
ICANN78 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and GNSO Council
Wednesday, October 25, 2023 – 9:00 to 10:00 HAM

MODERATOR: Hello and welcome to the Joint meeting between the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. All panellists are kindly asked to state their name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. This discussion will be between the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council members only. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience. I will now hand it over to ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Aaron. Welcome everyone to the joint meeting of the ICANN Board and the GNSO. My apologies for arriving late. We had back-to-back meetings and we failed to build walking time. So, these meetings are always very good. It's a candid exchange of ideas and pressure points and other similar issues. And so, shall we start with questions that we sent to you?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think that we wanted to start with the Sub-Pro update support.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Yeah. So, I'd like to first turn it over to you for some opening remarks. Thank you. Yeah. Oh sorry.

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.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you Tripti. This is Sebastian Ducos, chair of the GNSO for a few more hours. And so, I came a company with a few of our councillors, others are in the room. I must say this morning you found a room and intimate setting. It was a bit intimidating but anyway we'll deal with this. We wanted to present an update on our work on SubPro and that shouldn't come as a complete surprise as we're working. Once again must be set hand in hand with the Board on this.

We'll have then a topic, another topic about SubPro but about timelines that I'd like to discuss. And then we'll have Susan, walking through your questions and giving our thoughts about. But so, first I'd like to pass on the mic to Paul McGrady, who's going to walk us through the fantastic job that he's been shepherding with the pending list, the recommendations.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Sebastian. Paul McGrady here for the record. So, we have some questions for you this morning based upon the rationale from the non-adoptions and we'll get those in just a second. But just a very high-level update which is as you may know the GNSO Council has sent back two clarifying statements one for quite a big chunk of recommendations. And then most recently in relationships to the sort of the bigger theme of PICs and RBCs and the Board has voted on the larger chunk a smaller chunk of the picks and RBCs is with you now.

That leaves only a handful of remaining non-adopted recommendations in the small team has basically suggested that the GNSO Council continue to press forward on trying to get those across

the finish line. So, good news, we're going to keep working bad news. They didn't go away I guess. But t we very much want to try to come back to you with something that the Board may find workable. And so, in that process of triaging those that remain, we came up with a couple of questions for the Board that we'd like to ask. And these questions relate the Topic 9 and Topic 17 and Topic 24. The remainder the rationale was fairly move forward. And so, we don't have questions on those. So, should I just dive into those questions now?

So, this is the part in where the council is supposed to meet with the Board and talk this through. So, we're actually not only hoping to get good answers, but we're checking a procedural box, so that we can keep working if that makes sense. So, the first one has to do with the waiver related to the single registrant that is we call Topic 9. And I guess our question on this this has to do with code of conduct issues. The primary question is if the waiver were less broad, would this concept found in Topic 9 be more amenable to the Board?

And then a second question underneath that is, if the Board were amenable, if the waiver were less broad, what elements would the Board be looking for? What would you expect to see in an exception process? And so, I just will throw that out and see if there's reaction to that. And then we have a follow-up question related to the new contractual amendments. So, I don't know who wants to take that.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Paul and Avri. okay. So, just to make sure we're all level set here, this is really the question of the exception from the PICs for single registrants essentially. And the Board's concern with that has always

been that, while it may be true that a single registrant domain may not itself be engaging, we have some assurances that a brand is not going to be itself in using its website for or its domain for phishing and we'll have a certain amount of control over it. if it's not registering domains to third parties. We are quite concerned that an increasing source of problems is actually takeover of websites as opposed to malicious use by the registrant. It's really taken over by malicious actors and a blanket waiver of that, doesn't address the malicious capture the compromise of the website. So, the Board's inclination to date has been to say no, we want to have those requirements for doing the scans and not those kinds of preventative proactive checks to make sure that there's misuse.

Now, some folks have said that brand registries for example, actually do other things. They have compensating controls. I think that we wouldn't take that possibility off of the table, but it probably is appropriate on a case by case basis. So, if a brand registry came up and said we don't do this particular scan that you that you've asked us to do but we do X Y and Z and those are compensating controls that cover all of those things. I don't think that we would say no sort of comprehensively without seeing those and looking at them, but we can't say yes in advance because it's going to be case by case. Avri?

AVRI DORIA:

The only thing I would add is, if those were measures that had been developed and had been shown to be effective, then there's a history on different methods on different ways of handling it, then I expect that you would find a greater reception to getting an exception, but it's not

something you get at the beginning. It's something that you've shown along the way that we've got something else.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you both. And just a quick follow-up question was during the recent, assuming they're adopted contractual amendments related to DNS Abuse, does that give the Board any more comfort in relationship to going along with an exception process or its a neutral factor?

AVRI DORIA:

I almost say the same thing I said. If over time those things turn out have been effective, then they become a reasonable part that at the moment a they haven't passed. So, there's a big if there. Hopeful and second then seeing them in operation and seeing how clever people get around them will be part of what needs to be looked at.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you. I appreciate the direct answers on that and I think it gives us a sense of what we need to be talked about in terms of if we're going to introduce an exception process how to phrase that. So, I thank you for that. Our next topic is related to applicant support. This is Topic 17. And so, just by way of background the small team is aware of the reasons why the recommendation was not adopted. And so, and somebody asked me to say from the stage that nobody thinks the Board is against applicant support. The GNSO Council certainly not against it.

In fact, I've not heard from anybody who's against it. So, I think that not to take pressure off the Board to open the wallet as I've been saying all week, but I think that it's important to say that we're all in the same

rowboat, and we're just trying to figure out how to use the ores. So, for the record I think that there's a lot of good faith on this topic around community. But even so, we understand the reason why it was rejected. There was part of the rationale that said, as a result the Board is conducting ongoing work related to expanding the scope of financial support, we're about to bring together members of the community to help the GNSO Council small team finish up these recommendations and ideas are coming all quarters. We were hoping that you could clarify for us, what it means that the Board is doing that work. Is its independent work that the Board is doing as a Board or is that related or is that referring to the work of the IRT staff? Because the IRT staff has told us that they had been coming up with ideas and they want to come and talk to us. We just want to make sure that if, the Board has its own ideas that we don't foolishly not find a way to on Board those.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. I'll take that and by the way, I want to say I have a long history of being a great fan of applicant support. Now, I think normally when the Board says it's working on something, we're talking about it a little and staff is doing a lot of work. So, I believe that staff is coming up with a whole bunch of or at least three interesting proposals. We had a conversation the other day where they did have a whole bunch and they said, well, probably not this one probably. Oh, more discounts here, more percentages there. Yeah. More help and fellowships here. Yeah. You know so, they're basically going through a list of possibilities and then there in come communication with the IRT.

So, I don't think because staff is the connection between IRT and the Board here in terms of the discussion, I think they're very much in the

same space, looking at those kinds of solutions that don't involve the outlay of cash to who knows whom but basically the doing and the discounting and such.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you, Avri. And we have a follow-up question on this. As to whether or not the recently released a globally recognized procedures for financial assistance program has changed the Board's thinking on how to expand the financial support. This is the I think that's like a 70, was this is the 75 pager that has been circulating around. I don't know if that's something that has had an effect yet. It's early days. It's as we would say, airplane reading on the way over and it may just have been at the bottom of your giant stack.

PAUL MCGRADY:

I do not believe the Board has digested that document yet.

BECKY BURR:

It's really Let me just say that it is a resource and this is an on this is ongoing work. So, if there are good ideas that avoid the concerns that the Board had with face there's nothing that's off the table other than the concerns that we expressed with respect to those two the specific proposals.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you. And thank you both for not asking me how much of it I've read. So, and that moves us on to our last topic which is Topic 24 on string similarity evaluations. And so, this is one where was one of those rare recommendations coming out of SubPro working group that I

understand was unanimous. I was on that. I was in that working group and it's been a while. And I don't remember what was unanimous and was it. And so, this is one where essentially the community is looking for certainty on singulars and plurals.

And so, our question is whether or not the Board can confirm, whether its concerns are about the singular plurals being added to the scope of string similarity. And the exemption for intended use was the recommendation not adopted by the Board because the Board cannot edit the recommendation to carve out the intended use element. In other words, are both factors of that problematic? Is it the singular plural and the intended use or is it primarily the intended use? That essentially, we're asking can we do surgery on this one? Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA:

So, it definitely is the intended use in the sense that's all bound up with the content regulation issues that are potentially difficult. Having said that the sort of the blanket singular plurals issue does give the Board some pause from the sense in the sense that what we are comfortable with is the visually confusing assessment of similar of confusingly similar and that if you just have a sort of blanket singulars and plurals, you get questions with singulars and plurals cross languages where something is a plural of a of French word that means nothing related to the English singular gets mixed up in all of this.

So, I think that somebody asked me the other day well what if we said one letter difference is automatically the addition of an s is automatically confusingly similar. I think there are things that we can think about in person. And I'd certainly would prefer not to have like

the straight just add an s and it's and it's and it's okay. But I think that the fundamental issue that the Board has is getting away from adding rules that are both under inclusive and over inclusive when the standard of visual similarity is the one thing that we're comfortable with. Now, could the standard for that be applied in a more consistent and reliable way? Yes. Absolutely.

PAUL MCGRADY:

And this is this is off script so, I apologize. So, for the singular and plural could that be an element that the evaluators of the visual consider. Not necessarily a binding element but an element.

PAUL MCGRADY:

I think at that point is where you start getting into some of the very interesting conversations and we've had a bunch of them in the Board. So, the answer to your first question is yeah. We couldn't do much because the recommendation wasn't separable. But then when you start looking at the complexity of how you would make up those rules. It's hard to imagine a priority how that and perhaps this can be constructed in some way where the cases that you're thinking, the cases that the Becky is thinking of could be IRT-ed, etcetera but it's really how do you a, separate the two in the motion and b, come up with a set of rules that make sense and are implementable, etcetera.

EDMON CHUNG:

Edmond here. Just adding this off-script in. I think the answer is obviously not just surgical. I mean there there's some definition of singular and plural that needs to be and the Board is not the right place to talk about and negotiate that. If there is a clearer policy or if you have

a reference table or some algorithm for referencing that applies to different languages and the community is comfortable blah blah. I think we can definitely take it. Again personally, I guess speaking personally then I think Singular plural is good topic to think about, but it's too hard. And I guess the Board is not the right arbiter for creating that policy if that makes sense.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you all and I apologize for going off script, but I think that last little chunk is super helpful. Susan would like to say something.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks. Sorry. Hi. It's Susan Payne. And this is sort of off script, but I hope you'll realize it's not. It relates to appeals. Appeals are not recommendations. I think at the moment that you've non-adopted. It's still sort of somewhat in limbo, but it very much is relevant to when we're having this conversation about the singular and parallel issue.

I think one of the things that you'd mentioned, Becky, was that you were very comfortable with the visual similarity and that obviously if applicants were unhappy with where that came out, there was always the string confusion objection, but that only works one way. If you are found not to be confusingly similar and one of the parties thinks you are, that there is string similarity, then the objection is there. But if you're found confusing and you think that's the wrong decision, there's no path unless this appeal process that the SubPro developed does get implemented. So, I just wondered where that sits.

BECKY BURR:

That's a very interesting bringing together of those two issues. So, on the interim challenges and appeals as I think we've said the Board is in strong support of interim challenges in supports to the extent that they simplify and make the process more efficient and more fair. What we are having enormous trouble dealing with is the fact that there's these interim challenges on this long list of things when we don't know what the precise process would be, what the precise mechanism would be, and it's likely that the precise mechanism would be different for different kinds of issues.

And the way that recommendation is put forward, it essentially creates lots of opportunities to have disputes about whether the Board or the applicant guidebook properly implements the policy recommendation. And when we create those opportunities for disputes, we are going to have lots of opportunities for endless iteration which will not make the process, the application process more efficient and more fair.

So, the concept of interim challenges and appeals wherever you can make those work is something that the Board is quite supportive of but, the blanket have interim challenges and appeals for these things is not something that the Board has been able to get comfortable with. So, I think one of the things that we wanted to talk about is, can you come back to us with a with a recommendation that says, create interim challenges and appeals where you can where it's feasible that are designed to make the process more efficient and more fair.

And then have staff come up with a series of recommendations that work through IRT and the like for the specific things. And so, Susan the point that you made about this being a one-way street is something that would definitely be considered, but we want to look at that in the

context of how much opportunity, is it really going to make the system the process more efficient and more fair?

So, I don't think I'm revealing any secrets when I say the Board has not gotten comfortable with that recommendation. The Board would like a recommendation that says, look at these things and try to find them out, because otherwise we're going to do, we'd like to do that anyway, but we don't want to, we would have no policy basis for doing that absent some kind of recommendation from the council on it, but the way the current recommendation is set up we're not comfortable with it.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Susan. And thank you, Becky. Is that something that could be accomplished with a clarifying statement or is it a supplemental recommendation in your mind?

BECKY BURR:

I think it's a supplemental recommendation and that is my loyal-- I just put my loyal heart on, and I think if I was the person administering on the other end of this, this would be my worst-- that recommendation would be my worst nightmare. Sorry. So, I don't think a clarifying statement, unless it really is essential. What we need is clarification that that list is not a list of all the things that need to be done. I just think we'd have to look at it, but I think a supplementary recommendation is what we prefer.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Becky. And so, with that, I will say that the small team is currently working on its work plan to try to get all this back to you as quickly as we can. So, the sooner you can hit that thing back across a tennis net at us, that'd be great. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: I believe that we plan to get that back to you very quickly. And I just want to take the opportunity to say, and I know Avri will want to check-in it. It has been a really wonderful experience working with small team and the council on these things that the way in which it's been iterative and collaborative has been great. And I think it's a model for the way we can work together moving forward.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. Becky and you, Avri, are national treasures. I mean, that the way that you have been with us, I mean you spent endless hours with us. And unless you're following along on those calls, I don't think the community understands how much Becky and Avri have contributed to the process, and we thank you for it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, this is Sebastian Ducos again. The second topic that we wanted to talk about is the topic of timing for the next round. And in particular, I have been quite vocal since the beginning of the year, to obtain date for the opening of the next application phase. To me this is absolutely important as to have a hard stop where we need to have delivered by and making sure that we have a precise date a Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday is not so, much the problem but a precise date, to measure our efforts against and making sure that we will meet and making sure

that we're putting the resources that we need, if we find that we're late and so on and so forth.

We received your blog on the 1st of August, and we've understood April 2026. To me that's not a date. It's a month and there are shared concerns that there might be some slippage. And so, I continue insisting on the fact that I'd like a date, but this week we also found out and I think genuinely and generally applaud the fact that there's been some movement in the team, a change of direction a change of heads and in particular invitation of to sorry the appointment of a Marika to the very important role of operationally conducting this.

Now, I don't know that the job spec is completely defined and that's fine. I know for a fact that she hasn't started. It will start in a few weeks. And if she owns this apart from the fact that Lincoln and I our good friends that have been working very closely together for the last two years, is not fair to ask her or to impose on her a date that she doesn't own. So, let's not try to get this today. I understand that. But let's try to get this anyway working with her giving, her the time it takes for her to receive all the information, to digest that information.

But then the next question is by when can we agree to have this date? And a question was asked the other evening by Frank a very reasonable question is, how much time do we need as a community to prepare ourselves? Because this is not a program that I can always deliver to the community is a program that you're delivering to the community for us to go and deliver to the rest of the world. And we also need to get ready get staffed get all the same things that you're doing we need to do on our end.

And in order to get people not as motivated but having the money on the table etcetera, we need to know by when. We need to know how much we need to know all these things. I've gone back yesterday was a constituency day. So, I've gone back to my constituency of the CPH in general and ask them. And I believe that you have a meeting with them shortly this morning and they'll give their answer to them. The general consensus also that I've heard is that a year. So, the principle of two years to get to an AGB publish it and then a year to roll this out. And the day we have the AGB we will have the date of the application window.

The general consensus is that a year is going to be way too short for us. We will need to know before. Now, we don't want to have the AGBM for say well you told me that you needed two years. So, let's do it two years later. No. We're still holding on to April 2026, but we would like to have more warning better understanding earlier. Now, you and I had a meeting this week, we discussed about the possibility of sharing the plans. We discussed also the fact that at least from our community point of view, this is work that we're doing together.

This is not a us and it's not a you deliver, and we blame you for not making it on time. It's something that we genuinely need to do together. We're tie I keep on saying we're a tiny little village here representing the world but we're all in it together in that village. And so, we ask you and insist on the fact that we absolutely want to see the kitchen. We want to be part of it. We work with you on this and we want to work together on this. Becky was just mentioning the collaborative work on this multi, but it's the same the same spirit. We're all in it together. And so, yes, we need to see this. We need to have it. Again, dates costs timelines and also, to keep us honest tell us when you need

us by when and we will work with the rest community to make sure that we deliver our end to. Yeah.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Sebastian. First, I'd like to start by saying I appreciate the sense of cooperation that has existed the last several months especially with the small teams and Becky and Avri leading the effort on the Board side and we really appreciate the just the collaboration and where we are today. So, based on our previous conversations we selected April 2026 as a date. I did not realize that you wanted a precise date, so we picked a month. And if I understand you correctly, you're saying that we said the AGB is critical. We need to get that done.

And from that point we can extrapolate a date and we said one year from the time the AGB is done. Now, remember that lots of dependencies surrounding these dates and this is a beast of a project. I don't want to speak for Org, but I have taken into consideration your request from my conversation the other day. You asked for Gantt charts. My understanding is it's included in the implementation plan, but we will point that out to you again. But I'm going to turn it over to Sally now who is really truly the one who mixes the sausage and she will give you more details.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Tripti. Thank you, Sebastian. Yes. We've discussed this and we will continue to discuss this a lot. And I absolutely echo what Richard said and we're all very interconnected here to get this done. And thank you very much for making the point at the end of your

comment Sebastien, that you need to hear from us what do you need from the community when?

And this also you talked about a collaborative process to what I'm going to very loosely project management, project implementation. So, the continued existence of this partnership that we've built so strongly which just while I have the microphone I'm on. I do want to thank the council very much for the leadership you have shown around that and the hard work and hours you have put in. Because no, it is not only has it been critical to get us to where we are. I mean I don't know how we would have done it. We couldn't have done it without you around, but also, you're showing the ICANN community what collaborative trust based multi-stakeholder process is actually like in practice.

How we can change the way we work in such a way that we can get more done and we can get it done in a way that doesn't damage the policy requirements that keeps us true to what the community has asked for. This is innovative and effective and I want to do everything we can. And to do my part to make sure that we keep that going because it's not just important to get the project delivered, it's critical. I think it's we're showing by what we're doing. And I use this example a lot when I'm talking to governments and we're broadly on platforms about why the multi-stakeholder process and why it works. Like here we are right now doing this.

So, I just wanted to share that because it goes beyond the beast of the project, it's just you called it. Now the question about the resourcing you talked about, Sebastian, inside the organization. Yes. The first phase. Well, it's not the first, this project has had many phases but the most recent phase of the project, let's call it that, between when we all

agreed in Cancun that we were going to really collectively kind of what I called it "hold hands and jump". Like we were literally, the Board and the Board chair and I and the organization and you said right, we're going to do this. We're going to give it everything we can. Because we've just got to do that and that needs all of us.

And we did that in Cancun. Remember we got a huge round of applause from the community. It was a really big deal. And at that point, but we hadn't planned to do that. None of us had. You hadn't we hadn't we did decide we got to do this. And so, all of us everybody involved including Paul, Becky and Avri. What I've said to my staff is guys you've been living on fumes. You know what I'm saying. We didn't any of us have a chance to say, okay we know what we're going to be giving up all this time for this length of time.

We've got to stop doing a whole bunch of other things in our lives so, we can make the space for to happen. So, all of us have been doing extra work long hours often in different difficult time zones all, of us have been collecting computers including my staff. Now, we also knew because we believed once we knew at Washington that we believed as the org that we were going be able to deliver the plan by Washington, which we committed to do, but as we all work together, we go oh we're really going to do this? And we said, yes, we can do this. And we did. And the point that I'm making, I work very closely with all my teams and right guys. When we put that on paper and it's the implementation plan, it has to be deliverable.

So, your question are we confident? Am I confident? That what is in that implementation plan, based on everything we know now, we can put all our resources that you need us to do into an April date, yes.

Otherwise we would not have put it in the plan. That might be different from the past. It might be the same as the past but I wanted to make that really clear while we're all together. And I spent hours with the team saying, are you sure? What if this, what if that, what if the other? So, I feel very confident and my team is very confident that that is doable for us. But of course, I don't want to label the point, there are variables, that were dependencies.

And the critical dependency is the applicant guidebook and I know everybody in this room knows that. Now, on the plus side, we've done it before, we're not starting from know what, we collectively we have dotted line in the guidebook. It's not like we've got to start from the beginning and say what is an applicant guidebook? On the other hand, just 10 years later, lots of things. We learned a lot of things from last time. Lots of things have changed. But all of you will know that of course if we don't have an applicant guidebook finished, we don't really have very clear requirements for the platform itself.

We know broadly because we've done it before, and I've got the teams working now in parallel structures so that we can go as fast as we can with hypothesis and working assumptions as you would expect. So, but nonetheless, we're going to have to what we're going to do and I know you guys know this because we talked about it for the benefit of the rest of the council, the team will work like this all the time, pass-pass-pass-pass, shut the gate, shut the gate, move forward, pass back, forwards, back, forwards, because as you close out the policy requirements, there's an applicant guidebook drafting team and as an engineering team and they're working under Marika's leadership in a very classic project management structure which we put in place.

I worked on that as soon as I knew the plan was going to be, I felt confident that we could deliver the plan. So, through the summer and I spent a lot of time in LA and with staff on the around working out what exactly is it going to take, not just in terms of professional skills but in terms of people leadership skills.

Internally and excellently because keeping this relationship close and effective is more than just about running project management plans. We have to trust each other, not everything's going to be perfect. And when it's not perfect we have to pick each other up and say okay fine. We'll let this go. We can do it again. That is a special kind of experience in solving these kinds of community problem sense. Marika has choice with Lars, who knows very well or deeply knowledgeable on the content side.

And then, we've changed the T Mobile slightly because it's a different stage of the project, and we've just about to bring in and she's arriving imminently an extremely experienced external implementation personal person because we need just that's something we learned from the first round. Guess what? There isn't one single person that can deliver all of this. Of course, there isn't going to be a single her the senior, who is an expert on the policy and the issues and the considerations of the working partnership, but is also running enormous implementation operation projects. So, it's a team of many, but a particularly a core team of four under Marika's leadership and the 4th person is a dedicated communications person. As many of you have said to me, we need to keep talking we need to be really on the communications.

We can't just have the comms team waiting for us to deliver products. We need to have them in the process all the way through. So, I wanted to just give you that level of detail, because you talked about the team structure so, that is where we're coming from because absolutely, we won't do this in these meetings all the time and I know you say to me, look Sally, you just do it the way you want but we're in this together. This is a different kind of process. And finally, I'd say on the date itself, because you asked a very specific question Sebastian, kind of when will we know? And you made it you said look we can't wait if it's two years to do the AGB, a year isn't long enough is what you just said.

I think my hope on this is that we are comfortable with AGE. So, if that hasn't changed, it isn't a... which is this expression? I think fungible. That's not how we built the plan. Okay? But we don't know how we're going to get on none of us do. So, what I really hope to do and we'll work it very closely together as we go trips including me. So, Theresa and I will be the sponsors of the project Hansel. And I made it clear to the to the team and I will continue to be in that role with my stakeholder engagement role not with my interim CEO, because whatever happens with the CEO role, that's a huge part then success of the program is we're taking the program to different parts of the world to make sure we have different kinds of people applying that we didn't have in the last round and that is my other job and that's why I put it in there. So, we will not be, it will not just be Rico, will not be on her own, far from it.

She will have enormous support and there is an executive team steering coach. So, it's a very structured well-resourced project. And because of that, as we work with you through the through the next weeks months, I think it will inevitably become clearer. As we go it will become obvious

to us as a collective group. How are we getting on? What the implementation plan does if you like as a kind of an engineering idea these two years plus one, those charts will show the dependencies. I need this before I can do this.

Now, those will not change. We're still going to need to do that because that's how the project the house is built. But what might happen, and Avri was very lively, we had a very lively Board discussion about this earlier in the anyway. Some parts of that process so I can't remember the word you used. I'm going to use my word squidgy than others. It's technical term. And you said squishy, okay, we'll have squishier or "squidgier". I don't know.

That's an interesting, but it's important because it sounds trivial but it's not, because what we'll see almost in real time as we're doing that work together is that will play out. And that will give us those windows of opportunity as we go along. So can we look at actually [inaudible 00:42:38]. Apologies for long-awaited answer, but I know it's important. And I know that you, I thought it would be helpful to have it all out now. And then any question we have any discussion we have. I'm very able to do that. But I hope that's helpful detail for the council. For the GNSO, not just the council.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Sally. I think that Thomas had a point and a quick one because we still also want to answer the questions the Board sent us.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks so, much, Seb. Hi. everyone. Thomas Rickert for the record. I'll try to make this very brief, but I think that some of us are still

traumatized from the various delays that we experienced in the last round. And I'm happy that so, many of us are using the concept of trust when we are in these meetings this during this week and it looks like Chuck Gomes words that he said during the 20th anniversary celebration of the GNSO still resonate with us. I saw an interview with a composer who was asked what inspires him most when doing firm scores and the answer was a deadline.

I think that this is so true. And when we discuss this topic in council preparing for this meeting, it's not like we expect you to tell us dates but we are willing to commit to these dates. And so, it's not a one-way street that we're expecting a commitment from you, but we're in this together. And I think that several projects over the last 10, 15 years have shown that whenever we were working against the deadline, I think that the Ayanna stewardship transition with the clock ticking is probably a prime example for that. We delivered because we need it delivered in order to make it happen. Otherwise, we would fail.

And I think I'm not exaggerating that the situation is comparable. This is about trust, delivering, making commitments and delivering accordingly by the Org, by the Board, by the GNSO and its community, because otherwise we're going to lose trust from the outside world. It's not only the contracted parties that try to do business with us, but there is an expectation by those who are interested in getting new names that they have something to lean on, when trying to secure budgets when they want to get the support of their respective communities. And if we make them wait, they will lose interest and we will lose them and therefore, I think we don't have to do it now. Deadlines have to be realistic. That's all confirmed. But I think that in the next couple of

weeks, we should really try to find out what the deadlines for the respective groups are and then we all commit to playing by them.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you. We will come back to you. We're taking back your request and orders looking at it and we will come back with something more precise with concrete. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So, for the third phase of discuss, I'll pass on the mic to Susan Payne who was going to try to answer some of the questions you sent to us.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks. Hi. It's Susan Payne here. I'm one of the councillors for the IPC. I think I'm going to kick this off. I'm I don't think I've got all the full to that question, but certainly when we were considering the Board's question about the FY26-30 strategic plans. One of the things that we feel is important and we think you've heard this from the other the constituencies and stakeholder groups and indeed from wider than that across probably the course of yesterday, is that being continuing to monitor and really actively engage on what's coming down the pike outside of ICANN, the legislative developments, the discussions that are happening in Europe, but also in other governments and being sure that Org and the community are aware of what's coming and what the potential impacts could be on this space.

I think we always use the GDPR example as an example that's kind of starting to become a little historic but it's a good one. But I mean we've

more recently we've had legislative proposals in Europe about geographical indications and if they had gone in a particular direction we'd have been having to change the UDRP or all GTLD registry operators would have had to build their own kind of version of UDRP to deal with GI rights.

And so, really just kind of wanting to say we would share a desire to have a commitment to continuing to do more and better in terms of keeping us all abreast of what's going on, and that engagement with at the governmental level of if you do this, that's what it will mean for this space. So, thanks. But I think Anne was I turning to you on the right? I'll pause first.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE:

Just as a response. Yes, we have. So, we started development work towards the next strategic plan which is FY26 and we will likely be in the throes of the next round, when we create this plan. And you're absolutely right. We have accelerated our engagement, government engagement as you know, you've probably heard a lot about whizzes at this meeting. So, that's roughly two years away.

And we have all hands-on deck to look closely at how we're going to address that because there's an effort underway to potentially look at other models in managing this. And so, we have to reinforce the multistate hold holder models say show people that it works. Yes, it's not a perfect model. I don't think there is any perfect model for any system, but this does do its job. And we are looking exactly what you said. What are the regulations? What are the legislative efforts underway that could potentially impact us?

Like you said, geographical indicators. So, what we would love for you, is while we develop this plan it's going to probably take us maybe a year, a year and a half to get the plan in place. There will be listening sessions and talking sessions and many meetings. Please come with your ideas so, that we can then be prepared to one visualize what this world looks like 3-5 years from now and how we will embrace that world and deal with the how do we have to pivot to deal with what's coming down the pike.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: So, any other feedback on that?

JOHN MCELWAINE: John McElwaine. One of the things that I would have specifically mentioned when we covered this in the GNSO council meeting was how it really impacts the future work of the RDRS system and then the implementation of SSAD. So, those clearly that is we got the two years we that, we'll be doing on the RDRS and then moving into taking that information, what did we glean from that and then implementing the SSAD and making sure that if there are any future privacy developments anything like that that's getting baked into that system.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thank you. Yes.

GREG DIBIASE: This is Greg DiBiase. One other note that was raised in Council was just kind of highlighting how much implementation is on the table right now. And so, in the next 3-5 years. I mean we just talked about SubPro

but there's a lot of other examples that it's always great to focus on implementation but it seems like there's a particular amount of work on the table there right now.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks. Anne Aikman Scalese. NomCom non-voting on the council. And I think what Susan was referring to is that I had made a comment that I feel that in 3-5-year time frame, the success of the applicant support program will be very important to ICANN's global reputation. And that report that was done by staff, that the 75 pages, it's brilliant work about capacity building. And so, really commend it to you for reading but it's about again building trust with the global community. So, thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Just a quick bit of information because I think it's where it hopes helpful. I talked about the Marika taking over the SubPro project team and Karen Lentz who many of you will know who's done astounding service, leading that project through this incredibly difficult period of time is coming over back to her day job to lead the policy team implementation team that part of the work. So, I think this is really going to be helpful. We know this a lot on the table. So, I want to make sure that and we have other resources in the organization, but I just thought probably a lot of you will know Karen. And she's going to be part of that administration.

EDMON CHUNG: No. Not directly adding on what you said. I think that's important. And building on what Tripti response too, I want to pick up on Susan's point

and it seems like there are regulations or other things that are coming down the pipeline I think as much as the Board of hopefully through the staff government engagement team gets this information, but a lot of the policy work will need to come from bottom up from the council.

So, one thing that I think is relevant to the strategic plan, is I think at least personally, I'm hoping that this next version or this this next version will actually not only be relevant for the general community work, but it could become a part of a guideline for the community as well because the last version, it was a bit more of a guideline for I guess the Org and the Board, but slightly less for the community, but if those information can come up through the process in developing the strategic plan, then the strategic plan can also guide the priorities of the GNSO council and the other community work. And I think that would be a huge win for ICANN, I guess I'm calling this team ICANN in general. So, I just want to add that particular part to make the strategic plan also relevant for the GNSO work then that fits into exactly what you were raising, I think.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Any other comments feedback? Well, oh yes, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Just to add on to Tripti's comments about the strategic plan. Even though we have listed here the next 3-5 years, I think it's important when thinking about that time frame that you actually think further ahead. I think it's incumbent upon all of us to think about what the environment is going to be like for ICANN, what the environmental factors are in a longer time frame and I would encourage people when

they think about when they're contributing to the strategic planning process, that they really look 10 years plus because that's a time frame within which we really do need to do the next plan rather than just a relatively short period of 3-5 years. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Matthew. Other comments or questions? Well, that brings us to the end of this meeting. First, I'd like to thank the Council for meeting with us. And I would like to congratulate Sebastian on your tenure as chair of the Council. This is your last meeting. So, I'd like to give you a large round of applause please for your contributions and under your leadership, there's been tremendous cooperation with Org and Board and the Council, and we'd really look forward to getting to some more dates and deadlines and we'll get there. We'll get it trust us. Thank you very much everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]