ICANN76 | CF – GNSO Council Meeting
Wednesday, March 15, 2023 – 13:15 to 15:15 CUN

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 15th of March, 2023. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Nacho Amadoz.

NACHO AMADOZ: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZ: Present, thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Theo Geurts.

THEO GEURTS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Desiree Miloshevic.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here, thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Mark Datysgeld isn't here yet, but he's on his way. John McElwaine.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Susan Payne. Susan is coming. Perfect. Thank you. Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here, thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Thomas Rickert. I don't see Thomas in the room yet. Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Wisdom Donkor.

WISDOM DONKOR: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Manju Chen. And I see. For the record, Manju has just walked in. Farell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Bruna Martins dos Santos.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Bruna. Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Anne Aikman Scalese.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: President, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Jeffrey Neuman.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: I'm here. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Maarten Simon. I don't see Martin in Zoom room yet. And we have GNSO support staff equally in the room. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. A reminder that we are in a Zoom webinar room, Councilors or 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. This session is benefiting from real time transcription. Please remember to speak slowly and clearly for the scribes and for all attendees. To view the real time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are sound observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones, but do have access to the chat. Please note that private chat are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session's hosts, cohosts and other panelists.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with expected standards of behavior. And thank you, John. It's now over to you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Nathalie, and welcome everyone to the march 15th, 2023, GNSO Council meeting here at ICANN Cancun. It's great to see everybody here in person. As everyone knows, Sebastien Ducos is with us, but with us today online. And I as a vice chair, Greg and I have been trading off sessions. I drew the lucky straw to lead this session. So without further ado, let's hop into the agenda. Any updates to statements of interest? Anne, I see you have your hand up.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yes. Thank you. It's Anne Aikman Scalese. And update to my statement of interest is I'm now fully retired from the practice of law, and I have no clients. And I'll mention that I do have a volunteer activity with Arizona State University assisting in training students in the protection of indigenous cultural property. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Congratulations, Anne, on the retirement. The next on our agenda is the review of the agenda. I presume we can dispose of that as we all went over that in the informal meeting yesterday, but I will pause to see if anybody has any additions to the agenda.

Okay, seeing none. 1.4, just noting that the minutes of the GNSO Council on 19th of January were posted on February 2nd. And that the minutes of the GNSO Council meeting for the 16th of February were posted on March 2nd.

So next, moving on agenda item number 2. Are we going to review the project list or action item list? No. No review of that. And we have no consent agenda items, so nothing to cover on item number 3.

So we're on to now item number 4, which is a Council vote. And I believe that Manju is going to present us with the background on this.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, John. Manju, for the record. Do I still have to present the background? I thought we did this last meeting. I thought I'm just going to read the motion. But if guys want the background, I can still do it.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Maybe a little bit of background for everybody here, but nothing too lengthy.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, thank you. So the CCOICI has finished this recommendation for working self-assessment thing. So we were looking at before for the

PDP working groups. They only have a self-assessment by the end of the PDP when they finish the work. And we thought it might be helpful to insert this self-assessment during the PDP for the Council as the manager of PDP processes to have a feeling to how the working group is going on. And if there are any issues to be spot more on time and then to be dealt with, to avoid consequences of, for example, by the end of the working group, nobody was happy with the a final report and then people are starting to argue about results, having issues of accusing others of really complicating issues. Those kind of things we have kind of witnessed in the past.

So this is our recommendation. We recommend that we have a self-assessment in between the PDP to have a feel about the working environment and then just to better it's improvement of the whole PDP process in a sense. So that's the background. And we talked about this in the last meeting. And I think nobody really, I hope, against this improvement recommendations.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay, so you can go on to read the Whereas clause then, Manju. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, so let's start reading whereas. Wait, do I start what the Whereas?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I'm sorry. I mean, overall, just the just the results.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, cool. Results. GNSO Council adopts the CCOICI working group's self-assessment recommendation report. The GNSO Council directs GNSO staff support to implement the changes as outlined in the recommendation report and convey the survey to our technical requirements as outlined in sections F to the relevant ICANN org department. The GNSO Council instructs ICANN staff to post a new version of the GNSO operating procedures effective immediately upon adoption. The GNSO Council thanks to the CCOICI for its work on this topic.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay, so any discussion on this? So I think we can move on to a vote.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, John. This is Nathalie. I'm just noting that Thomas Rickert is not in the room at moment. This will be a voice vote. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say I. Hearing no one. Would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say I. Hearing none with all those in favor of the motion, please say I.

SPEAKERS: I.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you very much. No abstention, no objection, the motion passes. Over to you, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay, let me put the agenda back up. So we'll be moving on to item number 5, which going to be a Council discussion on the next steps for consideration of the expired domain deletion policy and the expired registration recovery policy. And I believe Greg is going to be leading that topic. So Greg, over to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Hello, everybody. This is Greg DiBiase for the record. As you'll recall, we had considered as a Council whether it was timely or appropriate to request a PSR policy status report for the EDDP and ERRP, which are the policies regarding expiration of domain names. We had decided there was tentative agreement amongst Council that while this is important, there are other more pressing topics and perhaps we can defer this, the review of this policy, to a later date and tackle the other things on our plate. Following that, ICANN compliance put together a report kind of what they're seeing from their perspective are registrants having issues with renewals that could kind of inform our decision and ensure that it makes sense that we can defer this work.

Small team of Councilors reviewed that report and as well as the recommendation to delay the PSR. In the report, the compliance noted that there was some registrant confusion regarding terms of these policies. And so as opposed to reopening the policies, there could be some incremental work done to better clarify what the requirements of this policy mean to prevent confusion. In particular, we looked at some language in which ICANN publishes education material. Considering this provision, the small team believes it's prudent to request further information from ICANN about what education materials are available for the ERRP and EDDP, and then we can decide if and how to supplement those to make sure registrants are getting the information they need while we defer this policy.

So that's basically the recommendation that is contained and was sent out to Council from the small team. That we'd revisit the PSR request within six months. And at the same time, we would reach out to ICANN org on behalf of Council and request further information on education materials and how we might approve them. So the discussion before us today is just to confirm whether this approach makes sense to everyone on Council and whether we can move forward with that recommendation. And I don't think we need a formal vote. But if I guess no one objects, I think we can move forward with what that small team had in mind. So open it up to questions, concerns. All right. Sorry, Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Greg, just for the sake of thoroughness and because this is a more public meeting, I want to note that we've discussed in several instances, had a briefing from ICANN staff and compliance, had a briefing from the registrars on their understanding of the issues and essentially arrived at this conclusion then. So that's why there's the positive conversation here.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Kurt. That's helpful now that we've looked at this from a couple of angles. And the report that ICANN compliance provided was very thorough. And I also just see Stephanie's question in chat. It is in fact mandatory that registrar and domain reminders when a domain is going to expire. They send one, I think it's between 7 and 10 days before expiration, one around 30 days before expiration, and I think one immediately after expiration. So based on compliance's report, it seems like the requirements are working. We could just add a little bit of clarification around what some of the terms mean to make sure the policy is effective as possible on its current form.

JOHN MCELWAINE: All right, seeing no further discussion on that topic, I believe we can move on to item 6, which is going to be a review of GNSO owned projects that might impact the SubPro timeline. And Steve Chen from staff is going to cover that topic. So Steve, over to you.

STEVE CHEN: Thanks very much, John. This is Steve Chan, for the record, from staff. And as a reminder, this item is a recurring item for the Council. Given the priority, sorry, that SubPro is a priority for the Council, there's an agreement that this item would be occurring to be able to keep a close tabs on projects that the Council manages. So I would just note that these updates can generally be found in the set up project and program management documents that are circulated. But nevertheless, given the importance of these projects, it made a lot of sense for the Council to be able to have an update on a recurring basis. And despite these updates, it doesn't preclude bringing any of these specific items to the Council's attention. If beyond this recurrent update, there's a need to dig into one of the projects in a more acute manner.

So this recurring item is probably particularly timely, given the expected Board action on the majority of the SubPro recommendations. With that, given that there is this existing information, I'll try to keep this brief and try to concentrate on really about the status whether or not it's on target or not, and then also whether or not there are any things that arise to the attention of the Council that might require mitigation.

So the four projects here, I'll just go down in order. They are in order. So the first one I'll start with is the IDNs EPDP Phase 1. This is concentrating on the top level charter questions. This group has essentially completed its review of the Phase 1 charter questions, and it's also considered a series of input from the ICANN org about operational feasibility, and is now in the process of drafting and agreeing to publish its initial report for public comment. And that report should be published shortly after ICANN76 in late April, which is according to the revised schedule that the group has committed to.

So this group will soon pivot to working on Phase 2. And as a reminder, those are the second level charter questions. And they intend to do that while the initial report is off of public comment, but also on a going forward basis after the initial report for phase 1 is delivered to the Council. The EPDP recognizes that there are some dependencies for Phase 2 with the new gTLD program. And they're still exploring the specifics of how those dependencies what they are exactly. So investigation is still underway. That phase 2 work is dependent upon some data gathering that is currently being facilitated by the contracted party's house TechOps groups, which we're deeply grateful for.

There is further triage of this Phase 2 work that is possible where we might be able to accelerate some of the questions that might have a more clear dependency on the new gTLD program and perhaps defer some of the less dependent Phase 2 questions for later. And at this point, I mentioned I might also try to bring up instances where the Council might be able to contribute. So for this 1 in particular, the EPDP welcomes input on how to perhaps accelerate some of this work and some of the ideas that the EPDP team has itself is extending meetings, meeting more often or as maybe as a sneak preview, requesting some dedicated face-to-face meeting time to try to take advantage of that interaction in a more accelerated fashion.

So the next one on the list is the GNSO guidance process on applicant support. This group is working towards completion on task 3, 4, and 5. Those numbers won't mean anything to you. So generally, what this is about is identifying what's success means for the applicant support program and then following on from that what the appropriate data and metrics are needed to measure that success. So the GGP is exploring the approach as well. So what I mean by approach is given you know what the success factors and the data and metrics that you want to capture. The approach is really about the how you go about trying to achieve those goals and success factors.

So what success looks like the data and metrics and the approach are being looked at from the lens of the application process lifecycle. So it's looking at every step of the process. That means that the group will be looking at both the outreach and awareness, application submission, application evaluation, and then also post delegation. So looking at all those different phases of the program and making sure that the success factors and data metrics are all understood for every part of the phase in the lifecycle. So while this group is aspiring to beat its timeline, it's actually currently on schedule at the moment. And the GGP initial report is expect to be published for public comment in the July timeframe. And so I'll just repeat it, it's actually also on schedule.

The next one on the list is the closed generics facilitate a discussion. This team held its face-to-face meeting at the end of January. And has continued to meet via Zoom, and it also held a closed session during ICANN76 here. Some reports of the work with updates on the group's work are being provided to the community on a regular interval. As hoped, the team has made considerable progress on this assignment and his currently working on a draft framework document. The team will share preliminary outputs with groups in the community for feedback before outputs are finalized by the dialogue participants. And the group is anticipating that it completes its work on the framework no later than ICANN77.

The next one, I'm not going to go into any detail at all. It's actually relevant to the very next item on the agenda. And then the one thing that's actually not on this list that I just want to touch on quickly is a topic that the Council has been asked to consider, which is, the composition for the SubPro implementation review team. I had asked my colleague Lars to help provide-- Lars Hoffman, somewhere over there. Thanks for waiving. What I had asked him to do is try to provide some written guidance on what this representative plus open model would really represent what it looks like in the context of an implementation review team, which is not necessarily going to be the same for APDP. And so what I intend to do is circulate that to the

Council. I think as Lars had mentioned, the decision on whether or not to pursue something a little bit different, like a represent an open model, that decision basically needs to be made now so is not to impact the timeline for the call for volunteers.

And I will definitely stress on his behalf that there's definitely no pressure on the Council to go with this suggestion of a different model. Just there needs be a decision one way or the other whether or not to try this or stick with the open model. So I'll just commit to sending that around to the Council and you can have a look at it and maybe a decision can possibly be made during the Council's wrap up meeting. So with that, I'll stop there. And if there's any questions, let me know. And I'll sort of just would invite any liaisons to the groups also to add anything if they want to. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Steve. John McElwaine, for the record. So we've got a queue forming and I'll go first to Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, John. So Susan Payne for the record. So a couple of things. I think there are more questions than comments really. I'll do both of them together. I think the first one definitely is a question for Steve. The second might be for the liaison to the IDN group. But Steve, we heard from Becky yesterday, I think it was, that the Board had had written or was writing to a number of different groups where they feel that there are dependencies to the separate work asking for kind of timelines, and effectively, I think it was mainly timelines for when they would think they will have wrapped up their work and asking to have that by the end of the ICANN77 meeting. So my question was, is the list that we have there, is that all of the ones that the Board identified and has written on, or are there others?

And then if you don't mind, I'll ask my other question, which was regarding the IDN EPDP. I know you said that the group was still identifying the dependencies in the Phase 2 work, the ones that are dependencies for the next round. And I wondered whether in doing that, could they be encouraged to identify both whether there are dependencies that need to be met in order for an application window to open, or is there some other timing on that. I guess I'm not being very clear, but I think what I'm thinking of is we've got a number of second level names that in the 2012 rounds were put on temporary hold, pending further work. And actually some of them are still on hold.

And so whilst it's not ideal, it would be really helpful to know from that group whether actually there are any items like that where in fact it would be possible to allow applicants to go forward and submit an application perhaps without this having been finalized and whatever recommendations are made having been finally implemented. Sorry, I'm talking too fast. And indeed, what's really important is that before they get to delegation, perhaps matters are fully wrapped up, but not that they necessarily need to be fully wrapped up when the window for application opens, bearing in mind that there is a period of time after application and before a TLD is delegated for work to continue. I hope that makes sense.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks Susan. This is Steve Chan from Staff again. I will indeed as you suggested defer the one on IDNs, either deferral or actually to Ariel who's definitely the expert on that topic. So for the first one, I will admit to not knowing exactly whether or not there's a one-to-one relationship between the projects that are on screen that the Council owns versus what the Board flagged as dependencies to get in a comprehensive implementation timeline. If I recall, it's actually not exactly matching. I think it's generally about the work plans that are needed for a set of projects that are SubPro related. I'm not sure it's exactly those three. So I can commit and take it as an action item and to investigate and make sure that we have a fuller understanding of what exactly the Board identified, and making sure that the Council has eyes on them. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel Liang. The GNSO support staff for the IDN EPDP and just want to answer Susan question. So in the second phase, charter question is about 20 questions and then there's some very detailed analysis about the dependency and it's on several aspects and whether there's a dependency on the AGB, whether there's a dependency on the application questions, and then whether there's dependency for the contract, and then whether there's a dependency for operation of the new gTLD program. So when we're doing the analysis, we'll have a very detailed analysis of all these various aspects of dependency and then we'll single out the questions that need to be prioritized first and then we can speed up the deliberation on that so that don't become a hurdle for the new gTLD program.

SUSAN PAYNE: Brilliant. Thank you, Ariel. That's great.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay. Over to Manju who has a question.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, John. This is Manju. Thank you, Steve, for the updates. It's very clear and thorough. But that's just me, I mean, I don't speak English growing up. So if I'm just listening, sometime it's like, right? As I from my right ear and then as desperately as I grab it, they go away. So is that possible if next time when we're having these updates, just very simple slides. I know you do slides where you don't mind and then where the progress is with the whole timeline thing. It's just easier for me to understand. Well, yeah, and remember them. I understand but just sometimes it just slipped. So, yeah, probably starting in the future, if we're doing those updates, it will be extremely helpful if we have very simple slides of the timeline of each projects and like bullet points of the points you are talking about. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay. Greg, over to you.

GREG DIBIASE: This is Greg DiBiase for the record. So Susan touched on this, but I mean just reiterating that Board request for timelines. So I think that's something we should, a, to what Manju said, always be keeping track, but then also make we're on track to deliver these actual timelines by ICANN77 so the Board can incorporate it into their work.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay, I'm not seeing any more hands up for this Council discussion on projects that might impact the SubPro timeline. So let's move on now to item number 7, which is going to be Council discussion on essentially the small team for the SubPro work. And Sebastien, I believe, is going to lead that. If you could come online, that'd be awesome.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I am here if you can hear me, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: We can.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Perfect. Okay, so for our guests today, but all Councilor should be the same page since we had the discussion that yesterday about this time. We discussed yesterday the possibility and the composition of a small team members Councilors who would be working with the Board or with the Board caucus on SubPro to review and resolve the 38 points that have been presented by the Board by Becky Burr Avri Doria. The 38 points and recommendations from the SubPro PDP that remain unresolved and for intensive purpose, I don't want to preempt, but that will not be voted on this week.

We have worked in the past year and so on this model of small teams and a year ago exactly a small team was working on the WDS, which Greg will present progress on that next item. I'm going to go into a details. But it is a model that both the Council and the Board felt very comfortable with, in particular, because it allowed that conversation. It's instead of sending letters to each other, which takes days to draft and weeks to get responses to, and so it smoothen and allows for a faster conversation.

There are a number of issues around the small team. And namely, an issue of transparency. There was a general feeling that things should not be discussed and negotiated in between closed doors. This is something that we've acknowledged and discussed during the ISBS, for example, in December on a topic like SubPro where normally all the eyes of the community are, but also where we're very conscious that there was an inordinate amount of time spent in producing, in completing this PDP. Hundreds and hundreds of hours from hundreds of individual, high numbers of individuals in this community.

And so we want to make sure that we are at no point create a sort of an impression that we're now, from now on, going to negotiate this between closed doors, small body, small subset of the Council with the Board and Bob’s your uncle. We do want, though, to have this meeting again, for what I explained before. Because the matter needs attention, urgency, sorry urgency is not the right word, but it needs attention and we need to be able to take care of this in a speedy fashion. I don't need to remind anybody that the last round is over 10 years old now.

So to this extent, on our discussion yesterday, I think I can say that we all agree that the principal of the small team is the one we want to go with. We had a discussion on the composition of the small team, and full disclosure, not only did I certainly not obtained any sort of consensus yesterday, but I've heard and read a few comments or received emails with people that wanted to have this further discussed. The idea was to have a small team with parity between the houses. What I proposed yesterday towards the end of the conversation is to have a small team of 6 people, 3 per house, for each house to designate their representative. The small team would be tasked with, again, discussing with the Board small team on the 38 points that were presented by Becky and Avri. I don't want to put any sort of label on these points or on how these should be resolved. That's for the small team to do.

We think that as a first task, we used the word triage probably sorting, if there's any misunderstanding of what the triage may consist of, but the first task would be to review these 38 points quickly, figure out what can be resolved quickly because they're basically misunderstandings, or misinterpretation or recommendations, and what will need more work. And, again, I don't want to preempt. The Board has hinted that some of the points may need further policy work. And to be able to then put that in a schedule, figure out what we can do immediately and fast, figure out what will take a bit longer, we were reminded when Avri and Becky presented their work on the 38 points they had themselves sort of estimated that certain task could take us all the way to. And I think it's ICANN79 that was quoted to me yesterday. I had time to go back to the actual document.

So without further ado, I think that we should hear from Councilors now who had doubts on the composition of the set small team to try to maybe resolve this with an aim to have a team ready to go as early as possible. I'm not hopeful for this week, but let's say in the coming week or two, we should have a small team already working and looking at all this to be able to start working with the Board on producing this calendar work that Becky referred to and wanted to have public before ICANN77. So as I'm not in the room, I think it's much easier for you, John, to direct that. Thank you. Go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE: John McElwaine for the record. I'm glad to do that, Seb. So the first person in queue is Kurt Pritz. Over to you, Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Greg. Here's my big idea. Agreeing with almost all of the framework that Seb laid out and addressing the triage that we've defined and also with our eyes on the goal of launching the next round and not on the goal of forming small teams or having discussions. I think we could. And this is a two phase idea. The first phase would be to form a small team right now comprised of whoever on the Council wanted to be on it. And they would get together and stare at those 38 recommendations that aren't settled yet, and decide how they can be economically or efficiently divided and considered. So right now, we have a quiver with one tool in it, right? The small team. Well, maybe we need to change that a little bit. And maybe there are some kind of, I hate to use the word multiple because that sounds bureaucratic unlike a lot, but more than one small team, each one to address a family or set of these things with the idea that we could get through them faster.

And then that first of all team would be let go. So, for example, in my personal case, I'd be happy to participate on a small team that decided how to manage this thing, but maybe not on a small team that was in for a long slog. And so then we might decide to divide the recommendations up by the kind of expertise that's required or by the outside resources that might be required, maybe there's similar outside resources that would apply to one set than the other set. You don't know until you read them through again. And if you're like me, I listen to Becky review them, which was thorough, but a couple weeks ago now, so I forgotten.

And then the second part of my idea and excuse my [00:40:11 - inaudible]. At the least, maybe the Board could replicate or mirror our way of managing it. So there'd be additional efficiencies there and there would be some sort of funnel there to go through. And the Washington DC meeting is the policy forum. So could we dedicate a day towards the small groups meeting with their Board counterparts for a day and trying to take through as many issues as they can or even more optimistically do that in advance of the Washington D.C meeting? Have a lengthy meeting, whether it's face-to-face or a virtual with the idea of trying to get through recommendations for that. So that with some amount of transparency. But then at the end, the third part I guess is that the Council will go through some process to get information of bottom up inputs so that the Board can consider them. So kind of a two-step thing that I'll not repeat.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you for those ideas, Kurt. Tomslin, over to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, John. In theory, the reasoning behind the idea of having three members per house, which is to use the service of the NomCom appointee as a third member is a good one. However, the challenge we have in the non-contracted party house is that the NomCom appointee is an active IPC member and therefore the NCIG does not believe he can genuinely be neutral on topics of interest to IPC. And I'm fully aware that this small team is simply going to triage stuff, but I've been in some where the debate get quite heated. So in the spirit of moving fast, so that we're not bogged down by the NCPS trying to pick who those three members are, I was proposing that we go with two members per stakeholder group as we did for the non-generic, sorry, closed generics small team. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you for those comments, Tomslin. Jeff, over to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. So a couple of things. Sorry, it's Jeff Neuman. Again, apologies, I can't be there. I think the first thing is just a reminder of just some of the things you heard from the GAC this morning that they very much want to be involved in the substance of any discussions especially on items that are on their list. And so what I'm hearing is that there's some people that think small group is just to triage in the way of meaning that it's trying to figure out a way forward. But it's not doing the substantive work necessarily. But there are others, like, and sorry, Kurt, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth at all. So if I'm wrong, let me know. But it made it sound like you wanted a full day meeting of the small group and the Board, which to me sounds more like substantive work.

So I think that this small team should be cognizant of what it means to triage and to make sure that experts and members from the community including the GAC that are interested in these issues are included in order to have the credibility and trust that's needed to move forward. And the other thing and I can't remember, Seb, if you said this, so I apologize if you did, but to others, there seemed to be some agreement yesterday that this group would operate with open mailing lists, record meetings, So everything would be done out the open so everyone could observe. And I use that loosely because I don't necessarily mean observed, like be there physically, and observed. I don't know. But anyway, thanks. I'll stop there and let you go. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Jeff. Susan, you're next in the queue. Over to you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks. And apologies, but I don't know if I'm the only one that I've now become really confused about what we're talking about as this exercise. And without wanting to complicate things, can we at least, by the end of this meeting, come away with a group of people who are just going to go through and do what some of us have been calling the triage, which is putting the 38 into buckets of hard, simple, needs a clarification, or that's a misunderstanding or whatever. Can we at least come away with just a group of anyone who wants to do the work, who can go forward and actually do that task? Because it that that task seems to me it doesn't matter who's on the group. It just they just need to be willing and ideally have an understanding and a deep knowledge of what the SubPro recommendations say. We don't have time for people to get up to speed on the huge SubPro report if they aren't already fully across it.

And I'm not sure. Apologies if that's what we're still talking about, but we all seem to have different understandings of what our task is and I agree. We actually need to then go on and deal with the ones that are hard, but there might be five of them. At the moment, we're talking about 38, but we might actually only have 5, we might have 10, we might have 38 that we need to do a bunch of work on. But can we just do the exercise of at least addressing that first part, even if we're still fighting over who should be in the group subsequently.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you for those comments, Susan. Anne it's over to you.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks. It's Anne Aikman Scalese, and I certainly agree with the comments about the difference between the triage phase of this work to try to categorize issues to determine if some are merely clarification and implementation type issues and if others need to be raised to the level of a policy process, which would certainly involve wider consideration formal input from the rest of the community, etc. And I actually, after thinking about what Susan has just said, support the notion that any Councilor who would like to participate in that triage analysis, which should be very compact and narrow estimation and should happen very quickly that any Councilor who wants to participate would be welcome. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: So I might take a point of privilege here to see if any Councilors have a problem with a group of volunteers undertaking a triage and what we mean by that is a sorting of the 38 issues and categorizing them into appropriate categories. Raise your hand if you've got an issue with that. Even you, Seb. All right. Go ahead, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I hate to do this, but can I then intervene. I'm more than happy for this to happen, but then we also need to all agree that that group of the willing to do that work won't be challenged later, the work won't be challenged later just simply because we didn't have our men on the team, our men and women on the team. If we agree that whoever raises that hand is on the team at working, then we also need to agree that the result of that work won't be challenged because we didn't have the representation that we wanted. I'm happy to agree to that. But otherwise it's a waste of time. Ad hoc team is fine as long as we all agree to respect the outcome.

JOHN MCELWAINE: All right, we did come to a conclusion there. So let me hop back into the queue and I'm sure people can discuss that. So Greg over to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Yes, I agree with Susan and what Seb just said, I don't have a problem with that. I think we can say, all right, this first team of volunteers has taken the first step, but we acknowledge that the next iteration may be changed to represent balance on Council and also revised to include AC and SO input. But yeah, I think we should just go ahead and get started with an initial team of who's willing to volunteer right now.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay. Mark, over to you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Mark Datysgeld. Yes, more or less echoing this. This first team doesn't need to follow anything particularly strict. And any composition is fine, representative open. The real matter is that we get started as this is being requested by the community from us. There is significant will from the community for us to deliver to them and we need to get to motion because we have to be accountable to our communities. So whatever happens at this first stage, let's get going. And for the second, we can have a more structured discussion on our meetings that's about how do we feel about stakeholder distribution and all that. Let's make it fair. Let's make something that's good for everyone. But for now, we just need to go. People are waiting on us and we have commitments to deliver.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Kurt, thanks for your patience.

KURT PRITZ: I was doing fine. Two things. One in response to Seb, I think there's a fine line distinction between, oh gosh, did you guys think of that? And you go, no, we didn't think of that. And I disagree with that. So I think the work plan that's developed has to be open to suggestion if that group missed anything. And I'll tell you what I'm for. Creating a meeting after this meeting to get started or tomorrow morning a group could be started. But anything to get the ball rolling because I think we do want by Washington DC to have a set of extended meetings with the Board small groups or small groups where we kind of get the conclusions on many of these.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Kurt. Paul, over to you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks. Okay, great. Perfect. Generation X created the technology, but doesn't know how to use it. And unfortunately, none of my children here are to help me with my mute button. So I won't address Tomslin's belief that I can't be neutral. I think the record's pretty clear that I chased all the constituencies for input on all issues. Some provide that to me, others are starting to, but there's still more work ahead to heal our house. So I'll just leave that there.

But on that topic, I do have concerns about the proposed three and three plan. Two main reasons. One, it implies that the small team will be decisional that are making decisions. At most, we can see the small team perhaps making suggestions to the entire Council about what mechanisms to use to deal with the various issues raised by the Board, perhaps provide a little bit of information about the timing and dependencies, but they're not going to be taking decisions. And so the idea of a representative small team, it's just inconsistent. There's not going to be votes. There's not going to be consensus calls. They're going to operate the way the other small teams have done with good outcomes. So for example, the RPM small team and the redress small team. Both with good outcomes and no issues.

The second reason I have a concern about the three and three is it creates false scarcity of seeds. And leads to infighting within the non-contracted party's house. Over the last couple of years, we've been trying very, very hard to heal our house and the three and three creates within the non-contracted parties house two C's that will inherently lose, while on the contracted party side will create two winners with one winner being a double winner. This all feeds the unfortunate narrative, the contracted party have more influence than the non-contracted party's house, and it's all so completely unnecessary. Again, this will not be a decisional team.

So I would really like for us to step back from the three and three, whether it's triage and then in paneling a more long term team, whatever. That doesn't matter. What matters is Council unity, what matters is us not losing ground on healing the non-contracted party's house. And what matters is that we get started as soon as we can because folks want us to move quickly on this. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Paul. Bruna, it's over to you.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, John. No, just to add some, I think I'm on the same lines as, like, setting forward some unity along the houses and things like that. So my suggestion would be for us to also follow the open model for now and then later on, we can learn from the mistakes and address the distribution of seats and whether or not this first attempt at an open model works. Because I think that given the timespan we have to take this decision for us to be caught up in a kind of like a distribution of houses, discussion would not be as productive as we wish. So maybe keep this as a volunteer group for everybody that's willing to do so to join. And I'm putting my name forward as well. And maybe we can learn from this experience and guide the next ones. Thank you so much.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Bruna. I think there's no other hands raised. Any other comments on the small team composition? All right. You got one?

GREG DIBIASE: So just real quick. I'm aligned on open Council to start, but I just want to reserve the right. We'll still may come back to this issue of balance in the next stage after triage. As long as we're aligned on that, then I think we can move forward with this first stage.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I was going to say the same thing. I think we've got consensus amongst the group to let's get started on this work. We need to get started on the work. And let's do so in an open model, but that's no guarantee. In other words, we may after seeing how many people volunteer. Because I think some point of having a limitation on the number was to make sure that this group would be nimble enough to get the work done quickly. But I'm certainly thinking we can get started with an open group and get that initial sorting work done and reevaluate the composition as things fall into place. Anne, I see you have your hand up, over to you.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yes, thank you. It's just a footnote to draw attention to the link that Steve Chan has posted in chat, which is our current Council draft guidelines on transparency in the operation of small teams. So I think that it's very beneficial for the community to understand the openness with which anyone can join Council reps model will be operating. Because I think we're near finalizing those transparency guidelines. So just pointing to the link that Steve has posted.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Anne, thanks for pointing that out. Yes, that is in the chat. I see it. All right, so with that, I think we can move on to item number 8, and that's going to be a discussion on the WHOIS disclosure. So great point that Greg has raised. Before we move on to that, if you're interested. I know we've had people volunteer in chat and just verbally, but let's please on the Council list. If you're interested in serving on the small team with respect to doing the sorting or triage of the SubPro recommendation, go ahead and send an email and we'll get you on that list and put you into the small team document.

All right. With that PSA, well, let's move to item 8. And that'll be you, Greg, to cover WHOIS disclosure system or the redress system next steps.

GREG DIBIASE: Was that me or Seb? Is that me or Seb? Seb, were you planning to do it? If not, I'm happy to.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, it's your name on it, but I'm happy to do it.

GREG DIBIASE: All right, cool. No matter. WHOIS disclosure next steps. So as I think we're all aware, there was a Board resolution directing the ICANN org to set up the system, which I now believe is settled on the registration data request system. Let's go with that. I think the next steps here are--sorry, so we need to reconvene the small team regarding this to deal with the open issues.

And the Board resolution has two specifics asks for the GNSO Council to consider. Namely a policy development process or other means to require registrants to use the system as well as the development of a success criteria for the system. In relation to the first question, we should discuss how to respond to the ICANN Board. For the second question, I think this would be a question for the small team to work with, but I think we can open up to discussion. You think we'll open it up to discussion there. So I put myself in the queue. So I guess on the first, sorry. Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks. This is Marika. Just to note that an updated version of the assignment form for the small team was circulated to Council earlier this week that aims to reflect the new asks in line with the Board now having adopted or having directed ICANN org to move forward with the implementation. So I think that the question is for Council, is there any concern or objections to what is proposed.

I said it's just changing or updating the specific assignment to reflect kind of the cooperation with ICANN org both on the implementation as well as the items that were identified in the addendum as requiring further conversation. And also making clear that, of course, there's an expectation for the small team to report back on a regular basis to Council. And should there be any kind of disagreement on how to move forward on certain items to consult with the Council as appropriate.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Marika. And I think that maybe narrows our discussion a little bit that both these issues probably should be addressed by the small team first. And so I guess I'll open it up to the floor if there's any concerns with reconvening the small team and having them get to work on these two preliminary issues. Okay, we'll get that team to work.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay, so that concludes item 8. Oh, no, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: No, I think on that one, I think indeed the cooperation part is indeed where the small team can proceed. But I think there is still the question from the Board who has urged the GNSO Council to consider, and I think the words are either policy development or other means to require register participation in the system. So I think on that Council may want to consider what kind of response it wants to provide to the Board or if it wants the small team to further consider that question. But if that's something you want the small team to look at it, it probably would also be helpful to give them some guidance on what your expectations are if you want them to kind of look at how that could be done in policy development.

Because obviously there would be certain avenues taking back the asset recommendations and doing it as part of that or looking at EPDP or other means that might be available. But probably is helpful or necessary for Council to provide some guidance on that. I think secondly as well, the success criteria were identified as a topic requiring further input. I think the small team has of course already considered that. But again, if there's also further guidance that the Council has on that specific topic, would also be helpful to share obviously.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Marika. So I guess I'll start with my two cents on this is that the ODA and the addendum were not policy, and the addendum recommended that there would be encouraging registrars to participate. I do not believe it contemplated making this required. So my two cents would be to start with the original plan as developed by Council to encourage registrar participation and not only registrar participation, requester participation, right? That there's two sides of this coin here. So in regards to this mall team, I think I would think the initial question is does this change the recommendation or the recommendation in the addendum that focused on encouraging participation or other thoughts like that. I guess, I'll open it up on that issue to see if people have different thoughts.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I think it's hard for the Council having just had a couple days to really intelligently talk on this. But I suppose that we need to look at whether there's in the temp spec or in EPDP Phase 1, there's any policy that could be adjusted that would have more encouragement or requirement that registrars participate in the RDRS system or any other way that we can, like I said, increase or entice more involvement in the system. But I think it's going to require taking a look at some documents that not everyone has memorized and that might be a good thing for the small team to take a look at. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. I think that's a good suggestion. And then I guess my other concern is that there were open issues too. Like, we don't know exactly what the system looks like. So I'm hesitant to move forward with the process to require use of the system when the parameters of the system are still being designed. But, yeah, like John said, this is pretty recent, so a lot of open issues here. Marika, is that a new hand?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, thanks. This is Marika. Just to flag that the addendum indeed didn't recommend requiring. It did recognize the importance of participation and exploring ways to encourage that. It did mention that the Council could explore whether policy development would be a means to do that. So I just wanted to make sure that people are aware of what was in the report. But obviously, it's up to Council to decide or determine how to respond to the request that the Board made.

GREG DIBIASE: Seb?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, as I did earlier in front of the GAC, I just want to remind everybody that one, the small team did discuss that last year. And that was on the table already last year. We really worked on ensuring if we're talking about registrars, but they're not the only party here, but ensuring that the registrars would final the incentives to participate and would have the buy in rather than coerce. We got strong and positive participation from the registrar community who gave a lot of feedback on how the tools should look and should operate for them to be able to use it efficiently and be able to offer the responses that the community seeks in time and etc. I'm not sure that a sort of and more policing approach would help at all. So let's focus on the positive. Let's focus on launching this. On making sure that everybody knows about it, that not only on the registrar side, but on the [01:09:17 -inaudible] side. The maximum people know to use it and know to be there and know to make it efficient rather than trying to see how we can twist the people's arms. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, seb. Desiree?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: I'm Desiree for the record. Yes, I'm glad that Sebastian brought us back to that this discussion was already addressed by the small team before. But I also think it is important for us to have further conversation as to how we can encourage this participation. If it's currently not perceived as mandatory and it would be difficult to fulfill knowing that there's so many registrars that are perhaps not members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And so the outreach to those who do not participate in RrSG should be done probably in some different way, shape or form, either from the org or either from different kind of channel of communication. And we should also have some targets, ideal targets that could be achieved as to threshold to how many registrars could participate and to have some incentives there. So yes, we should explore a little bit further our options. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks Desirae. Paul, over to you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Paul McGrady here. So, I mean, I think this is a great one to give back to the small team. Right? We need to do some thinking about it. This is one where my pessimism and optimism collide at the same time. Because if staff gets this done by November, which it seem like they're going to and I'm super happy about that, that only gives us two years and a few months to develop the policy and have it be alive for some meaningful period of time before the experiment ends. Right? And so, to a certain extent, my reaction to this was not only that's new, but also I don't know about the time. Right? But that's, again, small teams should talk about whether or not we want to do it, and secondly, if there's time.

It also collides with my optimism, which is, I think there's a powerful difference between virtue and compliance. And by not having an obligation to participate in place at least perhaps at first, it will show us who will step up to participate on this on both sides, right? If the registrar step up to participate, we'll know who they are. If the requesting community steps up to participate instead of complaining about they're not being a process, we'll know who they are. And so that's a piece of data on its own. So I don't think that. Regardless of how we go on this, we're going to learn stuff. But I definitely think it's a small team kind of thing. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, just to say that we need some good promotional material explaining what it does and making it easier for registrars to point requesters to the right place. Because I think the registrar or some registries will be the natural entity that requests us will go to. And some of them might try to use the systems or the contact details that they find on the registry or registrar's website to submit their requests. And in order for them to be encouraged to go elsewhere, I think we need to explain the process very well what the roles of the registries and registrars and ICANN are, and all that. So when we have the small team, I suggest that we should probably even have a small animated video or something that makes things easier to understand for the average Internet user and other requestors. So I'm not sure whether ICANN has a budget for that, but we should probably find out whether they do, and then maybe help them craft something that works for the contracted parties as well as for ICANN.

GREG DIBIASE: I think that's a really good point, Thomas. And just going back to my point, we need participation on both sides, right? Like that you can't require requesters. We don't really want to go down that path.

THOMAS RICKERT: Just if I may, if this is not a good user experience for the requestor, it's bad for the requestor, but it's bad for the contracted party as well.

Because it looks like the contracted party is pushing the user places where they don't get help. So that really needs to be done well. And I think that material supporting that with Q&A and all that could help this quite a bit. And if it's done well, it will take a lot of work of the shoulders of the contracted parties.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Hi. Susan, here. I have a horrible feeling I might be saying what Thomas was saying, but I apologize the audio in here is really bad and I couldn't really hear you. What I wanted to say and apologies if this is duplication is that one of the benefits of doing policy work on this would be that, obviously, it would be applicable once there was a policy to every registrar. Because that would be in the nature of it. And therefore, it would address those who are inside the ICANN bubble and those who never come to an ICANN meeting and don't even know this is going on.

However, I share Paul's lack of confidence, shall we say, about the ability to get something across the line in anything like a timely manner if we were trying to do a PDP. And therefore, I really do think, yes, Council can do things. The Registrar Stakeholders Group can do things. There's a real need for ICANN to be communicating often and clearly to all registrars. And there are thousands of them, and most of them are not here. And that isn't a Registrar Stakeholder Group activity because they are not all members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And likewise, therefore, it's not a GNSO activity because they're not all members of the GNSO. And so I think that's incredibly important that ICANN have to take a real active role in ensuring that all registrars know about this.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Susan. Thomas, is that an old hand? Great. And then there was a second point to discuss. Marika, remind me, what was the second point that we should consider discussing?

MARIKA KONINGS: I think there's the assignment form. That's what you're meaning. So I think the question is partly, are there any objections or concerns on the updates that were made or can the small team start working based on those instructions, noting that obviously if there is further work that the Council wants the small team to undertake, you can always add that to it. And I just also want to point to comment that my colleague Elyse just put in the chat, that ICANN team working on this project is planning various ways to reach requestors and registrars, and instructional materials are part of that package. And we look forward to sharing those materials as they are available. So hopefully that already addresses some of the comments and suggestions that were made.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Sorry, I actually remembered what the other second point. Maybe the third point was, was if anyone had thoughts on success criteria, I think that is going to be discussed by the small team. I guess I'll start with my two cents. I think everyone is in agreement. We need a certain threshold of participation. But after that, I think success criteria would be how the system functions, right? That it useful for requesters. Did it go to the right place? Was it working for them? Did they get an accurate answer? But I'll open that up to see if anyone else has comments on success criteria. We'll leave it to the small team. Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, I think success criteria can be in different places. It can be the overall number of requests compared to the overall number of requests hitting contracted parties. So are we seeing any development there in the use of the system? I think also meeting response times could be one of the success factors that folks get timely responses. And then I think we should also probably consider having a customer satisfaction form at the end or something to see whether requestors have a good user experience. Because even though they might not always get the data they are asking for, if you properly explain to them what the limitations of on ring disclosure requests are or something to that effect, they might still say well now that I understand I've been treated fairly and I'm happy with the overall use of the system, to avoid that people are starting to bad mouth the system just because they didn't get that well. And I think that can be managed with good communications around the system.

GREG DIBIASE: Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: On my end with respect to success criteria, my understanding is we decided to not implement the full blown registry data request system, and are using this to provide input as to whether that should be implemented or not. So I think the sub criteria that Thomas just listed are probably very helpful to that. But when we think about success criteria they should all point to, will this help make the decision easy, whether or not to implement the full blown system, yes or no. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Yes, that's a good reminder. Anyone else on this topic?

JOHN MCELWAINE: So John McElwaine, for the record. We will move on now to item 9, any other business. We have two issues to go over. The first is the GNSO chair election timeline announcement that I think Nathalie Peregrine will handle.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, John. This is Nathalie. So this kicks off officially the GNSO chair election timeline to just by the simple announcement and the fact that it's on the screen. So that's a really easy step. Most of the deadlines you see here are suggestions. Because it is up to the SGs to have within their charters their processes for official elections. However, row number two is an enforced alliance with 23rd of June, 2023, simply because that's the ICANN78 funded traveler name submission deadline. And given that incoming and seated councilors benefit from travel funding, the future chair will be within those either seated with incoming councilors. We need to have the names decided then. This has been communicated to the SGNC secretariat as well as to the leadership teams. So this is basically an FYI that in the next month or so, there will be procedures starting in your own SGNCs.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Nathalie. Okay, if you can go back to the agenda. And yes, so 9.2 is a policy status report on the policy implementation working group final recommendations report. And Marika, I think is going to handle that one.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks, John. This is Marika. So this is basically just a check-in. We discussed this during the last meeting. As you may recall, this was an action item coming out of one of the specific PDP improvements that relates to the review of the policy and implementation recommendations that were adopted by Council a while back. And at the time of adoption came with suggestion or requirement to review that within a certain time frame. We had suggested doing a policy status report that would basically help inform the Council's consideration or assessment on whether a review would be necessary and what that would look like. So the document was posted on the Council list a while back.

And we then discussed that during the last meeting, I think at that point, no objections or concerns were raised. And there were a couple of questions from Anne that I hopefully answered on the mailing list. And again, I want to make very clear, this is input that is provided to the

GNSO Council to decide if and how to move forward on a review of those recommendations. This could result in the Council deciding that no further review is needed because things are working as intended. It could include that certain items may require a closer look and could benefit from improvement while others may be working as intended or there may not be sufficient information to make a determination at this stage. Because for example, GGP was one of the outcomes of the policy implementation recommendations, but we obviously just have the first one underway. So that may not give sufficient insight yet into weather updates need to be made to that.

So again, this report will be provided to the Council and the Council would then make a decision on how to proceed. Of course, we would try to document at least our experiences as well on that and then share feedback from staff perspective on some of these processes as obviously they're also involved ICANN org, for example, the implementation part of those recommendations. But again, it's an input that's provided to Council and Council this possible at the end of the day for them making an assessment on how to proceed based on that information.

So I hope that's helpful. So the idea was if there are no further concerns or questions about that, we would basically move ahead and develop that report and basically bring that back to Council at the time that we have information to share. And I think there was also a question from Anne on kind of providing updates. And I believe that was also done with the UDRP PSR that was done not too long ago. Obviously, we're happy to provide updates on the status of work at any time the Council is interested. That report also goes out for public comments. So again, the community also has an opportunity to do weigh in and especially with their experiences in these processes. And if we have missed any kind of information that should be captured, Council will obviously be given that same opportunity so that based on all that information that's then provided, we would provide a kind of final version of that report for Council to review and decide if how to proceed on reviewing those recommendations coming out of the policy implementation working group.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you for that update. So we have a little bit of a queue building here. Kurt, over to you.

KURT PRITZ: Former hand.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay. Anne, over to you.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Great. Thanks, I appreciate that, Marika. This is Anne Aikman Scalese. Thank you for your responsiveness on the list to questions that were raised there. And having worked in policy and implementation working group and where actually wonderfully, you were essentially one of the chief authors in that group that was led by Chuck Gomes and Jay Scott Evans. A couple of things that I think are quite important about the work that was done there is the change so that essentially IRTs are viewed as mandatory unless Council makes a determination in extenuating circumstances that an IRT is not appropriate for some particular policy matter.

And also the fact that in that IRT process, if any Councilor has a concern, that what's going on within the IRT could actually involve a new policy question, then a single Councilor has the ability to raise that at the Council level and to institute new procedures. And those, to my mind, are quite important safeguards on GNSO Council's role as the policy manager. So I just wanted to flag those for consideration by the group.

My question, and I'm not sure what your answer was, is that it strikes me that in the "assessment as to whether these recommendations from policy and implementation are effective and fit for purpose." That assessment strikes me as an assessment that ultimately Council makes. And in that regard, I had asked if Council would in fact see the policy status report and approve it before it goes out for public comment. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS: So this is Marika. So it wouldn't be any kind of approval because the PSRs really staff document. We can definitely share. And again, the PSR itself is not an assessment. It's just basically we collect there all the information that we have available, provides, of course, the background on the origin of the recommendations, what the working group aim to achieve. How they have been implemented, how they have been used. We would obviously share, I think, some perspectives from our side. We may identify specific questions that we would welcome community input on this as part of public comment that will then also help inform further consideration of those as well as Council similarly can weigh in on this. But the PSR itself is not the assessment or decision making document.

So as such, we've never had kind of Council approval for it. This is not the first PSR. We had one recently on the thing to UDRP, there was one on transfers. So again, it's a tool that's used to kind of facilitate consideration by the Council to decide if and how to proceed with review of recommendations that have been adopted and implemented. I hope that addresses your question. Obviously, I don't think again there's an issue with us sharing what we're doing and then what we're focusing on. And if there's earlier input that people want to provide, I think we're happy to take that. But again, I don't think we would foresee approval of any kind because this is clearly labeled as a staff written document, not a Council product.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yeah. It's concerning to me. I think that Council should have input on the effectiveness of those mechanisms. So I think even in the draft stage, that it should not just be a staff document, but I understand that you're saying that that's not traditional. I'm just raising a question about it.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Anne, for those comments. Bruna, over to you.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks. This is Bruna for the record. So my comment is about something different. I just wanted to raise one point about this small guidance. I was recently going through the document, and I think it's very concise and all the necessary points and messages we need while assessing them. But I would like to just raise one point about this small team leadership and what are the cases on which, like, they are allowed to represent Council. Like, what are the occasions are we agreeing on. And by occasions, I'm mentioning, like, meetings with the other parts of the community, but also open forums and other kinds of, like, sessions that are hold throughout the ICANN meetings in general. So my suggestion here is to maybe add an additional point up on the document about when is the small team's leadership able to represent Council and suggest that it's only when agreed upon by the whole group.

I mean, the point why I'm raising this is because, I guess we want to avoid some sort of community interpretation that has certain leadership from one of the small teams is representing the whole Council on one or two topics. So it's more like a procedural topic. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Bruna, for those comments. We'll certainly take them into account. But I'd have to look at the small team document and the planned work for that small team to really put it in context. Any other comments or questions? All right. Well, seeing none, I just want, on behalf of the Genesis Council, thank everybody for attending our meeting today. And with that, I hope everyone has a good rest of their ICANN meeting and we can adjourn this meeting. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]