
ICANN77 | PF – GNSO Council Meeting
Wednesday, June 14 2023 – 13:45 to 15:45 DCA

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday the 14th of June 2023. Would you please acknowledge your name as I call it? Thank you. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Nacho Amadoz?

NACHO AMADOZ: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Kurt Pritz? I don't see Kurt at the moment. Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Theo Geurts?

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.

THEO GEURTS: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Greg DiBiase?

GREG DIBIASE: Yep.

TERRI AGNEW: Desiree Miloshevic? Oh, Kurt is here. I don't see Desiree. Marie Pattullo?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Mark Datysgeld? I do see Mark in the room. John McElwaine?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Here. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Paul McGrady?

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Wisdom Donkor?

WISDOM DONKOR: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Stephanie Perrin?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Manju Chen?

MANJU CHEN: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Farell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Bruna Martins dos Santos?

BRUNA SANTOS: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Just noting Bruna is online only at this time. Tomslin Samme-Nlar?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Anne Aikman Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Jeffrey Neuman?

JEFF NEUMAN: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Present, and I'd like to take leave earlier before the call ends because I've got to get to ALAC session. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Everton Rodrigues.

EVERTON RODRIGUES: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: We do have GNSO support staff in the room,

May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded.

Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones. A warm welcome to attendees on the call and in the room who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones quite yet, and there will be a town hall, open mic, during this meeting. All are welcome to use the chat. Please use the dropdown menu in the chat pod and select everyone if you would like everyone to see your chat message. Councilors, if you'd like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. During the town hall open mic session, those in the meeting room will be invited to put their hands up in Zoom and queue in the standalone mics located by the screens at the back of the room there. Those participating remotely will be able to raise your hands in Zoom and unmute their mic when called upon. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN's multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our GNSO chair, Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Terri, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everybody. This is a very special session for many reasons, but it just happens to be my second council live session in three and a half years,

and the first one I chair in front of you. I'm no longer that ghostly figure on the screen. As we will start, so 1.1, we've just done, 1.2, updates to statements of interest. Do I see any hands raised? All statements of interest are up to date. 1.3, review and amend agenda. So I will raise my hand, and I'd like to propose that the item three of the agenda, the consent agenda, be taken last, otherwise we won't be able to do this. If that's okay with everybody. 1.4, we published the minutes of all recent meetings. As I always say, please review the minutes. These are quoting what you say and are kept on the record, so it's your job to do so. Leadership does diligently, but make sure that you've checked them.

And if there are no comments on this, we normally keep on the agenda item two, which is the review of projects and action list items, for now a number of months, we do not devote any time on it. It is assumed that councilors before the meeting review these items and raise issues if they have any. Again for the rest of the public, all this information is published, is on our website, is available. If anybody has any questions, please raise them or contact your councilors.

So we'll go directly to item four, which is a council discussion on the non-objection to SubPro timelines. So again for everybody in the room, the board asked us in ICANN 76 in Cancun to review the 38 recommendations that they had not passed and to propose for each remediation and timelines. And so we have been working for the last three months over this in conjunction with board representatives to make sure that we would land this on target. And up until last Sunday, we spent a whole day reviewing them again one last time with board members, and last night, yesterday evening, a final review. Paul, did you want to take this as you've been running these discussions for the last

three months and maybe to hold the discussion? And again, I see no hands raised at this stage.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. So there are a couple of things on here that are not necessarily small team related things. But on the first one, the outputs on the section B of the scorecard are the small team items. And as we discussed in our various sessions on this, there are various buckets that these will fall into. Bucket or landing spot, I like the word bucket, but it got changed to landing spot, so I'll stick with it.

Landing spot number one is things where the board has agreed that a clarifying statement from the council would be sufficient. And Steve did send around the latest chart to everybody, so you should be able to find those. At this point, everybody should be sick of them and know them very well. And so that is landing spot number one. That looks to be like a fairly quick process, and staff have volunteered to do the first draft of those for us, for the small team, so those will move quickly.

The second landing spot are, we anticipate having non-adoption from the board. They apparently don't reject things, they just non-adopt them. And with those non-adoptions, most of them, I think the board is expecting for us to provide them with some sort of supplemental recommendation. Again, we've talked through all the substantive issues, so I won't bother doing that here unless there's a particular question on a particular one. A couple of them, though, I think the board is not expecting us to issue a supplemental recommendation, but there's nothing saying we can't.

So one of the small team's first jobs when this meeting is done and we next meet on our call is to determine how we will draft those supplemental recommendations, because there's no reason why we can't go ahead and start drafting them, socializing them amongst the council so that we're ready as quickly as possible to send them back to the board when the board does get around to non-adopting. So we don't know the exact timeframe for that, but it will be work that's done in June, I assume in July, because the board is expecting both of those sets of landing spot documents back in September so that they have a chance to look at them and go through their process and decide whether or not our clarifying statements did the trick so that they can pass the remaining recommendations on and whether or not they're comfortable with our proposed supplemental recommendations so that they can pass those on. Avri and Becky have graciously volunteered to stick with us, so there shouldn't be any surprises by the time all that work is done.

There were various recommendations given around the table this week about how to best expedite that. Those recommendations will be taken on board by the small team, and we're going to find the fastest, most efficient way to do it in a quality way, but we're going to be busy this summer.

And then there's a final group of things having to do with communications with the GAC and some issues related to registrant protections that fall into buckets of further discussion on these, and I know that they're officially maybe not in that landing spot. I keep saying bucket and landing spot. I mean landing spot. But there is some anticipation on further dialogue on those, especially registrant

protections, before we move into any kind of phase where it's a clarifying statement or a supplemental recommendation, or maybe they're just not adopted. So some of that work, that work may take a bit longer. All of this is meant to get the board what they need early autumn so they have time to go through their processes and hopefully pass on the remainder recommendations by December. There may be some things that they can pass on sooner than that, and they signaled that they would if they can, but that's sort of the time frame.

So it's all really short time frames in ICANN land, but I think the small team is excited to be done with their work and move on to the next big thing. So that's for number one. I don't know that you want me addressing the remainder, unless you want me to, but I mean I've been paying attention, but I'm not necessarily a big expert on them. All right. Thanks, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you very much, Paul. So the item two that the board was asking for is related to the IRT working methodology, which is actually really more in the hands of staff. As a reminder, IRTs are run by staff with support of the GNSO and the rest of the community, and particularly with those that participated in the original PDP. So we'll leave that to them. The next thing that we needed to produce was a project plan related to closed generics, and I will pass the mic to John.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks Sebastien. So as most folks know, we presented the project plan on the closed generics that has 96 weeks, actually starting from about

today, as the proposed plan. I think it's critical to say that that's proposed, and that we hope through chartering this work, this EPDP, likely EPDP, very narrowly, that we can do the work quicker. But what we might want to have a little bit of discussion on right now is the comments that the SGs and Cs are encouraged to submit on the draft framework, and then a discussion at the council level as to whether, using air quotes, approve or endorse of going forward with the framework after seeing those comments. So we'll need to have a discussion on that. But otherwise, I think it's important to get started on some of the initial work for chartering, some of the initial work for a call for volunteers, so that we can make sure that we're making quick progress on the work that needs to be done.

So at an appropriate time, maybe we can talk, it could be now or after we go over the other parts to this agenda item, if anybody has any thoughts on how the council ought to discuss comments and then provide some guidance as to whether the framework is something that we want to proceed with. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, I don't know if it's related to that, but I see Anne's hand up.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: No, sorry, I think I didn't get my hand up quickly enough. In relation to the 38 pending issues, I just kind of wanted to remind council that our small team is open to participation by everyone on council, and I would note that originally we were assigned a triage exercise about putting things in quote-unquote buckets, but at this point with respect to non-

adoption, I think we are going to be discussing things that are more substantive in nature, so I would encourage councilors to attend if they can find the time, and you do not have to have been on the SubPro working group in order to participate in these meetings, so just wanted to emphasize the importance of the work and the open nature of the team, as far as I know, so thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think to be correct, and without gathering an army of hundreds, we even discussed having non-councilors joining, only urging to make sure that these were fully ramped up and knew what we're talking about.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thank you, I sit corrected.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: But thank you for reminding us of it. We will need the help. I see now Stephanie Perrin's hand.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. I think it would be really, really useful to, for those of us whose principal interest is not or has not been SubPro, if we had a document that traced the history of some of the concepts, terms, definitions over time, because if we weren't around for the earlier round, some of this stuff is not included in the final report of this time around, and it's the history. I'm always pounding the table saying we need a librarian. If we had a librarian at ICANN, I would go pester him or

her, but since we don't, can you point us to historical documents that would quickly fill in that gap? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So if I may pass on the mic to—Susan is in the queue already. We did have time imperatives up until today where I would have said no, we need to go through now and go as fast as we can. I'll let the small team decide and see, but I think that now, not that we still have a lot to do and we want to do it fast, but maybe we could have a day or two to help bring the rest of the council up to speed, too. I would personally suggest that it might be a good idea without tooling down completely, but as we're no longer on that time speed, I would see it as an interesting exercise. This said, I see Susan Payne's hand.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks. Hi. It's Susan Payne. I can just see Jeff is putting it in the chat as well. So the initial report from SubPro was very detailed. I mean, there were a lot of questions being asked, but there was a huge amount of information in there, too. However, I do recognize it is a big document, taken in conjunction also with the final report. It's a lot of document, but maybe if there are specific topics or issues, we could try and drill down on that, because it might be that we could do some kind of a, like a training session just to get everyone on to a certain level, which is outside of the kind of urgency of all of the stuff we've been doing. So if there are specific issues, that might help to kind of drill down on what it is we should be focusing on. But yeah, I think it sounds like a great idea.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, thank you. I'll go through the initial document. I mean, one doesn't crack into a document like that if one thinks one doesn't have to. So if it's in there, I'll find it and let you know after I've plowed through it. Thank you very much.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And this is Sebastien again, for the record, three months ago, the initial idea behind the session that we had on this Sunday was to find time for such. We just ran out of time and still had things to do, but we haven't completely forgotten. Any other comment on that? And I want to particularly invite comments on where John left us with the closed generics. Was there any questions or comments about it? I see your hand, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Sorry, this is back to the 38. Just so that I have clarity after having listened to this conversation. So as to Stephanie's question, it seemed like she was asking specifically for background information on the things that we expect will be non-adopted because we will be drafting supplemental recommendations for those. And so that narrows the universe of issues. And I think if there is to be a training session, it makes sense to train on those so that the full council understands what they're looking at when the small team brings back recommendations, right? Because those recommendations may vary in important ways from what the working group did. So I think that's a rational request and it's a reasonable universe.

In relationship to the composition of the small team, Seb, did you mean to open it up to all non-councilors or were you just recognizing that we had had that discussion and we're sticking with our councilors or members of the small team, but we're happy to have observers in the process? Because we have observers now, right? Anybody can observe. I just want to know what I'm walking into on Monday. And I'm happy either way. I just want to know.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks. So can I suggest, personal suggestion, and as asked on the fly, that the small team authorizes itself to invite the competence from outside of the council as it sees fit. You're absolutely right. Observers can follow our proceedings and have been invited to do so for a number of weeks. So if competence is not found around the table and you feel, as you're chairing the effort, I'll trust you and on your good judgment, that we should invite somebody from the outside to cordially invite us to. So again, second pass. Questions on closed generics for John. So Kurt Pritz. Yeah. Go ahead.

KURT PRITZ:

Does it make sense or not that we could start drafting a charter for that? I forget whether you write the charter first and then approve the PDP or you approve the PDP and write the charter. But in either case, having a draft charter would help us approve that and then amend it in accordance with public comment because I think we're going to have quite a bit of discussion about what narrowly tailored means.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So we are talking about the closed generics?

KURT PRITZ: Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic.

KURT PRITZ: Isn't that the topic? Okay. Is that all right?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I think that's a good idea. I mean, the plan is to start at least getting the background of a charter put together. Again, we just don't want to wait until after the comments are brought in, analyzed by the group and a final report is developed when we ought to be at least starting some of those initial work on a charter and on a call for volunteers.

With respect to my first question as to what we ought to do in terms of providing some guidance on approving the closed generics framework, I think we ought to wait to see what our various groups think about it, and that's going to be done through comments. And then after that, we can have a discussion of how we can get that feedback at the council level.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you for that, John. Do I see any hands up? Jeff Neuman.

-
- JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. So this is Jeff Neuman, GNSO liaison to the GAC. I think John raised a point earlier about us starting an EPDP before both the framework is final or starting to draft the charter. But we do need to decide because the GAC, at least, and I don't know, maybe Justine can talk from an ALAC perspective, but from the GAC perspective, their understanding is that a PDP will not start until they, the GAC would say the GAC approves the framework. And so I think we need to have a discussion as to how far we can go until such time that the GAC signals its approval. And if not, I'd like to know what to tell the GAC is our plan and timeline. Thank you.
- SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fair enough, Jeff. Do you want to answer that? And for the record, I don't believe anybody has said that we would start before they finalize the document. Okay. Go ahead, then, John.
- JOHN MCELWAINE: So I think it's important to get started on the charter draft. I'm not saying that we complete it all, but just have the basics down there so that when the final framework is approved by the group and then by the ALAC, by the GNSO, and by the GAC, we can hit the ground running, that we don't start the 12 weeks at that point. So let's do the homework. Let's put in some of the effort to get those basics of a charter drafted so that we don't lose time.
- SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Jeff.
-

-
- JEFF NEUMAN: And just to follow up, I think it's really the 12—so initially we were talking about the first 12 weeks and the second 12 weeks being concurrent. The first 12 weeks dealt with the charter, I believe, and the second one dealt with solicitation or getting volunteers. I'm assuming that the second 12-week part wouldn't start until the groups accept—okay, which means that they're not going to run concurrently.
- JOHN MCELWAINE: I also think we have to decide what is the composition of the EPDP going to be, but at some point we can start putting out information about a call for volunteers, but I agree that it can run concurrently, but you have to put that chartering in place first. I agree.
- SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Any further questions or comments on closed generics? And I no longer see any hands in Zoom or in the room. Thank you. So the last item that the council was supposed to go back to the board with is reviewed timelines or possible review timelines on the ongoing IDN EPDP. Essentially the board was concerned with ensuring that all the elements that were vital to be able to proceed with the SubPro IRT were—[one of the timelines] to know when these would be delivered. And, sorry, I'm trying to find my words because as it appears this week there was some, if not confusion, but some doubts as to what these elements were and if we were only talking about the AGB, the contract and etc. And after circling this again and again, I think that we got it right.

The EPDP team came back to us, tooled down for a few weeks in order to review that planned work and came back to us essentially saying the whole phase 2 is important and so we keep to our timelines and we keep to the original timelines that we gave you, the entire phase 2 is necessary for this.

They also noted as they're right now in the public comment period for phase 1 and as at least as of the beginning of this week, my understanding was that the public comments were light, that they assumed or they opened a window to the possibility that they wouldn't have to spend a huge amount of time on phase 1 review following public comment and would be able to continue working on that phase 2 that they have started already and provided all that was available, they would be able to give us a much improved timeline and when I say much improved, it's a timeline, the original that would have taken us to November 2025 and they would pair back to October 2024, a whole 13 months earlier. This is obviously not encouragement not to put public comments on phase 1, they're still expected and I think the deadline on them is the 19th, but we will review at the end of this month, depending on the quantity and the quality and the importance of the comments that are raised, we will evaluate with the team how much they can exactly pair back and we'll confirm that.

So to this extent, we have prepared a document. And maybe, is it time to put it on screen? I don't know, I'm looking at you, I don't know exactly what was planned here, but we have prepared a document to go back to the board. We finalized yesterday evening, there was still a few questions—and I see red light's on, I hope that by now they are. And so we would like to not raise a motion but ensure that there's no objection

to this document as you saw it finalized yesterday evening and as you see it now online, no objection to sending that to the board before our deadline of 15 June in two days. Do I see any hands up?

This doesn't particularly require non-objection, no positive approval, but I take your silence as approval and so we will forward that to the board if I can ask staff to take care of that. Thank you very much. It's been a long process, frankly it was a bit of a scary prospect when I heard that coming out of Cancun, it looked like a whole enormous mountain to climb. I'm not joking, I had a few apprehensions that I hadn't seen since school days, but we got there to the line and I'm very happy for it. Thank you very much for all your efforts. I really have trouble seeing the colors on the screen, so don't hesitate to raise your hand too. Go ahead Jeff. Oh sorry, Anne first and then Jeff.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE:

Just a note, this is not an objection at all, but in the same vein as we will reconsider IDN timeline after Donna comes back with us, I do think that it's worth looking again at certain aspects as we continue our work to see in particular if there are items that council itself is responsible for and could potentially speed up to do the work as quickly as possible that if we can include that reviewing the timelines again on the agenda when Donna comes back and try to make sure that we're working efficiently.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Absolutely well noted and well said. In our communications both with staff and with the board this week, we have clearly indicated that what

we were giving them now is a snapshot of what we have and our best knowledge but that the work was ongoing, absolutely. I see Jeff Neuman's hand.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, thanks. And I understand that this is not—you could disregard this comment because this is not my role on the council, but I would like, before a decision is made on page 4 which is a chart, number 8 and number 4 include activities that are not council activities and I don't think should come from the Council. And in other words, yes, the council needs to approve. So if that's like two of the four months, we should put two months and certainly shouldn't have something on there that says four months or more on any kind of timeline because that's not really a timeline at all. So again, you don't have to take those comments, I understand and thank you. I apologize for making that intervention.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

[inaudible] the queue and I'll recognize you as next, Mark, but before that, does any councilor want to second that, take that on their name? The suggestion would be not to leave in those, so we have a deadline, an internal deadline and then four months afterwards to correct that and keep that next timeline strictly to what is of concern to us. Are you happy to take that, Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE:

Yes, very happy to, I completely agree.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Then we will take note and thank you for the suggestion and thank you Susan. I see Mark Datysgeld's hand.

MARK DATYSGELD: Real quick, on page 7, there's something that I have been wondering about and perhaps for my education or perhaps other councilors who are also questioning this, what do we mean by between 4 and 62 weeks? I've been trying to grasp the concept of that, but if anybody would be willing to offer—that would be very good.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I read that as a time spent that is not yet fully defined and hearing also—Oh, it's a typo, sorry. Thank you. It's a typo that apparently has been fixed, we're good to go. Can somebody maybe, to allay any fears, read to us what it says now without the typo?

STEVE CHAN: I think specifically the line that Mark was talking to is actually being highlighted right now, it's actually since been updated. We got a notice that there's a couple typos, that was one of them. It's definitely not 4 to 62 weeks, that's a pretty ridiculous range. There's another one I think that was like 6 to 182 and it was obviously another typo so we quickly amended that after someone informed us of the typo and we recirculated shortly afterwards. Thanks.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Steve, for the clarification. That makes me less fearful.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And thank you for the editors that pick up on these typos. I see now Paul McGrady's hand.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. I realize this is a snapshot, it's going to change, the board needs it. I would like to put a place marker down on the timeline for closed generics we talked about in our informal session that I think hopefully will reemerge as we talk about chartering. And that idea is that when you think about the number of closed generics that may run the gauntlet of that framework, I would be very surprised if it's a big number, I think it's going to be a small number and we do run the risk of the tail wagging the dog. So one of the ideas that were kicked around is that when we redo this document, when we think about the charter, what we communicate to the board is the possibility of establishing essentially a holding pen for closed generic applications that get put off to the side if the policy work is not done, and then when the policy work is done, those applicants will have an opportunity to amend their applications, to conform or to withdraw their applications and get a refund or something like that, such that if the closed generic work is the last thing holding up the new round, it doesn't hold up the new round. So today's not that day and there's lots of discussion, but sometimes if you don't say the ideas into the record, they go away and I don't want this one to go away. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's fair enough, Paul. And indeed, I think that everybody is agreeing around this table, we should put the effort right now, today, starting as soon as the documents are finalized, Jeff, don't get me wrong, but the work towards closed generics, but the general consensus here is if they're not ready by the time the rest of the next round is ready, we'll find a way, a graceful way to put them on pause. Any other comments? I'm seeing Desiree, I believe it's your hand.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes, it's just to echo what Paul was just saying, I think it's important to socialize this so it doesn't get buried into some footnotes so that there is expectation that the closed generics will be dealt with. I think it's a really important point because we discussed it yesterday, quite a lengthy time. So let's make it somehow more visible. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Any other comment? Oh, I see Anne's hand now, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: I'm sure this is for further discussion later, but I think that the idea that Paul introduced was that closed generic applications would be accepted in the next round and then decide later whether you want to comply with the results of the EPDP. However, I don't know that that's the appropriate sequence of events, not at a \$240,000 application fee.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So to be revisited—and I'm no expert, but I would assume that creating a holding pen, these things also should have been planned as policy and etc. We're not going to decide that right now. The gist of it though is, again, that we'll do best efforts trying to get the closed generics across the line and if we don't, we are allowing ourselves to reassess later in the program and decide to pause them. Do I see any further hands on this? I see Steve's hand.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. I just wanted to validate something that I thought I heard. So it sounded like Susan was willing to take up the suggestion from our council liaison. So to confirm, I think what this would mean is it takes up the timelines through council adoption and it stops there, it doesn't take into account the public comment and board consideration after. So those parts of the timeline would be removed, am I understanding correctly?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That is correct. To our adoption, so beyond when the document is delivered but only including our steps after it.

STEVE CHAN: And just further to confirm, that would be throughout the different timelines where those additional steps are included, remove it universally throughout the document, not just closed generics.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, absolutely. Okay, sorry, can we scroll the agenda some more? So are we now all agreed with the amendment supported by Susan and the possible last typos found beyond Mark's, are we now agreed to send this to the board? Yes, I guess so. Okay, well thank you very much, good discussion. And we move then to item five, DNS abuse. So this is a theme, a topic that we had on our previous agenda and weren't able to get to, so we're getting to it now. Greg, do you want to take it?

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Noting we're a little behind schedule because of the good discussion on SubPro. So first I just wanted to make sure everyone was aware that the contracted parties and ICANN have reached an agreement on an amendment to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the Registry Accreditation Agreement involving DNS abuse provisions with an aim to strengthen these provisions and how this relates to our small teamwork. Just so everyone remembers, the DNS abuse small team was tasked with soliciting feedback from the community about what areas within this DNS abuse world might be suitable for policy development.

One of the feedback requests was to Contractual Compliance, who gave us some interesting information on how they viewed the contract and identified some clauses that were potentially ambiguous or did not provide them the tools they needed. So the abuse small team sent a letter to the registries and registrars identifying what Contractual Compliance said. This letter did not tell them to make an amendment. It was more of a, here's some interesting information we've uncovered. Registries and registrars then engaged ICANN based on that

information and now the amendment that they have developed in a relatively short time period is out for public comment. That public comment ends July 13th, I believe. So I encourage everyone to bring that back to their stakeholder groups and ACs to make sure we have as much feedback on this as possible, as I think this was a community-led development as well as negotiation between the contracted parties and ICANN. That's the first update, so I'll pause and see if anyone has comments or questions on the amendment. If not, I will move on.

One of the other pieces of feedback we received when we reached out to the community, we received some feedback to look into the role of bulk registrations on DNS abuse and whether this topic was suited for policy development at this time. And Mark, chair of the small team, will share the kind of reports of the analysis that the small team did here.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much, Greg. So we carried out a wide consultation on the matter of bulk registrations and let's put it this way, it's not that we do not see as a potential problem, it is that we do not have enough evidence right now to start any policy-related work around bulk registrations and we would not want to engage in a PDP under those circumstances.

However, having the small team flag this was actually very useful because ICANN itself started to pick up on this thread and has commissioned a study currently named Inferno with an M. And we have heard from folks at the DNS Abuse Institute that they are looking a little bit into this.

So what we are hoping is that from this project, further information will emerge that will allow us to take this back into consideration now with proper scope and understand if this is a policy-related matter. So the consensus, so to say, for now is that we do not advance on this but we bookmark it and as soon as we start receiving information, we decide if it's actionable or not. So this does not wrap up the effort on DNS abuse, it just puts us in a waiting mode. And I would complement by saying that during the engagement between the GNSO Council and the contractor parties, there have been many talks about subsequent policy work to come from the DNS abuse effort. They are not covered by this specific amendment.

So let's say this is not the end at all of the discussion for the Council. It just wraps this first round of engagement and the first DNS abuse small team work. And we are now looking forward to seeing, especially hearing from our community and our constituents how to move forward with this because clearly the work is not done but we need a mandate to do that and we need a focus. So this is something that I personally will be looking into for the next few months but very glad to hear from all the Councilors what are their thoughts so that we can start brainstorming how to move ahead with this. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Mark. And so just a discussion topic on the next points, I think it was proposed that the DNS small team will look into potentially scoping narrowly tailored PDP after we have the results of this contractual amendment. We can take that data back and measure if there is an impact and then assess whether a targeted PDP on

something like malware or phishing, which is clearly DNS abuse, should take place.

So I guess the first question before Council is if we're willing to table this group's work pending the outcome of the amendment process and then pick back up where we are and continue this conversation. And then I guess I'll add color to that is that I think we've been having really productive dialogue with the community about abuse and I think we should consider alternative forum, for lack of a better word, to keep these discussions alive. I've had some preliminary discussions with the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the Registries Stakeholder Group that have biweekly meetings. And so one idea that was thrown out was maybe once a month or once a quarter, they can open up that group to other parts of the community to have a fulsome discussion on a topic like bulk registrations and further define that topic so maybe in the future it can be suited for policy development.

So those are kind of the two proposals put forth right now. I don't think we have a vote, but I'd like to get people's thoughts. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD:

Very briefly speaking on behalf of the small team. And if any of the members disagree with what I'm saying, please raise your hands. I think our consensus is exactly that we will wait for these results so that we can take the discussion back to the table. I think that's where we arrived. If any of the group's members see it differently, this would be a good time to raise the question. Otherwise, we are in waiting mode for now to see how this impacts the threat landscape. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Tomslin, I see your hand.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. I think for the question regarding whether the small team should continue the effort, I think our scope at the time was to consider whether any policy effort was required, right? And I think we've concluded now on that work. And I think in the last meeting of the small team, we wondered whether we will require another scope for that small team to continue its work. And I think, in my opinion, that small team should wrap up and then if there is need for another small team to be reconvened on this, then we can open that, at least at the council level. That's my opinion on that.

But the second thing I wanted to comment on was something you mentioned about possible policy work coming out of these contractual negotiations. Because I asked a question similar to that yesterday at the contractual party outreach on this. It's not clear to me, and I'd like to know, if the contractual parties think there are any possible policy questions or issues that could come out of these negotiations as the text is currently written. Because I remember yesterday it was mentioned that this is just the groundwork, and there could be specific policy questions that might be required to be dealt with by a PDP. But I can't tell what will come out of that. That would be a policy issue. You know what I mean? So I don't know if you have any answers to that. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Yeah. Thanks, Tomslin. So I think there's two things here. There's the amendment, which is not policy, right? That this is a contractual negotiation between two parties. If it hopefully succeeds and the amendment is adopted, we want to see kind of what effect that may have, if anything. Kind of assess the results. And then afterwards, there was some discussion, and I don't think there's consensus or further discussion to say whether there's a position on that, but some of the feedback we received in our initial outreach was perhaps you could take a specific type of abuse, say phishing or malware, and have a really targeted PDP to make sure you don't get lost in one of these massive PDPs that can't go anywhere.

So that was, I'm just raising that as, that was an idea that was raised. I don't think there's a firm position from the contracted parties at this point, and I think that is something separate from the amendment process that's occurring now. Does that make sense? Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I don't mean to be controversial here, but I'd just like to put a marker and indicate that as far as I'm concerned, and I think I can speak for NCSG here, there have always been policy issues wrapped up in the contract that is negotiated between the two parties, and the oversight of that contract has, there's policy implications in the lack of oversight of such things as, for instance, bulk gathering of WHOIS data by some of the information service providers—mentioning no names.

So naturally we're concerned, always, to keep an eye on the contract and detect the policy issues that might need scrutiny by the council. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Understood. Thank you. I see the queue. Oh, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Greg. This is Justine for the record. Since I've been a member of the small team on DNS abuse, I'd like to have a word. I think it would be useful for council to see what comes out of the public comment on the contractual amendments, and insofar as if the small team doesn't believe that the concerns that have been raised through our process has been addressed properly, then that could be a possible angle for looking into a PDP or whatever process that we want to take forward. So insofar as that is concerned, I think the small team needs to be kept, how do you say, on the table, or kept alive at least, until we are satisfied that we do not have any more work to be done.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, that's a great point, Justine, and I think that goes with the spirit, the original spirit of the small team, soliciting input from the community, so yeah, I think that's a great point. I see the queue is clear for now, and I think we're under some time pressure, so I'm going to hand it back to Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Greg. Thank you for the good discussion, and indeed, I'm turning to my left. It appears that we are running way behind, and we need to move fast. Okay. Thank you for that. We raised the discussion on our last council meeting regarding the accuracy scoping team and

the fact that we had agreed six months ago to put it on pause for six months. We were, as you would remember, waiting for a number of inputs that to this date haven't arrived, and that would be required to reopen this. We suggested extending it by six months. I believe it was Susan Payne who raised the fact that six months ago we voted to have that postponed and that we might need to vote again to postpone it another six months. I don't want to belabor here the discussion again. We are running very late, so either we agree simply that indeed in July we will vote to push it another six months—there has been some recent development, for example, on the DPA, but this is still not ready, and I don't know when it will be, so to me it seems reasonable, but either we decide we table it for a vote next month or we just push the discussion and have that discussion next month, but today, sadly enough, we won't have time for it.

Susan, as you suggested that we should vote next time, do you have any particular opinion on this one? Otherwise, if people are not ready for the debate, maybe we all agree that we have that discussion in July and we see how we go.

SUSAN PAYNE:

I'm sorry, I'm kind of not quite following what the question was to me. I mean, it seems to me that I think there's probably agreement we ought to vote on it. If there's time for us to discuss it now, then I guess we could do, but if you say there isn't time, I don't feel strongly, but I think as a matter of formality, we should have a vote, I think, and I'm seeing agreement.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: My question is, do we table a vote in July, assuming that we all agree that that's what needed, or do we table a discussion in July and then possibly a vote because we want to discuss it? I think if everybody agrees that this needs to be voted, then we can prepare ourselves for July and then we'll do that. I see no objection, so we'll go with that. Thank you very much. Go ahead, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Is this a good time to talk about my suggestion? On accuracy?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, I'm sorry, because there are people that came here for the open mic. Let's see it, and afterwards—but I believe I need to move.

THOMAS RICKERT: Then I would still like to make one point on this one, because we are so elegantly moving over this topic and say, okay, let's defer it for another six months. Just to refresh everyone's memory, what we're waiting for are the data protection arrangements that are due since we had the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations out there. Had a child been born at that time, it would now go to kindergarten. I think this is something that really the team that's negotiating that should put the pedal to the metal that we get these agreements. That's imperative for GDPR compliance. Absent these agreements, which haven't yet been published, we can't make progress not only in this area, but also in other areas of what we're doing. So I just want to put that on the record that this is a matter of urgency. We're waiting for that, and I hope that we're going to see

these agreements before the six months that we're about to extend are expired.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So I've heard this week from my constituency, the registries, that they have received responses from ICANN Org on the questions that they had that were pending. I'm definitely not a legal expert, and this needed to be reviewed. But at first read, it showed great progress, and there was strong enthusiasm in the room about the progress that had been made. And I hope I can turn to my fellow registry constituency. So there will be progress, coming progress there. I don't know how many other steps there are down the line for it, so I can't comment to that. But definitely hopeful progress coming down that line. And for the record, we found out this morning that—you were talking about a child would have been in kindergarten by now. Through the parallel IRT that was running, apparently we are celebrating now the sixth birth of a child. I see Stephanie's hand. Go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you very much. And thank you for the analogy, Thomas. I do have a granddaughter who was born in that period who is going to kindergarten. She's adorable. I'm not so sure about the DPAs. And that's where my question is landing. I think there are policy implications in the DPAs that are agreed between the contracted parties and ICANN, just as there are in the registration agreement. So when do we get to see these DPAs and comment on them? And that meshes back – I thought you were actually going to raise that issue that you raised in the informal

council meeting, which is the discussion of the precision that will be coming in national law to the directive that has passed.

And I think that's very important because whatever may come, we do not want an unharmonized approach. Either ICANN doesn't want it, and as privacy advocates, we certainly don't want an unharmonized approach to authentication procedures. It'll just be a mess. So I'd like to move forward on that, just as I would on looking at your DPAs. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Obviously, you'll appreciate that I can't answer that. We'll see the DPAs when we can see the DPAs. Yeah. Okay, so next item on our agenda is the public forum, I believe. The town hall, that's what we call it. Sorry. So we have organized mics in the room, and I'm turning around. I can't see. Oh, there's one in front on either end of the room, closer to the screen. And we wanted to make sure that the public could address council. This is a tradition that we've had for a long time, but we came to the realization a few months back that this was one item of the agenda that kept on getting cut if we weren't meeting our timelines. And we thought it was not fair to the community, well, not fair to anybody, but also the feedback was important to us. And so we wanted to make sure that not only did we have it on our agenda, but we would respect that 30 minutes of discussion now.

So to this extent, so there's one particular thematic that was of interest to us, but the mic is open and we're ready to take any questions. The problem that we're seeing as managers of the PDP is the attrition amongst the participants. There is a lot of work. There's a lot of work

coming our way. We've been talking about it all week. After several years of being locked down in Zoom rooms and now a return to some normality, we are still finding it very difficult to find all the volunteers to help.

I know that it's a great concern also. I keep on hearing it from org and that they are looking to us also to provide solutions, to suggest. They're very open to listen to suggestions. But we wanted to also take a feel of the room and hear you on this topic. And I keep on talking because I see nobody getting up, which is exactly what a forum moderator dreads. Do I recognize Heather, who is going to save my life on my right? Go ahead.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Seb. I'd like to say something in response to—you've given me a brilliant setup, Seb. First of all, I want to applaud the council. I'm going to invoke my favorite. I'll invoke Paul McGrady first, who used to say, you're my favorite, don't tell the others. I'll invoke my favorite colleague in that spirit, Donna Austin, who used to remind me and the council on a very regular basis that we could spend 16, 17 hours a year together face to face in a room as a council. And I applaud you for devoting the entirety of Sunday to the issue of round two. It's the first time in my knowledge that the council has ever done that, ever devoted an entire day, that amount of time to a single topic. And I think that was very clever.

On the other hand, I was deeply disappointed, and those of you who were still in the room, amongst whom staff, who were giggling, and saw me flip out at the end of the day after many of you left at how few action items came out of that full day of discussion. I encourage you, I implore

you, think creatively about how we can get some action items here. Don't be constrained. You'll all be shocked, right? All of you who know me, I am a devotee of process. I like process. It brings predictability. It brings transparency. Don't let process hold you back. Don't process yourself into corners. Use creativity. Use this time, please, that you're together in the same room. This is the most fruitful time you will have in your term on council. Use this time to think creatively about solutions and work together on those. And to the extent that any of us in the community can assist you in that regard, I, for one, raise my hand to help. I'm sure I'm not alone. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Heather. Deeply appreciate it, particularly coming from you. As we all know that you sat in my chair, I know exactly what it feels like. Thank you. Do I recognize Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII:

So I just wanted to talk about this special creativity that is going on at the Council small team. And I'm not talking about the specific small team at the council. I'm just talking about the concept. Yes, it is good for the council to be creative, but there are certain principles that we need to adhere to and not sideline when we are being creative.

And on a few occasions, the small teams have been opaque, or I have heard—maybe I misinterpreted. I'm from the civil society, and we are very paranoid about things. But I heard that they represented the council views. And I believe that the small teams should not represent

the council views in other fora or in other sessions. And everything has to go through the council.

So last time, when the board asked us, what do you think about these structures, like the small teams, and how would they affect transparency and accountability, we told them, don't worry about that. We are going to sort it out, because we want to make policy here. But now I think that the council should start thinking about how to sort it out. I totally agree with Heather, not to over-engineer things, but also not to have these small teams to grow feet and go around and do things that the council has not agreed to and also represent.

And also, I wanted to mention—maybe I'll mentioned that later. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So thank you very much for the feedback. It has been a concern for us, too, the opacity of the small team. And I think that you'll find that we're putting a real effort in making sure that all the recordings are available, the notes and everything, everything is online, is available. Some of the small teams, indeed, have been closed to councilors. Some have been opened. The one on the RDDS are open to actually members of the community, chosen members of the community in the sense that council didn't feel that it had the competence on this theme, and each council and each group went in their own community and designated people for that, in that sense.

They need to be small. The idea is to have an instrument that is nimble, a small team. It is not a public forum, indeed, in all cases, but we do

really worry about that transparency and make an effort. Now, every now and then, the leads of those small teams have been invited by the council to represent the work of the small team to the rest of the community. That is not to say that they speak in the name of council, unless I'm missing one, but in my experience, it was always a councilor asking them to step up and represent their work, and I wouldn't believe that they would have had the mic had they had the support of council to do so.

FARZANEH BADII:

Just one more thing. This is generally a trend that I see at ICANN as well. Also, we have this closed generic group. Apparently, they have a Chatham House rule, and I just want to say that we are seeing these different governance structures that are coming up, and we don't see the transparency, and we need to work on it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

On this very topic, if I could remind everybody that this is a specific topic where we tried different venues, different formats, and were asked by the board to work with the GAC on finding yet another creative solution. That format was chosen by the group itself. I think the feedback that we've heard after a few months of it is that there's probably ways to do that without closing the doors, that we may not want to do it again, but again, we need to remain nimble. So that aspect of the discussion, the fact that it was behind closed doors, is probably something that we will want to avoid, but the format of the discussion itself is not questioned, and the results, I'll leave it for public comment. Now, I see Jeff Neuman.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yes, thank you. I'm speaking, I guess, in my own capacity, not as a GNSO councilor or GNSO liaison to the GAC. Two points. One, Farzaneh had just started. I'd like to make a request to the council to strongly consider letting the closed generic facilitated dialogue group, sending a message that all future activities not employ Chatham House rules. For full disclosure, I am a member of that small team, whatever we're called, and I, for one, have never been in favor of the Chatham House rules. I think it sets a bad precedent, and I think that we should, as the council, send a message, or sorry, you all, as the council, should send a message that the work should not continue using the Chatham House rules.

The second thing is, 2013, the GNSO council passed a policy that would, a consensus policy, capital C, capital P, that would allow registries to release IGO acronyms to the public, or as they see fit. That was 2013. The board never adopted that specific proposal. There was some GAC advice. Ultimately, the GAC had asked for a moratorium on the implementation of that consensus policy until the policy work of the IGO curative rights was completed. Policy work was completed. The GAC has now asked for a moratorium until all of it is actually implemented, and that ICANN builds a trademark watch service.

We're more than a decade after the council passed a capital C, capital P consensus policy, which is so rare when we do that. And I just haven't seen anyone from the council or the GNSO really saying to the board that, look, yes, we understand you're trying to work with other SOs, ACs, but at some point our policies need to either be adopted and

implemented or ultimately sent back that they can't be in limbo for 10 years.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Jeff. I'll take note and pass the message on. Sorry, I'm certainly not an expert on this topic, so I can't respond better. I see hands open from councilors. In response to this, specifically, Kurt?

KURT PRITZ: Yes, so I agree with Jeff that I wish that the small team on closed generics was open, but I don't agree that at this late stage—this comment might be moot given Mary Wong's comment in the chat, but I don't think at this late stage of the game we should be asking them to change their methodology. Evidently the whole state of the whole free world depends on GAC approval of whatever they're doing and the GAC participation of what they're doing, so I don't want to jeopardize that. So I think we just take it as a lessons learned rather than—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, exactly, lessons learned. And let's not forget this is not a process that was entirely within our control. We had some input in the beginning, but it wasn't our process alone. Can I pass the mic to Mason then?

MASON COLE: Thank you, sir. Mason Cole, chair of the business constituency. I have a brief statement on behalf of the BC, but I'd like to open it with what may be something that's a little unusual in ICANN land lately, and that is at

least between interactions between the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties, and that is to say thank you to the contracted parties for their work on DNS abuse over the past several months. So let me open my statement.

The BC thanks the contracted parties and ICANN Org for the step forward in addressing DNS abuse with the proposed contract amendments, an issue for which we've been advocating for many years. We recognize this is the first of many steps, and we look forward to participating in the upcoming PDPs. As we approach that work, it's important to set as context that the definition of DNS abuse used in the contractual updates is a bit of a misnomer. ICANN Org has said the definition of abuse was taken from SAC 115. However, SAC 115 actually repeats the abuse definition put forward by contracted parties. SAC 115 actually says new types of abuse are commonly created, and that the SAC supports regular community-driven review of abuse definitions. This omission has not yet been put forward in recent community discussions, but it's useful context for how the community should approach further work on abuse mitigation. The community must remain vigilant and flexible if we really are to make measurable progress on abuse mitigation. The BC looks forward to continued work in this area. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So do you want to make a comment? Go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD:

I would like to acknowledge Farzana's intervention. The points she brings up are very important for us to stay true to the multistakeholder model and understand what we're doing with this. I would like to address one specific point of her intervention, which is small teams representing the council. So at least as far as my recollection goes, and it's not perfect, I could be corrected, but there are two moments for a small team. There's one in which it is a small subset of the council, and when we act on that behalf, we say we represent the small team and so-and-so. But at some point, this is internalized by the council and approved by us as part of our agenda. And then at that point, it becomes the council's view because the entire council has deliberated on that and internalized that as a decision.

So one thing to keep in mind is at what point is the small team at? Is it still at this small team phase only where it should be representing itself and the members of that group? Or has the decision been internalized, and at that point, yes, it has become council consensus regardless of where it originated from. So this is, I think, an important decision for us to make, but fully acknowledge that we need to be very vigilant about transparency and continuing with these practices. Our meetings are open and available for all the recordings, and yeah, let's continue to work to make this better.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Mark. So I'll go now to Donna Austin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Seb. I'm Donna Austin, chair of the IDN EPDP Working Group. I just want to thank the council and really the GNSO Secretariat for giving the IDN EPDP four slots on the schedule this week. The ability to work face-to-face over a series of days has actually been really beneficial to our work, and if you have a meeting once a week, you have a stop-and-start effect. But I think we've had really good contributions this week, and we've made really good progress, and we wouldn't have been able to do that without that face-to-face opportunity. So thank you for that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. It's really encouraging. I see Paul McGrady's hand, maybe answering a comment made before. Yeah, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Real quickly, dual purpose. One is to thank Mason for recognizing the work of the contracted parties and staff. I think that culturally it's important for us to recognize each other when good work is done. I think that adds to a positive culture and reinforces people to try to do more. So thank you, Mason. I think that was really important.

And then I wanted to maybe prime the pump a little bit on your question, Seb, which nobody's addressed yet, on the issue of volunteer attrition, if I can. And so I think there are lessons that we can learn from other organizations. A long time ago I was the only inhouse lawyer for a nonprofit chain of nursing homes in Ohio, if you can believe it. And we had a department that worked with volunteers and brought them in and recognized them and did some things. And so there are little things that we could do in terms of encouraging the volunteers to stick it out.

We could recognize years of service. We could hand out fancy ribbons that says one year, five years, 10 years, 25 years. I know it sounds silly, but fancy ribbons can sometimes be meaningful. We could have ribbons that recognize new people. This is their first meeting, and those of us that have been around for a while can more easily recognize them and try to bring them into the group of volunteers. We could have a platform that could say open to volunteer work, because I think a lot of us are extroverts, but not everybody is an extrovert. They're not going to join unless they're asked. They're not just going to feel comfortable moving in and asserting themselves in that way. And so there may be a thousand other ideas, but I think one thing that we can think about, I know we're out of time, is how can council help create that kind of volunteer appreciation culture? Because we have a fabulous group of volunteers in this organization. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: All fantastic ideas that I hope we can note and discuss with Org about. Keith Drazek, I see on the mic. And after that, I'll have to cut the cue. Sorry. Go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Seb. Actually, I wanted to respond to the point that you all were just talking about that you raised that Paul spoke to, and build on what Donna said. I think the key several items in terms of dealing with the volunteer turnover, attrition, churn issue, one is to make sure that the charters of our PDP working groups or small teams or whomever, whatever we're chartering, are very, very focused and targeted and have some clear deliverables outlined. So make sure that

the policy work itself and the chartering process are sufficiently targeted and small, not overexpansive, to make sure that the work can be done in a timely manner.

Two, making sure that working groups have the ability to meet face-to-face. I think this is a critical component that takes additional resources. It's expensive. It requires people to travel. But to have dedicated time and dedicated focus for groups to meet face-to-face at critical junctures in order to successfully advance the work. And, again, I think that those are a couple of things that we can reasonably do. And, again, if that requires additional resources, I think the policy work that the GNSO manages is critical to the functioning of ICANN. And I think that this is an opportunity for us to demonstrate at this time if we're going to deliver on the promise of the multistakeholder model and our multistakeholder bottom-up consensus-building policy development work, that this has to take a primary position in terms of the resources that we as a community need from ICANN to be able to deliver in this timely fashion. And I think doing those things will ensure that we're able to avoid the concerns about attrition and turnover and losing the institutional memory of a particular working group. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Excellent suggestion. I want to acknowledge already, even if it's not fully confirmed, that I've received personal confirmations that, for example, the IDN PDP that had requested a specific retreat in November-December in Asia, because this is where the majority of the group is, will have it. I have also been approached by a number of Org leadership to tell me that if we needed to have these retreats, these off-

sites within the context of an ICANN meeting or outside, that we were cordially invited to be creative with it and ask, and we will be helped. So thank you very much for noting that.

With this, we will close the town hall portion. Tomslin. Go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Seb. I actually just had a question for Donna. I noticed the council has been putting increasing pressure on the IDN EPDP, and they've had to be increasing the hours of meeting and frequency of meeting, and I was wondering, how are the volunteers taking it? Are they okay?

DONNA AUSTIN: Justine looks all right to me. It's a pretty fair question. I think in organizing the meetings this week, one thing I came to appreciate is the one that was bearing most of the pressure was Ariel, because she had to do pretty much four weeks' prep in a shorter period of time. So a lot of the prep work falls back to the staff. So there are finite resources that we need to be cognizant of.

But I think feedback that I got back from some of our team today is that they really appreciated the opportunity to continue discussions rather than have this stop-start all the time. So I think we're holding up pretty well. We do have a steady state in terms of our people that attend regularly, but we have dropped off from what we originally started with.

But I guess one of the things about this PDP, it's not controversial in the sense that we're not at odds with one another a lot, but it does have

technical complexities and process complexities that we need to wrap our heads around. So that takes time to unbundle, and we all had a little bit of brain fade today during various phases. But I think we're in good shape. We were a little bit surprised that people were worried about the IDN EPDP this week. But we're doing the best that we can, and we will get back to you with a revised timeline in maybe a month's time when we've got a better sense of where we are. But we're in good shape for now, and I think if we can get this face-to-face done towards the end of the year, we're going to be doing much, much better than what we thought we would. So thanks for the question.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And thank you for all the work, again. Yes, and I really want to be able to do this last part of the agenda. Okay, go ahead, please.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Very quickly, I wonder if it would be helpful for council to develop a list of sort of entry-level committees that would make sense for new people at ICANN to get involved in. Because I recall a long, long time ago, J. Scott Evans looked at me and said, "You're going on Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation, and read the operating procedures, read the work." So if we could develop a list where we could invite newcomers and feel comfortable, that would be helpful.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Anne. Good suggestion. So we skipped Item two of our agenda, if we can go back on top of the agenda, which was to pass a motion. I'll let Greg do it.

GREG DIBIASE:

Before I start, I want to kind of recognize this figurine that is next to John. This was made by Net-Chinese registrar, a member of our constituency as a retirement gift for Pam that will be delivered to her family. We submitted a motion that was seconded by all of the council. I'm going to take the opportunity to read it now.

This is a motion to commemorate Pam Little. The council was informed earlier this month of Pam Little's passing. We wish to recognize Pam's significant contribution to the GNSO and the ICANN multi-stakeholder model during her tenure, as well as her professionalism, her friendship, and her mentorship to many. She will be greatly missed.

Whereas, one, Pam Little joined the GNSO Council on the 1st of November 2017 as an elected representative of the Registrar Stakeholder Group from the APAC region. She served two terms between 2017 and 2021.

Two, Pam served as vice chair of the GNSO Council between 2019 and 2021.

Three, as vice chair of the GNSO Council, Pam brought her professionalism, her deep knowledge of the GNSO Council's best practices and history, her thirst for knowledge for subject matter, to serve the CPH she represented, as well as the council as a whole. Pam made significant contributions to ICANN and was a strong and respected community leader.

During her tenure as GNSO Council vice chair, Pam participated and lent her talents to many GNSO initiatives, including, but not limited to, PDP

3.0, Implementation Final Report and Consensus Playbook, the Accuracy Charter Drafting Team. Pam was also an active and valuable member of many ICANN initiatives outside of her service to the GNSO Council, including, but not limited to, the Non-PDP on Data Metrics for Policymaking, the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance Workstream 2, the Cross-Community Workstream 2 Community Coordination Working Group, the Nominating Committee, and the Transfer Policy Review Working Group.

Pam was a well-respected and much-liked member of not only the GNSO, the CPH and the broader ICANN community. She was a mentor to many who were able to trace back their commitment to the ICANN community to her example, her encouragement, and her enduring support. Pam was also an active member of the community of ICANN participants within the APAC region. She was known and respected as a leader, facilitator, and active contributor among many in her region. Pam mentored and assisted many new APAC participants in their starts as new ICANN APAC leaders, and was available and helpful to many throughout their ICANN journey.

Pam's roots in the ICANN environment also extend to her time at ICANN-ORG, where she was a valued member of the ICANN Contractual Compliance team and brought her professionalism and subject matter expertise to the role and function.

Pam's passing is a great loss to many people across the ICANN community and organization that had the pleasure to work and interact with her, and for her many friends at ICANN, this loss is significant.

Resolved, one, the GNSO Council wishes to recognize the significant contribution of Pam Little made to the GNSO Council and the ICANN community during her tenure and her notable achievements during this time.

Two, Pam's energy, professionalism, and commitment to the ICANN community will be dearly missed.

Three, on behalf of the current and previous GNSO Council represented today, we offer our deepest and heartfelt sympathies to her family and friends at this most difficult time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So I'd like for the Council to consider this motion. Can we go for a vote?

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in favor of this motion please say aye.

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. With no abstentions or objections, the motion passes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Terri and all. I'd like to ask the past leaders of this community if they wanted to say a word. I've been sent some words by ex-colleagues of hers, Tatiana and Rafik. I understand that they were transcribed into the book that is at the entrance there. I'm sorry, but I'm not going to be able to do this at this stage. If Keith wanted to say something, please go to the mic.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Seb. That was a perfect resolution. Couldn't say it better. But I did want to add a personal note. Pam, Rafik, and I were the leadership team of the council for two years together. I think we made a really, really great team. We were cohesive. We relied on one another. And it was an honor and a privilege to serve with them both.

I have to say that Pam had an amazing attention to detail, something I do not. And I relied on her, and I will miss seeing her. I will miss having her here as a friend, as a colleague, as somebody who would keep me honest. And it's just such a shock for all of us, I know. And this is obviously difficult for us all. But Pam made me a better councilor, a better representative of the community, a better chair, for sure, and a better person.

And so I just want to note that on behalf of those who aren't here to be able to speak in memoriam and to remember Pam, I will miss her smile, and I know that we'll all miss her contributions to the good work that we do here. She was always positive. She always had a smile. She was always getting the work done. She was always getting the work done. And as I said, it was an honor to be able to work with her as a leadership

colleague and as a councilor. So thank you very much for the opportunity.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Thank you for your words. Philippe, who worked with Pam then after Keith.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Seb. What I want to say is that—well, as Keith mentioned, I took over from Keith. That was a difficult time for the community. It was COVID. And for her second term as vice chair, we pretty much worked virtually for the whole year, which meant that she would rise up very early, as you would guess, having people in Europe and back in the U.S. for the support team. And I'll be sure, as Keith said, she could be opinionated in a good way, never spoke ill of anyone. And she was extremely supportive for the team.

And maybe for that reason, because we worked remotely, the thing that I will remember is her voice, her cheerful tone, and her ability to team up and convince people that we should work together. So there we are. Thank you, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Philippe. Graeme, you will have the mic, but maybe I'll invite Farell [inaudible] Just get set up, and we'll let the last two mics. Go ahead, Graeme.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Graeme Bunton from the DNS Abuse Institute, but former chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And Pam was a GNSO councilor for us during much of my tenure. I second those comments about her unbelievable dedication to the job and her attention to detail. There was nothing else like it at the time, and I'm not sure there has been since.

My own brief personal story that I love to share was that I live in Toronto, Canada, with my wife, and my wife is Australian. Vegemite is exceptionally hard to come by there. So I had asked Pam, prior to a meeting, if she could bring me a small tube of Vegemite for my wife. And bless her, she brought over a kilogram of Vegemite to who knows where in the world. And it was such a generous piece. And I miss her quite a lot. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Graeme. Heather?

HEATHER FORREST: On behalf of the Council of 2017 and 2018, I'd like to echo the comments that have previously been made. And likewise, on behalf of all APAC members of the GNSO Council, past and present, add my aye to your motion. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. We'll take now a moment to listen to a piece that Farell offered to play in Pam's name. I would like to remind before that, because we will need to leave the room afterwards, that we have left a

condolence book at the corner of the room. And I strongly encourage everybody that wants to leave a message to do that this week before we send a book back to Australia with the help of Donna Austin. Thank you. Farell, it's all yours.

Thank you. This concludes our meeting. We did plan on having a photo, and we will do it, red eye and all. So for the councilors, we will need to pack up and leave this room because somebody needs it afterwards. We meet just outside there. We'll take a quick picture. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]