discussion after the scoring, it seems that this family has agreed on the cat. So, this is just a lighthearted scenario. Sorry that it has caused some dizziness because it is animated. It is actually giving me a little bit of dizziness, too, at my hour, but it is very cute. I think this is just a way of demonstrating how this pilot can work. Of course, we are not plugging in our

---

---

actual work, but when we do it, we will be doing that. Let's go to the next slide.

I think that is it. Oh, great. Okay. So, it is really important to mention that if we look at this approach—and maybe this is a good time... Oh, this is the last slide. Yep. If we do agree on this approach, the hybrid approach of looking at this hybrid multi-criteria scoring model, and also a ranked discussion model, so we score and then we talk about it, and this is this pilot. Then what we will do as next steps is Council leadership will look at it and propose some criteria. The current document that you see with the green text—and maybe it is good for staff to actually post that link for Councilors to remind themselves—the Council also, of course, has to agree on those criteria first. So, I think there are currently, in that model, five. And then after that, we will be setting up with staff to see exactly how we can start this pilot.

Are we able to get that document on screen just for us to take a quick look at the current criteria? Thank you. So, the green text, as I mentioned, was added since you have last seen it. Thank you for making it bigger. If we scroll down a little bit more, I just wanted to show very quickly the criteria. Was there no criteria in this document? There was. I think it is a little bit lower. There you go. So, right now, this document contains this set of criteria. Leadership is happy to go away and take a first stab if we are going to the next step, but I think right now these criteria look

---

reasonable to me. Of course, Councilors are able to propose amendments, and otherwise, if they see this come back from leadership and staff and think it needs to be tweaked or adjusted further. So, let me go to our next steps. I think this is when I open the floor to see if anybody has any questions or comments specific to looking at our next steps. I do not see any hands. I see an active chat about the SPIRT, so either everything is very clear about our prioritization mechanism, and everyone is happy for us to go to next steps. Tapani.

TAPANI TARVAINEN:

Just looking at this, the proposal I made actually works just as well with this multi-criteria scoring model, as long as somebody can be bothered to come up with a spreadsheet-type thing to do it. I am just trying to clarify if the intent was—we need to get it clear—that we do this once, and then review it, and then continue that. So, the timeline for allowing people to play with these scores is actually something somewhat important. It should not come up as a one-off thing, because then it, again, has this danger of ending up with gaming and other issues. So, what kind of timeline or... It would be possible to set up termination criteria for that, by the way, if you want to, but I am not sure it would be useful because eventually the Council can just decide that now enough is enough and it is over. But what kind of exact process was supposed to be

---

used with this multi-criteria thing? I am not sure I understand it.  
Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Tapani. Your question at the end was, what is the set of criteria we will be using in addition to the discussion piece that you suggested? Was that the question?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Well, yeah. Basically, I did not understand from your description if you were going to go by the process I described or some adjustment to it other than just this criteria scoring being used.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Ah, I see. Staff, can we take a look at that document that we just showed on screen? Yes. So, if we move back up, the Option Zero, I think, is what we put back in, and this was your suggested way forward for us in the email that you sent to the Council. I think this answers the question about making sure it is transparent, making sure we are mitigating against gaming, et cetera, so everybody can see what is going on and how we are doing that. So, that is the spreadsheet part. Our suggested way as a pilot is to include that as a second part. So, we do include that multi-criteria model, and then we see that on the spreadsheet. And then, of course, we take a look at that and we discuss. That is a starting

---

point for Council discussion. Again, we will be looking at how to operationalize it, so I think that is the next step for Council leadership to take back and work with staff to get something before Councilors to try this out as a pilot. I see Anne's hand.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks so much, Jen. Appreciate the summary. I have to admit that—and this is Anne, NomCom Appointee—wow, when I read that document, my eyes got blurry-eyed. Things sounded a bit academic, but for now, I would like to focus on those characteristics that are there. If you scroll down a little bit, it says importance and urgency. Next page. Keep going.

Okay, so as I understand it, you are not wanting comment right now on these criteria for importance, urgency, demand, complexity, resources, and duration. I am a little unsure when you are saying, 'Okay, can we go ahead and do criteria?' when I feel like I see the criteria right here, and they look quite reasonable. In prioritization exercises, I am used to that quadrant system that says urgent and important, urgent but not important, not urgent but important, and not urgent and not important. Most of those exercises that I have been involved in, in the private sector, involve that sort of four-quadrant look. What I am really trying to understand right now, in terms of your next steps, is whether the criteria development will be based on these things that are listed here, which look strong.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Anne. I will try to answer your question now as well. This is actually what we have seen before, and we discussed this in January. So, this was prepared as a sample for us to look at. And you are right, it looks pretty strong and it is pretty reasonable as well. But in case you do have any specific comments right now on these criteria, we are happy to go away and see how we can actually operationalize the proposed pilot with this criteria. I think leadership also wanted a little bit more time to consider, specifically with this criteria, if these are the correct ones to go forward. We welcome, of course, your comments, and any Councilor's comments on this if you have any right now. And, of course, when we actually propose it forward and you look at those criteria again and see that there are concerns, we welcome your comments then, and tweaks and edits as well.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay. So, just a quick follow-up. I would think that when you are working on that, when you look at something that is both urgent and important, that raises it in terms of the attention level where the Council should be addressing it. Even if it is complex, if it is both urgent and important, then it really rises to the top from my point of view. That is all. Thank you.

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. I just wanted to acknowledge that. I think that is a really useful point that you made, Anne, and that does actually kind of align with the quadrant approach that you mentioned. That would sort of align with that, so it brings some other factors in, but maybe that is something we look at on the scoring front so that we can sort of weight those two a bit higher than the others.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes, exactly, Susan. That is exactly what I meant. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Anne. Thank you, Susan. I thought I was speaking, but I was muted. Now I am not muted. Sam, please go ahead.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jen. Hi, everyone. This is Sam. I just wanted to echo some agreement with maybe highlighting those two items, but I do like that the multi-criteria scoring model also includes a few extra potential criteria. I think that will make for a richer discussion when we start going through this. But also, I just wanted to note my support for the combined approach that you guys laid out at the top here. I think we should give it a shot. But as you said, with open minds, we can make tweaks after the first kind of prioritization exercise and discussion that we go through. Thank you guys for the work on this.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, I was trying to not be metaphorical; I am very literal. When we discuss these criteria, when we say 'importance,' is there going to be some kind of explanation or are we going to talk about it during the discussion? There could be demand by the community, but it could also be that the community has ignored the issue for a long time, but it is still an important issue. I think that during the discussion, this matter of importance and why it is important can be addressed. It could be that we have overlooked an issue for a long time, and it has caused problems. So, I think that during the discussion, we should go through the criteria and explain our scoring.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Farzee. I think that is what we envision with the hybrid approach. We are doing this numerical scoring, and then, of course, the qualitative part is the discussion. Right? So definitely, I think we are on the same page there. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. Thanks, Jen. You have kind of said what I was going to say, but just to agree, I think we all, in our groups, have different priorities, and so we are inevitably going to assign different importances to things. That is why the simple scoring route was not necessarily viewed as being optimal, because we have not had

---

---

the opportunity to understand what people are saying. It might be high priority for one group for one reason, and for another group for another reason, and then we come together and discuss, and someone else goes, 'Oh, I had not thought of those issues. You are right, now I think this is more important than it was before.' So, that is the aim, really, for us to be able to drill down a little bit in that discussion element and understand why the scores are what they are, not just what they are.

VIVEK GOYAL:

Hi. Thank you for this work. So, is the next step to agree on these criteria? Am I understanding correctly? Or are the ones written in Option 1 the criteria we are all okay to go with? I do not want the ranking process to become another policy process before we implement it to decide which policy to do. That is all I am asking. Because it is just guidance, it should not become a project in itself.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Vivek. Thank you for reminding us that we also need to be wary that whatever we choose should be working for us, not against us. I do not see any objections to these criteria, but of course, the next step is we will present to you how to operationalize this pilot going forward. Hopefully by then, you might be seeing the same ones or maybe you will see something

---

tweaked, and you will have a chance to, if you see something that is really out of whack there, comment on it. Peter.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Jen. Without repeating what other colleagues have said, I just wanted to touch on the proposed part. It actually makes sense, and I see that we generally agree with that and are moving the conversations to looking at the criteria. One of the things we should look at in the criteria is actually coming up with definitions of what importance is, as well as urgency and demand, when we are taking a look at the criteria. That gives an understanding of what they mean so that we do not interpret them out of context. Thank you.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Thank you. I think it is good that we are starting with a trial, because ultimately, we will have to see how this works out. I feel that if we have ranked voting, there is a lot of chance for gaming the system. It would encourage more extreme positive or negative votes if you want to prioritize or deprioritize something and maybe even remove the middle ground entirely. Ultimately, if you want a certain pet project or topic to be ranked very high, you will give it the highest priority, whereas somebody else who wants it very low would give it the lowest priority and nothing in between would make sense to vote for. So, there are certain

issues with how this could be gamed or how this would turn out in practice. Given that we are going for a trial, I think that would be very good. We should just make sure that once we have the trial in place, there should be no presumption of continuing with the initially chosen path. There tends to be a certain gravitas attached to having done it like this before, and if we want to change it now, then we would have to have a majority vote. It should be a case of having tried this, and now we must have an affirmative vote to keep it like that, rather than needing an affirmative vote to change it. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you very much, Volker. You have highlighted very important things. I think Tapani and others have also warned us and mentioned weaknesses of certain things, and I think with this hybrid pilot, the requirement for us to actually have it as a starting point for discussion will bring out a little bit more and at least mitigate some of what we would see as a weakness for perceived gaming, et cetera. It is also very important that you highlight that it is a pilot. I think at the end of the day, this is something that should be working for the Council. This is a tool that the Council can use. It is a lightweight tool. If it turns out after we do this pilot that it does not work, certainly it is not going to be something that the Council should have very big difficulties in changing, because ultimately, this is a tool for the Council to be able to prioritize its

---

---

work, and the substantive work is what we are trying to get to at the end of the day. So, hopefully we are not bogged down by all of that, but we should give it a good, fair shot in the pilot and see how we go. Okay, I think I am going way over time on this particular agenda item. So, I think I will pass this back over now to Susan for AOB.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Jen. Yes. As I mentioned, we do have a few AOB items. We have 20 minutes allocated for them. That might be a bit optimistic, but let us see how we get on. We do have a little bit of extra time on our meeting slot, so we should easily get through all of these, I hope. First up, I think we have a quick ICANN 86 planning, and I think I am handing that over to John on this.

JOHN EMERY:

Thank you, Susan. Just a quick reminder: next week on the 28th of May at 13:00 UTC, we will have the GNSO Prep Webinar. This is an opportunity for Councilors to ask questions of and get updates from the current PDP chairs, Paul McGrady and Michael Bauland, on the progress of those PDPs. It is required to join unless apologies are given in advance, and the two PDP chairs will be taking questions from Councilors. So, please be sure to be there and come with some questions about Latin diacritics or DNS abuse. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Sorry, I could not find my mute button there. Thank you very much for that, John. Okay, and then DNS abuse PDP2 charter drafting. This is a quick update item, so do not panic. Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Susan. This is Jen again, for the record. Just as a heads-up, we noted during our Mumbai meeting at ICANN 85 that there was clear interest from the Council to start looking ahead to the PDP2 draft charter. Considering this request and the discussions that we had, the leadership team asked the staff to take an initial look at reviewing this draft PDP2 charter. As you know, there is already a draft charter contained in our Final Issue Report, but of course, we want to take a look at if there are any revisions and updates that are needed, specifically informed by lessons learned during the PDP1 and the ADC charter development process.

So, this initial review is going to focus on some areas where there was some significant discussion or practical learning in the in-flight PDP, including topics as we have discussed previously about membership structure, et cetera. Once staff is done with this preliminary review and has proposed these updates, these materials will be brought back to the Council as a starting point for discussion, and this will probably be in the July meeting. At that meeting, the Council can determine the appropriate next

---

steps to see whether we want to establish a dedicated charter drafting team or to develop and refine the PDP2 charter. This is really a heads-up and an early preparatory step, a signal that work is underway. We have not forgotten all of the issues that we have listed as priorities in our Final Issue Report, and so we still have this momentum.

One more thing: I would encourage all of the Councilors, especially since there is some time and we are going to be meeting in Seville, to talk to your respective SGs and Cs if there are any things that you want to see or any concerns you want to bring to the table. When we meet again in July, be prepared to take a really good look at that draft charter to see how we can move forward. Definitely, I would say take advantage of the face-to-face meeting time to talk with your SGs and Cs. I think this is it, just a heads-up. Handing this back to Susan.`

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Jen. Okay, and the next item is a possible change. We've spent quite a bit of time talking about the SPIRT, and so this item now is the potential change that relates to RSPs. That is something that may need the SPIRT to work on. At the minute, I think we're just having a kind of introduction to this item so that it goes onto our radar. And I'm passing this over to one of our RySG... Thank you. Sam has put her hand up. I wasn't quite

---

sure who I was handing this over to, but Sam is going to just give us a kind of a heads-up on this one. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you so much, Susan. And thanks, everyone. Now that we've had a bit of a discussion about getting a process in place to consider this, here is a topic that the Registry Stakeholder Group would like for the SPIRT to be able to consider. I'm going to try to give a fairly brief overview, but if anyone has any questions, I'm happy to give it a shot.

So this item is a bit technical, so I'll start sort of at the beginning. In the draft version of the base registry agreement that was put out for public comment, there was a requirement that all registry operators would only use EPP extensions that are registered with the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority. These are the extensible provisioning protocol extensions that registries use. There is a registry that exists—the word registry is going to come up a lot here, and I apologize that it's confusing. There's a registry that exists within IANA, and there is a very specific process where new, proposed EPP extensions can be approved for inclusion in this IANA registry. In certain cases, registry operators use EPP extensions that are not included in that database. That is something that has existed in the ecosystem historically. But there was a proposed requirement that would say registry

---

operators can only use those EPP extensions that are included in the IANA registry.

A number of folks from the Registry Stakeholder Group who were reviewing the base RA requirements and providing some feedback to ICANN org, alongside and in conjunction with the public comment that went out for the base registry agreement, flagged that this requirement was pretty problematic. That has to do with the specific process by which the Internet Engineering Task Force evaluates and approves EPP extensions to be included into that IANA registry. That is the background. This concern was raised with ICANN, and the outcome was that ICANN agreed to remove the requirement from the base RA. So now everything that I just described is somewhat moot because it is no longer a requirement in the base registry agreement.

The issue now that we would like the SPIRT to consider is that, despite the removal from the requirements of the base registry agreement, there remain some requirements under the technical questions and the registry system testings that back-end registry service providers have to go through that pertain to this requirement. To set the scene again, there are some technical questions to evaluate registry service providers that require the applicants to attest that they will only use the EPP extensions that are registered in the IANA registry. That requirement is similarly tested during the registry system testing.

---

I'm just pausing here because I see a question from Justine: "There has been an external change that removed something that had been required under the first-round RSP evaluation?" Basically, Justine, yes, that is the question here. There is no longer a requirement for the registry operator to only use those extensions, but the RSP testing and the questionnaire retains the requirement for back-end registries to make the assertion that they are only using the extensions that are registered in the IANA registry. So there is a misalignment between what is tested and required during testing and what is actually in the registry agreement.

Therefore, the Registry Stakeholder Group is requesting that SPIRT and ICANN org consider revising the testing criteria. That would require a revision to the registry service provider handbook that lists out the registry questions that have to be evaluated, as well as the registry system testing that tests against this criteria. Specifically, we are proposing making the attestation that you will not use EPP extensions that are not in the IANA registry optional, so that it would go back and apply potentially to those registry service providers that have already completed the testing, meaning they shouldn't necessarily be held to a standard that may be being removed.

I understand that this is a bit of a complex topic. I hope I have given a basic overview in a way that makes sense. I see Vivek's

---

hand, so, Susan, if you'll permit me, I will take Vivek's question now.

VIVEK GOYAL:

Hi, Sam. This is Vivek here for the record, from the BC. My question, which I have pasted in the chat as well, is: wouldn't the base registry agreement that a registry signs, and then in turn sends the same requirement to the registry operator, supersede the one the registry operator did when they were being evaluated? In that case, the registry operator is free to use the calls that are needed to get the job done because the registry will be held accountable for running the registry as per ICANN laws, and they in turn will hold the registry operator accountable for running it as per ICANN laws and compliance requirements.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

This is Sam again. Vivek, that is an excellent question, and that is exactly the issue that we are trying to resolve here. There is a bit of a gray area between how long the attestations made during registry system testing are applicable and when the registry agreement would then take over, and what the consequences are of saying one thing during registry system testing versus that requirement not existing once the RA is, like you said, the ruling document. That is the discrepancy that we are seeking to remove

---

through this process. It is really just about harmonizing the two sets of requirements.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, I understand. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks again for the excellent question. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks so much, Sam. That is the clearest explanation of the issue that I have heard thus far. My question relates to ICANN org's point of view on this issue. I had asked the chair of the SPIRT what was going on here, why this was coming up at the Council level, and Jeff indicated that ICANN believed that it should be raised at the Council level. And so I am trying to understand: does the Council actually need to hear from ICANN about its proposed solution? I think some proposed solutions have had some minor discussion, but I do not know what ICANN's point of view is, and I do not know operationally whether they think this crosses over into... Well, it certainly has a material impact because apparently there are RSPs who are already qualified who have already agreed to this term that we now need to revise in some manner. Can you tell me what ICANN's point of view is on the solution?

---

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks for the question, Anne. This is Sam again. Unfortunately, I cannot tell you what ICANN's view on the solution to this is, and I believe that this is one of the key items that will be sorted out during the discussions between the SPIRT group and ICANN org, if and when this does get taken up. I do not want to presume or make assumptions about where ICANN org is on this front. I think that is something that the group needs to sort out once, hopefully, the SPIRT takes this up. I wish I had a better answer for you on this one. Sorry, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Sam. Just quickly, that might be a reason that ultimately, if it is assigned to the SPIRT, the Council might want to see the proposed solution because when I spoke to Jeff about it—and when I say spoke to, I mean via email—he said that he did not really know why ICANN org thought it needed to be raised at the Council level. He did not agree with that, but that is what ICANN org said, and that is why I think it is important for the Council to hear from ICANN org. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Anne. This is Sam again. Yes, there is certainly no objection to hearing ICANN org's views on this. Lawrence?

---

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Sam, for explicitly laying out the issue. To answer the question, and to touch on Anne's question, where the Council decides to move this ahead—and I think this is definitely one of those issues that needs to be determined before the application round closes on the 12th of August—if the Council moves this to the SPIRT, the SPIRT will definitely have to interface with ICANN org. A good number of these questions will get answers, or we will have insights into the thinking of ICANN, even before the SPIRT makes a determination.

It is definitely my role as the liaison to bring back issues of concern and of interest to the Council, and I believe that even before the SPIRT makes a determination, the Council can still provide some form of guidance on issues such as the one we have before us. Since it is pretty clear, I would be happy if, before the close of this meeting, the Council finds it fit for this to be moved forward to the SPIRT. But if we want to test the process that we spoke about earlier—bringing it before the Council formally for a vote—I would want to encourage that, by the nature of this particular issue, we look to do this speedily so that we can have the SPIRT provide their guidance and recommendation before the application round closes on the 12th of August. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much, Lawrence. This is Sam again. I think the Registry Stakeholder Group would definitely agree that this is something

---

that should certainly be resolved prior to the conclusion of the application round, because, as you mentioned, that is also when the next wave of back-end registry service provider evaluations will close out. We are definitely in alignment with the timeline point. Susan, over to you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Sam. I am sort of taking my chair hat off here, if that is okay. There is a lot of comment on whether we need to get org's input before we decide whether to pass this to the SPIRT, and I do not believe that is the case. I think the point here is: do we think as the Council, having heard from the registries, that this is something that potentially needs a change and therefore we want to ask the SPIRT to look at it? As a reminder, because the SPIRT cannot refer things to itself, it is not really allowed to have looked at it or to have engaged in discussion with org because it is not within its remit yet until we ask them to work. And so we do not need to hear at this moment what org thinks before we decide if we ask the SPIRT to work on it. Obviously, what org thinks becomes relevant in the course of those discussions. But for now, we just have to decide whether we want to let the SPIRT work on it.

We will have opportunities for folks to think about this. This is obviously for some people the first time they have heard about it. But bearing in mind what Lawrence and others have said about it

---

being relatively time-sensitive, we have a June Council meeting coming up while we are in Seville, and I think we really should strive to reach agreement, and that formal agreement, to pass it on to the SPIRT, if that is what we decide to do, in our June meeting if we possibly can. So I am just urging folks to think on this and take their instructions if they need to. Hopefully, we can come into the June meeting able to actually make a decision and pass this on to the SPIRT.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Susan. This is Sam again. I see Anne has her hand up, and then I think this may be the last item, so I can hand it back to Susan. I just want to be mindful of hitting the last AOB items before our time expires, as they say. Anne, over to you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks so much, Sam. I hope what I said about needing to hear from ICANN org was not misinterpreted. It is not, to my mind, a question of needing to hear from them before it is referred to the SPIRT. I am merely flagging the fact that ICANN org apparently said to the SPIRT, 'You need to have this raised by RySG or raised at the Council level.' And so, when it is assigned to the SPIRT, we will want their analysis and proposed solution to come back and inform us of the ICANN org point of view. Perhaps they will end up agreeing on something. It is the fact that it was flagged, in sharp

---

contrast to the ASP qualification issue, which was raised by ICANN org itself and was dealt with in accordance with the charter and appears in the change log; this issue is different. I do not think that we have to hear from them before it is assigned to the SPIRT. I think they have to work together and come back to the Council because ICANN org said, 'You need to raise this to the Council.' Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Anne. This is Sam one last time. That clarification is super helpful, especially as it pertains to the question of when we, as a Council, make a decision as to whether this should be referred to the SPIRT. In closing, thank you everyone for your time. I will just say the Registry Stakeholder Group would really appreciate if this is something that we could potentially tie up at our June meeting in Seville so that we can get this over to the SPIRT and get this process cooking. Thanks, everyone.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Sam. That was really helpful. And I agree with—I cannot remember whose comment it was—that this is the clearest explanation of what this issue is that I have heard as well. It was really super helpful.

---

All right, so we have a few other AOB items to just cover off. The first one is, I wanted to give a quick report back on the leadership team's one-to-one with Curtis, and indeed with Russ Weinstein, that we had a few days ago. There tend to be these one-to-ones in the lead-up to an ICANN meeting. So I just wanted to report back on the highlights. It was a fairly brief call. One of the things that was flagged to us on Curtis's side is the community discussion that is coming up later today—well, later on Thursday for those of us who are not yet in Thursday—the community prep week discussion on the participant code of conduct. Russ actually followed up on that with an email which was shared on the mailing list. But they were giving us a heads-up that that is what that community discussion session will be about. I think actually we will come to have a quick talk about the code of conduct in a minute.

On our side, one of the things that we did flag was the kind of community concerns that are bubbling up again around delays—delays on GNSO policy recommendations being adopted by the Board, in particular. This is the subject of a letter that the Registrar Stakeholder Group has drafted and which a number of other groups have signed onto. So it was really in the nature of giving Curtis and Russ a heads-up that that letter is coming. Curtis acknowledged the concern. He flagged the scorecards that org have started producing in an effort to be more transparent about where things have got to in the process. But he did also at least

---

suggest that we maybe should be having... maybe we can have a further discussion on how to speed up Board and org processes. I think that is certainly one of the messages that the registrars are hoping to deliver as well.

We also raised other potential timing concerns or delay concerns, and a lack of visibility on some items which are in implementation, particularly if it is implementation where it is not something that an IRT is dealing with. An example is, again, something that has been talked about by a few folk in the last week or so, which is something like the notification system for IGO names. It is one of the items that is outstanding and has been for quite some time. When the IRT that is looking at the curative rights for IGOs has concluded its work, the other missing piece in the puzzle is this notification system for IGO names that org is meant to be building, a bit like a claims process, but I think simpler.

We mentioned that whilst we had an update on this, I think back in Puerto Rico or sometime around then, we really have not heard anything further since. That inevitably leads to a perception that perhaps nothing is happening—not necessarily a correct perception. Russ confirmed that actually that is the case. It has actually been developed, and it is really sitting there ready to be rolled out when the IRT on the curative rights mechanism concludes. So that is one of those situations where the issue is

---

really more about transparency and communication, and the inevitable assumption that if you never get any updates on what is happening, you do tend to assume that nothing has happened. That was good news, certainly for those who care about this. There are some names that are sort of blocked from release for applicants from the last round, the 2012 round, that really do want this to be closed off.

We also took an opportunity to give Curtis and Russ a bit of an update on what we are doing on work to agree a prioritization mechanism. Overall, I think those were the highlights, but I will also pause and see if Jen or Peter have anything they wanted to add from that call.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Susan, this is Jen. Nothing more from me. You covered it very thoroughly.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Jen.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yes, same here. You did excellently cover that.

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, perfect. Then, as I said, this was just a heads-up. So I think let's move on to our next item, which is regarding the community participant Code of Conduct regarding statements of interest. I think Nacho is going to take this up for us, which will be lovely. Nacho, over to you.

NACHO AMADOZ: That is right, Susan. Thank you very much. This is something that we wanted to bring to the table from the RySG, because we have been working for a while on a document to establish a procedure for the enforcement of the Code of Conduct. We thought that this would be a good addition to the GNSO materials, so that this could be reviewed once it is ready. That is going to be shortly. We were hoping that this would be ready by today, but it is not ready for circulation because it is in the last steps of being finalized. We will be able to circulate this with all of you shortly.

A lot of thought has gone into this document, and we thought that the Council would benefit from taking a look into this. This is, of course, RySG-specific, but this also has many references to how the process needs to be escalated to the Council when the occasion arises, as the ultimate body to oversee how this is enforced. We also have specific sections for GNSO community activities. The document also contains Annex 1 from the community enforcement guidance, I think. All in all, we think this

---

is a good document and that this could help us do the work in establishing a similar procedure here.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks for that, Nacho. I think we will look forward to hearing more about that. I think that sounds like a really good effort. I will pause and see if there are any comments before we move on.

Okay. All right, the next agenda item is just a brief update on some of the topic leads for discussions with the GAC. As you will have seen, there have been various issues on which the GAC has been looking for the GNSO to participate in some of their discussions, and topic leads have been invited to attend and present at some of the GAC sessions. In particular, the GAC is planning discussions on the 15-day timeline for verification of registrants by registrars. It is no secret that they want to see that timeline reduced.

The other item on which they are hoping for a discussion is about something that has arisen out of some previous GAC advice, which is on the possibility of org providing a platform to allow Applicant Support Program applicants to become their own RSP. On the 15-day topic, Ashley and Jen will be discussing this session with the GAC topic leads. On the applicant support issue, whilst I think various groups have an interest in the Applicant Support Program, whether org is able and willing to provide a platform in

---

the way that the GAC is envisaging seems to be largely a matter for org to consider. But we have also reached out to the RySG to see whether there might be one or more volunteers from that group who can bring a kind of RSP perspective to help inform the GAC as part of an informational session about some of the practicalities of running a back-end registry. Again, that is in progress of hopefully being able to field some participants to that, and so we will hear a bit more on those sessions over the coming week or so.

Those sessions are envisaged to take place during the ICANN 86 meeting, and the GAC is very much driving these and has times in its agenda for when it wants them. Whilst we can certainly explore whether... I think the 15-day one, the time allocated for that is not entirely ideal, but if we can, we can seek to try to move that session around. However, the GAC's agenda appears to be fairly fixed. That is all on that item. Farzaneh and Anne have their hands up, maybe on something else. I saw your message in the chat, Farzaneh. So I will just pause and see if either of you want to comment on that particular issue before we move on.

FARZANEH BADI:

Yes, I want to comment on the GAC's letter, especially on accuracy and the 15-day

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, cool.

FARZANEH BADI: validation. Basically, I find the letter—I do not know how to put this diplomatically—basically, we need to inform the GAC that this kind of trilateral meeting, because they are asking for a contractual amendment, and they want to have a trilateral meeting with us... In the letter, they ask for a contractual amendment, and I think that goes against the ethos of how we work and how the multi-stakeholder model works. They also invoke this research that has been commissioned, of which we have many criticisms with regards to its method. If the Council does not agree that this letter is concerning, that is okay. But at the NCSG, I will talk to the NCSG, and we might send a letter to them and tell them that if they want policy change, it has to go through a PDP or the normal multi-stakeholder policy development processes that we have, and it should not be through contractual amendments. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Farzaneh. I will just react and say, obviously, I cannot tell the NCSG what to do. But the letter we originally received talked about doing some kind of an informational session before ICANN 86, and then having a trilateral meeting at ICANN 86. That timing has been moved somewhat, so the session at ICANN 86 now will

---

be that more informational discussion. I think one of the areas for sharing will be around the fact that this was an issue included in the issue report on DNS abuse, for example. So it is something that is teed up in the pipeline, and it is just a conversation about how policy might be developed on this at some point. If there is a trilateral meeting, that will happen after ICANN 86. So maybe let's sort of see where this discussion gets to first. Obviously, it is entirely up to you what your group decides to do. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you. On a different topic: I thought that 6.6 might be about the trilateral, and I know that you are working on the agenda for that. I would just like to request that on the agenda for the trilateral, we get a clarification from the Board as to what it means by 'advance.' They have asked ICANN org to advance the authentication process via a proof of concept in relation to these law enforcement email addresses. If we could get that on the agenda for the trilateral, I do think it is quite important because those of us who have been participating in the PSWG, talking about authentication processes, had made some suggestions that were, I think, quite constructive about that kind of publication of email addresses by ICANN to registrars. But we did not get a follow-on from that for the SPIRT, and I think that the Council needs to know how far ICANN org is going to go in publishing email addresses of LEAs or not. Have I misunderstood the term

---

'authentication proof of concept'? I do not know what it means. If we could get that on the agenda for the trilateral, that would be terrific. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Anne. So that trilateral, the one being proposed, was specifically about that 15-day verification issue, and as I mentioned, it is now going to be, if it happens, later than ICANN 86. But noting your comment on that letter, perhaps there is a need for a bit of clarification there. The leadership team will take that away and think about whether we need to send a letter back, or indeed whether we can utilize some of the opportunity while we are in Seville to try and get a bit more clarity on what they are talking about. There is, for example, a SOAC roundtable with the Board and org, so that might be an opportunity as well. I am really conscious of time. Justine, I think you are probably going to have the final word.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Susan. This is Justine. I am still trying to grapple with the developments of the trilateral being moved around. So I leave that, obviously, to leadership. But I just wanted to ask, if and when that trilateral happens, would the Council support the inclusion of ALAC in that discussion so that it is not a trilateral anymore? It should be just a dialogue in the spirit of what

---

Farzaneh said; it should be multi-stakeholder participation in this kind of discussion. So, I would seek the support of the Council to include ALAC in that. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Justine. I am not going to respond to that now, but I certainly hear what you are saying. And again, that trilateral, or whatever it is—which, to be clear, is not something that we have been proposing, but came from the GAC and was not expected—is not happening now. If and when it happens, it is after Seville. All right. Thanks, everyone, for a good meeting. Thanks for all your thoughts and comments. For many of you, I think, see you in Seville in just a few weeks' time. So keep an eye on the mailing list. There seems to be an awful lot going on. Thank you very much, and we can stop the recording.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you, everyone. As you heard, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care, all. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**