ICANN79 | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and GNSO Council
Monday, March 4, 2024 – 3:00 to 4:00 SJU

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello. My name is Franco Carrasco. I am the participation manager for this session. Welcome to the joint session between the ICANN Board and the Generic Name Supporting Organization Council. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic. Please state your name for the record and the language that you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please also remember to speak at a reasonable pace.

This discussion today is between the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience today. All are welcome to use the Zoom chat. Please note that the private chats are only possible amongst panelists in a Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session's host, co-host, and other panelists. With that, I will hand the floor over to the ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Franco. Welcome, everyone. Thank you, Greg, and to the GNSO Council. This is actually the first of our many bilaterals. So you're first in line. Well, we always look forward to this meeting. It's our time to have an informal discussion. I know we've exchanged questions, but nevertheless, I don't believe we should feel restricted to them. Let's make sure this is an organic discussion on topics.

We sent you one question and we got four from you. It turns out there's an overlap on NIS2 with our questions. With that, Greg, I was actually going to turn it over to you for opening remarks, and let's decide how we want to run this.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. Thank you, Tripti. It's a pleasure to be here. I'd also like to thank the Board for their engagement recently. I feel like we've had a lot of productive both formal and informal meetings and resolving issues, particularly with regard to the SubPro recommendations. It feels like we're making great progress there. Like you said, we look forward to an open dialogue. I guess we have more questions so perhaps we'll start.

All right. The first topic is regarding recommendations that are "Board-ready," and this is something we've discussed for a while now. We want to ensure to the maximum extent possible the Board is not surprised by recommendations or we're aware of potential issues and the recommendations we send to the Board. We've been thinking about that issue from a number of perspectives, and I think Thomas will give a little more detail of what we're thinking, and potentially some questions.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks so much, Greg. Hi, everybody. Now, for those who have not followed the recent discussions in the GNSO, I should probably explain what Board-ready means. Because what we've seen a couple of times in the last few years is that the GNSO has produced policy recommendations that then went to the Board, and the Board had issues with recommendations, leading to either a situation where the Board did not adopt recommendations or they sent them back to the GNSO Council for them to be amended and fixed. This doesn't make the GNSO Council look good. It doesn't make the GNSO look good. It doesn't make ICANN look efficient. So we were looking for ways to make this whole process more effective and avoid complications in the very last minute. So we were thinking that it would be good to increase at least the chances of GNSO policy recommendations not being at risk of being rejected. That's not the proper term, I know, but I guess you guys understand what I mean. We want to reduce the risk of non-adoption of policy recommendations.

We had a couple of discussions with the Board already. We had a great exchange at our Strategic Planning session in December on how we could do that, acknowledging and realizing that the Board cannot and must not be involved in policymaking, so you can't do policy on our behalf. But we still think that in addition to involving ICANN Org for their feedback and in addition to involving the liaisons, maybe it would be a good idea for us to present to you policy recommendations if and when they are sufficiently stable that they might enjoy consensus in a working group for your feedback. We do not think that this is something that we should formalize in a particular way because that would make things cumbersome again. But maybe we can discuss this more and reach an informal agreement whereby you agree to be helpful and chime in so that we avoid friction at a later point. I hope that's a fair reflection of where we are. Anything to add, Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: Yes. In particular, we were looking at the concept of Board liaisons being involved in these points within the policy development process where comment is necessary. To Thomas's point—and we want to be clear about this—this is not policy recommendations but more looking at feasibility and implementation concerns. And the sooner, I guess, in the process those can be raised, maybe the more effectively they can be addressed.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Greg and Thomas, for the question. We couldn't agree more that just in the spirit of expediency, early intervention always helps. Becky is going to address this for us. Becky, over to you.

BECKY BURR: I think we've talked about this several times in the last several months, that more informal interactions that we are having, the more convinced we are that these are extremely valuable. I think the liaisons have been getting more comfortable with the line between intervening in the policy development process versus being engaged enough to understand when to say that could create a problem for the Board. That is taking some learning on our part and also we certainly appreciate the way in which the Board liaisons are being received in the process. I think I'm speaking for myself but I know there are many other liaisons around the table who feel very welcomed and welcome to participate in this, and I think that's very valuable.

The notion that you're proposing here is that before things are fully baked and before they get thrown over the transom, there's a conversation between not just the liaison but the Board more broadly. I think we are open to all of those kinds of suggestions. Obviously, we all have time limits, but taking a little time out to do that may be much more efficient than what happens down the road if we don't. We've been experimenting with lots of different ways of engaging with the community, and I think this is another area where it makes sense.

We also talked about a regular periodic check-in between the Council and the Board. I think we haven't talked about this a lot in the Board, but Tripti and I have talked about it. We also think that is just a good way to keep the lines of communication open. Bottom line, we're open to this, and just a thank you for making the Board liaison feel welcome in the process.

THOMAS RICKERT: Just to say that we much appreciate your response and your willingness to work with us more. I think I can speak on behalf of the entire Council that we very much appreciate the dialogue with you. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Thomas. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Just quickly adding to what Becky said and what Thomas said, I think over the last few years, we have formalized some of the channels like the liaison, like the other parts. And I think the Board very much welcomed the informal approach. On the formal side of things, we're also well aware that we're going through the review of the ODA and ODP processes, how we can front run many of that into the policy development process before it's thrown over us, as you said. And also, how much of it, I suppose, could be done in the IRT. That's one of the important things about the ODP and ODA review. I think part of the discussion, including some informal channels and informal processes, with a small P then, would be very useful. Let's brainstorm around how do we actually then take the next step is probably a little bit—I don't want to throw it in your court, but it seems like we're all ears, tell us what you want to do more.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Edmon. That actually is an ongoing action item we had coming out of our Strategic Planning sessions, is to continually identify points where this engagement makes sense. Then with regards to your point on the ODP, optimistic might be the word, that this engagement can reduce the need for a formalistic and burdensome ODP and just lead to efficiencies and policy development generally.

Okay. Moving on to the next question. This involves the Board resolutions from Hamburg concerning Recommendation 7 of the CCWG on Auction Proceeds. We had sent a letter raising concerns about this resolution, and that the resolution had put forth that accountability mechanisms such as the IRP could be contracted around within the Terms of Service for applicants applying for Applicant Support, and that a Bylaw might not be necessary to disallow these accountability mechanisms, even though the recommendation referenced the Bylaw amendments specifically. Since then, we've received the proposal for a Bylaw amendment, as well as your letter, Tripti, on amending Recommendation 7 to maybe broaden what can be challenged or taking out reference to the Applicant Support generally.

As an initial issue, we want to say thank you for keeping this dialogue alive and not responding in a formalistic letter. We note that in your letter, you did address our concern using the Terms of Service to contract around an accountability mechanism. I guess our questions at this point, as we're still digesting the proposed Bylaw as well as the letter, has the perspective of the Board changed since that resolution was passed? In other words, does the Board still believe that accountability mechanisms can be contracted around by Terms of Service? And does the Board now believe that a Bylaw amendment is necessary? I think that's the first question.

The second question we noted that the Bylaw amendment is broader than what is in Recommendation 7. So Recommendation 7 speaks to this specific situation of Applicant Support. The Bylaw speaks to situations where CWG recommends that accountability mechanism can be disallowed. Then any other comments or background you have on the two new things that were sent out. Apologies if that was a little wordy.

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much for the question. And thank you for your patience while we continue to refine our thinking on this. As you know, the spirit of the Grant Program is to preserve the Grant Fund for its use. So we're being very, very cautious and deliberate in how we dealt with Recommendation 7. There are two parts to your question. Maarten is the shepherd on that and Becky is also a subject matter expert on the Bylaw amendments. So, Maarten, go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. Thanks for indeed re-raising the issue because if it's an issue for you, it's an issue for us. I think we always had the same intent. Let's put that first. We want to use that money for its purpose, not for other purposes.

Now, how to go around it, that is where we had the approach where we thought we shouldn't think every time that something new comes up to the Bylaws, but make clear that the Bylaws—and Becky will go deeper into that—provide an opportunity for the community to live with access to certain accountability mechanisms.

For the Recommendation 7, you have seen the letter. It's really that I think at the time where the CCWG-AP developed the policy, the implementation wasn't fully considered, and therefore, it's a practical amendment to make sure that the money will not be spent on other factors than only its purpose. To go beyond the individual independent panel's decision, also the other decisions that relate to that, you see that reflected.

So we look forward to the response of all the chartering organizations. GNSO is an important one in that. And that seems to be the right way forward at this moment. We also feel that because in the intent we always had the same feeling, that it shouldn't keep us back from launching the first tranche of 10 million sooner than later. So we'll come back on that later this week.

BECKY BURR: I just want to first answer your question about do we think a Bylaws amendment is necessary. We've put it out there. That's the answer. We are proceeding to seek a Bylaws amendment and the decision to fund the program contains a reservation that says if we don't get the Bylaws amendment, we have to rethink. That's the answer to that. On the question of how the proposed Bylaws amendment is structured, what we sought to do was create a mechanism that preserved every ounce of authority that is granted to the Empowered Community with respect to fundamental Bylaws. But to provide a mechanism that uses that authority and preserves that authority that says, rather than hanging "Here's a specific exclusion here and here's another specific exclusion there," that would outline the process by which the community could recommend to the Board that the accountability mechanism should be restricted in some way. And based on an expression of the Empowered Community that is equivalent to the fundamental Bylaws change process, the Board could go ahead and do that without having to enact a Bylaws change every single time.

Now, does that mean we expect that there are going to be lots of carve-outs and exclusions to the IRP and the reconsideration? No. It's not intended to reflect that at all. What it really is intended to capture is a more orderly mechanism to describe how we will do something that we may do from time to time. Probably rarely because the accountability mechanisms are a cornerstone of our accountability work and the 2016 Bylaws transition. We just think this is a better way to describe what is going on here and to give us an opportunity if we need to use this mechanism again to do so.

Please go through the proposed draft language very carefully. The goal was to ensure that nothing could happen without the level of support from the Empowered Community that is required in the Bylaws. And if we've gotten that wrong, let us know. That was not our intent. Our intent absolutely was to preserve the authority. You'll probably have to diagram it out because there's different ways in which it's constructed. But I think we understand that it might be easier just to say, "Okay, we're going to carve it out in this particular case and deal with another problem down the road." But we really think that this is a cleaner and more appropriate way to go about doing it.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Becky. I think the Council understands that logic. I guess our question is if this is the first time it happens and we don't have an indication necessarily that will happen again, then maybe the more prudent path would be the more specific amendment, given the importance of the Bylaws. Given that we're doing something big and disallowing an IRP. I guess I'm just expressing some of the thoughts from Council on that. We're looking for perspective on if the Board has some indication more situations like this are coming.

BECKY BURR: There's no ulterior motive here, just to be clear. As I said, if you think that it dilutes the authority of the Empowered Community, raise your hand and tell us that because that's not our intention. Many of you were there in 2016 when we wrote the now 232 pages of Bylaws and that process. Thomas is grinning at me because he was definitely there. Having thought about this carefully, if one was to read the language in the Bylaws very strictly, and particularly given the history that we've just created on this thing, what if ICANN issued an RFP for a vendor? Is there anything that prohibits a losing vendor from trying to use the IRP to challenge an award for a vendor? I don't think that's what we intended in 2016. We haven't talked about it. But as we started thinking about this, what occurred to us is there may be other situations like the vendor thing, which is the only one that I've actually thought of, but it is sort of surprising. No, of course we did not mean that a vendor for paperclips could challenge a decision, but that's sort of what you guys are saying to us. So we want to have a way short of a—which wouldn't be short of. We'd still have to convene the community and the community would have to tell us that. But rather than having something that says no vendors can't use this and you can't use it for the Grant Program and whatever, who knows what's going to come out of auctions in the next round. It just seemed prudent to do what I think with legislative drafting would be a cleaner and more proactive way of dealing with it. But it's not intended to shortcut anything, and there's no ulterior motive.

GREG DIBIASE: Understood. I think that's really helpful context for us as we consider this. Real quickly, I did want to go back to your first point on the Terms of Service. I think what you said is you see the Bylaw, we believe this Bylaw is necessary and we cannot rely solely on the Terms of Service to disallow an IRP. Am I putting words in your mouth?

BECKY BURR: Well, we certainly do not want to do that, given the history here. I mean, the community has spoken very clearly. It does pick up this issue. But just to be clear, we actually said in Hamburg that we were going to do this. We had decided a long time ago that, really, the right way to do this was through the Bylaw's amendment, not through the contract.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If I may complement this, what you see is in the way in the spirit of the Bylaw change when enacted, that also in the change for the Rec 7, we clearly go back to the chartering parties as the ones to agree or disagree with that. In that way, I think all the concerns are addressed and we clearly respect and express respect also for the Empowered Community in moving forward to that.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. That's great context. And we will go forward and consider both of these. Susan, I see your hand.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Really quickly. Just to comment on your last point, Becky, about what the Board had said in Hamburg. I agree with you. You did indicate that you would pursue a Bylaw's amendment as well, but you did also very clearly say in your Board resolution that you considered a Bylaw's amendment not to be necessary. I think we are hearing you now say that I think that you, as a Board, have agreed that it is necessary to go forward with a Bylaw's amendment. I'm just trying to understand that that's what you're saying.

BECKY BURR: We have certainly reconsidered that position.

GREG DIBIASE: Wonderful. Any other comments or questions on this topic? Okay. Moving along, we have Paul McGrady to touch base on the outstanding SubPro recommendations.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Greg. This is a lighter topic, which is good. The good news is the SubPro or Next Round, as we're starting to call it, Next Round Small Team Plus has been meeting and making great progress. We did a Prep Week webinar on the draft Supplemental Recommendations. Before we all got here, we are having a community engagement this week, I think on Wednesday, in the morning. It's going to be a showstopper, everybody show up. Most of that will be a quick race through the slides to highlight the Supplemental Draft Recommendations for anybody who missed the Prep Week webinar, and then a lot of time for question and answers. We're going into it humble because we really do want to listen to what the community has to say. And if there's different views, we're going to take those on board. We have a working session the next day and we are hoping to get all of this back to Council because the Small Team Plus is not a decisional body. We're just getting these to Council for Council deliberation in April. So we're on track. In terms of time frame, we're on the home stretch.

All of this could not have been done without Becky and Alan and Avri sticking with us and attending all these, I don't know how many, dozens or hundreds of hours of calls. So, a great big thank you to the Board for lending us those three. It's been terrific. It's been a good experience.

So that's where we are. There is one little thing. This is a technical legal word, squirrely. You guys will likely get one back that may be a little squirrely, and that is the singular and plural. There were some concerns about the intended use language in that recommendation, which we've dealt with by taking it out. Then we did a little clarification on the dotBrand issue because taking that language out generally would affect dotBrands. We've tried to do something there. So far, the Small Team Plus is sticking with this idea that singularism and pluralism are confusing. And I know there's some concerns about that.

The only reason I raised it is not to try to put any thumbs on the scales or advocate today. I just don't believe in surprises. I believe in like, "Happy birthday, surprise." But other than that, I don't like surprises. I don't want anybody here to be surprised. If you get something and you think to yourself, "I wish McGrady had told me this one's squirrely, because it is." So that may come your way.

Then the last thing, which is not really Small Team Plus business, but it has to do with the Next Round, it has to do with the issue of private auctions. The Council were curious where that is landing or the work that's being done. We didn't send you recommendations on that. The community couldn't come up with something new. But we do recall that you, the Board and staff, were looking into issues and models. We were just wondering if we could have an update. If it can be done around this table, great. If it needs to be in some other way, great. But anything you can share with us. Like we said yesterday, we're just nosy. We just like to know what's going on. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Well, thank you for being nosy and also thank you for the sneak peek on the squirrely issue coming our way. On the Auction Proceeds, I'm going to turn it over to Alan and Becky will talk to plural and singular stuff.

ALAN BARRETT: Okay. Thanks. This is Alan Barrett. I'll try to address the issue of private auctions. The SubPro PDP and the GNSO did not really send particular recommendations on that topic. But the Board did receive GAC advice. I forget the exact wording, but I think that the GAC basically wanted us to strongly disallow, disincentivize the use of private auctions. I think the Board is quite sympathetic to that view. And the Board and Org are trying to figure out how to implement that the best way that we can.

The Org is working with a vendor, trying to figure out ways to conduct an auction for the ICANN auction of last resort, maybe to be done in a way that disincentivizes private auctions. Maybe figure out some other ways of doing that. We don't know the answers yet, but what I can say is that we are looking at it and we are sympathetic to the idea of disincentivizing private auctions.

Then one of the other things that came out of this was the use of joint ventures, if two applicants want to form a joint venture. Again, the Board would like to allow good faith joint ventures, but there's a risk that applicants might use a joint venture in a bad faith kind of way as a way of transferring money from one applicant to another in much the same way as private auctions could have done. We want to figure out a way of allowing good faith joint ventures, but maybe ask them to show documentation to demonstrate that it really is good faith.

Is that enough? Have I forgotten part of your question?

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Alan. I appreciate the update on that and we're looking forward to more news as it happens. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Paul, thank you for the heads up. I just have to say one of the virtues of having liaisons on these calls is there's not going to be a surprise to the Board even if you hadn't given us this heads up. We have been advising the Board, updating the Board all the way through. I think we are aware that this is an issue that continues to be of importance, at least to the Council Small Team and likely to the Council.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Paul. Any other comments on this topic? Okay. I think those are our questions. We can turn to the Board question at this point.

TRIPTI SINHA: The Board question overlaps with your question four.

GREG DIBIASE: It was in response to your question. We agree that this is a question. However, we have a very short answer in that there is not a unified position on Council at this point, but we know that the Board is talking to each of the SGs individually and we think that is the appropriate place to get answers.

TRIPTI SINHA: All right. Well, Becky is going to elaborate further on this.

BECKY BURR: Chris can join in on this. It is something that we have heard in the community forums repeatedly, and so we are interested in making sure that we've touched base with the community, make sure we haven't missed anything. I think I said pretty clearly in a public forum a while ago that we had not identified anything in the ICANN contracts or consensus policies or requirements that got in the way of registries and registrars from complying with NIS2. There are obvious things that could be interesting and useful contributions, views on accuracy and the like. But we really haven't identified anything that prevents a registry or registrar from complying with NIS2 or that requires a registry or a registrar to violate their obligations under the contract.

So if we've missed something, we'd like to know about it and we thought these venues were probably better venues than the public forums where people are making statements, and so we'd like to have a dialogue. I know some members of the GNSO Council, you'll all be in different meetings with stakeholder groups where this comes up and we look forward to hearing from you on that.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: I think, Becky, you've really said it all there. As a newly incoming Board member, I've heard from community members about this NIS2 situation. I'm certainly trying to wrap my head around the implications and what ICANN can do in this situation and if anything is needed. I think that was where the value of these open discussions was hopefully going to come to the fore and we'd be able to get a better understanding of where the different positions are. As you say, we're also bringing this up particularly with the Commercial Stakeholder Group, so hopefully, there'll be some enlightenment.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. To be clear, we've instructed the various stakeholder organizations and the GNSO to raise this if they have opinions.

TRIPTI SINHA: No more questions?

GREG DIBIASE: I think that's it.

TRIPTI SINHA: We've still got time on our hands so anything else that you'd like to discuss or any of my Board colleagues who would like to bring something up? Any takers? Becky?

BECKY BURR: There are about a thousand things that we could be talking about. We did have one question I think that would be interesting is we tried a new form of engagement in ICANN Prep Week which was the interactions, the webinars on topics. We actually thought they went pretty well and enjoyed them a lot. Katrina is the author of these, and as somebody who's volunteer for one of them, I had a great time.

We have heard from one group that they didn't enjoy them, although I don't think it was because they didn't enjoy the format but they didn't enjoy things being added to Prep Week. We're interested in reactions about that form of interaction. We're obviously always looking for new ways to effectively interact. I just split an infinitive, I can't believe that. I just wanted to put that on the table as something that we might discuss. I'd love to hear from people on that.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Becky. We did have a brief discussion and I think the sentiment was overall positive. Any negative feedback of ironing out technical kinks and I think we had one comment about the nature that the sessions were overlapping, and these three topics appealed to… People wanted to be in all three rooms at the same time was one comment we got. I think at a higher level, directly engaging with the Board is the right direction. Confident the technical kinks can be worked out, and maybe there's a better way to stagger the sessions to make sure any interested participant can go to the session they want. We haven't reached a formal decision on this, but the general consensus was they appreciated the session and yet direct dialogue on… For me, that CCWG in particular was something that just needs to discuss. We brainstormed ideas on the best path forward. I don't know if other councilors have feedback as well.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. I think it's great because different people have different learning styles. There are some people who love these big notebooks and they have everything printed and that's how they learn or they dig through documents off websites. Other people like me, I learn when I hear it. That to me is a great way to get caught up on topics, especially because, besides Becky, nobody can know everything that's going on all at the same time. There are nooks and crannies in all this that you can explore in that kind of format. I know it's extra work, but I would encourage you guys to keep going with it. I think it's positive.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you very much for that feedback. Because as Becky said, the feedback we've been getting is that it was very well received. We cluttered Prep Week a little bit but the format itself is quite good. Organic conversations always lend you some interesting insight. So they're not contrived and staged and so forth. I think Sally would like to chime in.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Tripti. Thank you for the feedback. And as Tripti said, we've had a lot of very positive feedback. There's just a couple of things I would share. Firstly, the staff team is collecting feedback on all aspects. The way in which the event was promoted, which we think we can always do better, can always be promoted further in advance, more comprehensively so that more people are aware of it. One of the pieces of feedback that we had from Jonathan Zuck from the ALAC, which I thought was something that we might share in the feedback that we share with the community as a whole, "Here's what we learned, here's what we'll do next time," that kind of thing. I don't know if the GNSO did this, but some community groups prepped beforehand. You talk about documents and prepping exactly that and actually even appointed shepherds and were really said, "Okay, we'll have this person go to session one, this person…" that sort of thing. So each community is different, as you say, but clearly the feedback was promote as far as possible ahead of time as widely as possible. We use our existing channels to do that. I think, please, if there's more feedback that you have on the sessions, let us know through me or Tripti and we'll collate all that into "Here's what we'll do next" after everything we've heard. Thank you so much.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Sally. Go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE: One more note is, unless I'm mistaken, the letter, Tripti, that you sent last week looked eerily similar to one of the solutions that was raised in that Prep Week session. So I don't know if ultimately that's going to be the right answer, but it's certainly a step in the right direction of solving a problem and possibly a real life solution.

TRIPTI SINHA: Didn't I tell you organic solutions and insights suddenly percolate in these meetings?

GREG DIBIASE: There you go.

TRIPTI SINHA: Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks for that. As we have time left out, I would like to use this little slot to also draw your attention to the strategic plan for '26 to '30 that we are in the process of developing. Whereas we have a lot of focus on and so much to do on the short run. It is so important that we look ahead and make sure that by 2030, we are where we want to be, and that starts by thinking about it today. As you know, also the previous plan is a plan that is not from ICANN Org or ICANN Board, but from ICANN Community, Organization, and Board together. And to make that happen even more this time, we've invested in making sure the cycles are such that we have that interaction. The Prep Week session was one of those opportunities that we had the opportunity to share the draft working session for 2030. Draft working because we recognize that before we settle down on "this is the plan," we have interaction and we want to hear feedback. But also this week on Wednesday, there's an opportunity for you and the community to get involved. Let's make this something that really drives us beyond our current positions, beyond the current little things we need to get right, and a big call to be there.

GREG DIBIASE: That all makes sense to me. Susan?

SUSAN COSTERTON: Thank you. Super quick. I think of those sessions I attended, the one that what do we do if policy can't be implemented or has become superseded by events. I agree with the other comments. I thought the session was really good. The format was really engaging. I really enjoyed it. I'm really interested to know what the next steps on that topic are. Obviously, we ended up talking not just about policy but also about sort of CCWG recommendations as well. But I'm not sure that the path is the same for the two things. But bearing in mind that obviously GNSO policy is the remit of us here in the GNSO, is there a next step where we engage further on that with you?

BECKY BURR: Absolutely. I think, as Greg was saying, Tripti sent a letter out to kick off the process on that. There are two different issues. One was at

CCWG. So we need to understand not just with the GNSO Council but with us participating members of the community who participated in the CCWG, how they would like to proceed with that. Because we have identified a need to modify Recommendation 7, not to change it profoundly but we think to accomplish what was intended by Recommendation 7, which is that Auction Proceeds not be used to dispute decisions to award or not award a grant. Whether that decision is made by the granting body, or whether that's a Board ratification of a bunch of grants because that was the gap we identified. So we need input more broadly than the GNSO Council because it was a CCWG with the other issue on the urgent request. That is a GNSO issue, although, as you all know, that GNSO Council recommendation came out of a policy development process in which other members of the community, notably the GAC and ALAC, participated. But because it's a PDP, we think our first stop is the GNSO Council. How do you want to proceed on that?

GREG DIBIASE: Well, so since you brought it up, I believe the last time we spoke regarding urgent requests is that the Board would send a letter to Council outlining potential concerns with the recommendation and asking for a dialogue on how to proceed what is the status of that letter.

BECKY BURR: Right. I shouldn't have… I just put my foot in my mouth because I am on top for getting that letter out, and we will get it out.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Any other topics from councilors?

TRIPTI SINHA: We might be able to call it a wrap. Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: As we have time and this is certainly not a pressing issue, but I just wanted to express my personal thanks for the invitation to take part in the Strategic Planning session late last year. Particularly, I know we had a couple of other Board members there as well, but personally, I wasn't able to be there in person in Washington. So also for the efforts that were made to allow participation remotely. But again, as an incoming Board member, it was invaluable, really, and great to have that kind of communication and interaction with the GNSO Council. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: That's great. We certainly appreciated your presence, and I think it really forwarded our work.

TRIPTI SINHA: All right, Greg. Well, thank you very much. The power of liaison, they're working for us. So please, any other questions, send them to us through Alan or Becky. There's lots of work ahead of us so there's no rest for the weary. All right. On that note, I guess the meeting is adjourned. Thank you, everyone.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]