ICANN81 | AGM – GNSO Council Wrap-Up
Thursday, November 14, 2024 – 13:15 to 14:30 TRT

TERRI AGNEW: Hello, and welcome to the GNSO Council Wrap-Up. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Helpful reminder, turn off your computer speakers. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I'll now hand the floor back over to GNSO Chair, Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you so much. Welcome, everyone, to the GNSO Wrap-Up. This is where we talk about some administrative matters and give people an opportunity to raise any kind of last-minute AOBs, so let's dive in. Can I do the next slide, please?

Oh, before I get to this, I did want to note one misstep I think leadership did during this meeting. We didn't have that third working session, and so we didn't have an opportunity to go over the work that's on our plate, and we also, although we had sent out the agendas for our bilaterals with GAC and the Board, we didn't go through those again as a Council,

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.

and that's probably important we do. So, mea culpa, and we'll make sure that we are thinking about that going forward.

Okay, our first order of business is to confirm liaison roles to other groups. Transfer policy, we have Osvaldo. Osvaldo, you're happy to continue in this role? Great. We have an opening on the IRT for IGO Curative Rights. That's Intergovernmental Organization Curative Rights. That's in the IRT stage, so we're looking for a volunteer for that. Would it be helpful to give more background? I don't know if I can off the top of my head. Anyone? Oh, Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'll volunteer for it.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Damon. On the IRT for SubPro, we have Anne and Susan. I'm assuming you'll be happy to continue in your roles, or I'm certainly hoping you two won't be happy to continue in your roles, but please confirm.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yes.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. And then, Susan, we also have you for the IRT RPMs phase one. Great.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. I'm hoping that it won't be too much more work, although I have a feeling it's now likely to run certainly some way into next year, but yeah, yeah.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, great. For the IRT on Registration Data Policy Implementation Phase 1, Thomas, I'm assuming you're still good to go. Stoked. Great. And then, I guess the one, so we have the IRT on privacy proxy services. We had two because we had two very interested Councilors that are interested in the subject matter, but I'm not sure we had two because of the workload. So, maybe, Paul, I'll ask you, do you think this can be covered by one Councilor or are two liaisons needed?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah. So, I think one is fine. It was great working with Stephanie, but I think based upon the pace and the work product, cool. Yep. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: He's cool. Okay. Any questions about these liaison roles before we go forward? Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Farzaneh. What does the liaison role entail? So, I'm a newbie here.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. Great question. The liaison role will follow the work of a working group or an IRT and report back to council. There can be summaries of what's going on or, more critically, if there's a roadblock or something Council might need to address, they bring it to our attention. So, for example, Thomas is on the registration data IRT. They encountered this issue with basically a billing contact. There was some language that might have not been intended about a billing contact. He's bringing that back to Council for us to proactively address. Any other questions on liaisons? Manju?

MANJU CHEN: I'm not sure. Are we also talking about liaisons that we send to the other SO/AC because I'm not seeing on the agenda, it's only the working groups and IRTs?

GREG DIBIASE: So, I think these are, those are settled, right? Desiree is ccNSO and Sebastien is GAC. Am I missing one? No, we don't have one to ALAC. Do we have Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: The other way.

GREG DIBIASE: The other way.

TERRI AGNEW: Reminder, Mic, we have remote folks.

MANJU CHEN: So, we have one from ccNSO to us. We have one from us to ccNSO. I'm wondering if we should have this fair treatment that we have one to ALAC too. I don't know. It is like a question I raise to people to consider.

GREG DIBIASE: Steph, have we had this before?

STEVE CHAN: Not to my recollection.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Is this a proposal that we should have one? No. Okay. No? Oh, sorry, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: I just actually want to ask Justine, do you think this is a proposal worth us considering?

JUSTINE CHEW: This is Justine, I think it's Council decision, but I guess it could depend on the person involved. So, although I am the ALAC liaison to GNSO, invariably, I also act as the GNSO liaison back to ALAC. So, any issues that come up between the two groups, I am the liaison. So, for me, it

works both ways, but it's entirely up to Council whether you want a separate GNSO liaison to the ALAC. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: I guess, speaking of my personal capacity, I'm fine having Justine continue in that role, but I'm open to other opinions. Okay. All right. Any other liaison questions? Next slide, please.

Confirming our GNSO empowered community representative. As a reminder, we are a participant in the empowered community. So, for example, if the Board amends a fundamental bylaw that requires approval from the empowered community, which is something that's coming on our plate, but we'll discuss at next Council meeting. It has been Tomslin. I think leadership is aligned that it will continue to be Tomslin because it's usually someone in leadership. So, I suppose that's more of an update. Steve, does that sound right to you?

STEVE CHAN: Yeah, thanks. This is Steve. So, I guess typically what happens here is the chair usually takes that temporary role. Leadership consults amongst the three of them, and they identify the permanent position. I think the only difference here is Tomslin will be the temporary one for now, and leadership will probably talk it over, and I would not be surprised. It's still going to be Tomslin. So, this is just a notification who the temporary is, and leadership will come back with a permanent person identified. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Steve. Next on the list is a call for volunteers for the GAC communique. So, you can raise your hands now or on list to GNSO staff. Is there? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, can I make a short comment here? I happen to be the fearless leader on this, but I've never done this job. So, I would very much welcome somebody who's done it once or twice to join the team at least the first time.

GREG DIBIASE: Farzaneh has volunteered. I see Susan's hand. I'm hoping that's a hand for volunteer. Okay. Now, we got a whole crew. Sam, Osvaldo, Desiree, and Jen. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. This is Steve. Just to temper expectations, from what I hear, there is not a whole lot of GAC advice this time. So, it'd be a very big team for a very small effort, but maybe that's great for Seb's onboarding.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry. Susan, did you want to talk?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes, please. Just briefly, if I'm not needed, I'll de-volunteer myself, but I reacted to Seb's request and I have done it a bunch of times. So, I'm happy to at least be one of the volunteers to start with, but it was more of a general kind of process, I think, point really. We do this at the wrap-up meeting and that's great, but I mean, we know going into every ICANN meeting that there'll be some kind of GAC communique and we'll want some kind of team to look at it and potentially make the decision on whether we need to respond, even if we end up on everything in the communique deciding there's nothing for us to do, we still have that effort.

And I wonder if maybe we should use the meeting before the ICANN meeting itself to actually take some volunteers then, and then we can actually schedule the first call before we've even gone into the ICANN meeting. Because we always end up scrabbling around to get this thing done before the Board meets with the GAC and the scheduling is a part of that. It's just a wonder whether we can get ahead of the game for the one we do for Seattle and have this all fixed up so that maybe the first week back after the ICANN meeting, we already have the communique group meet, obviously assuming we've got the communique itself.

GREG DIBIASE: That sounds like a great idea to me, Susan. I'm seeing support in the chat as well. Okay, we'll onboard that and unless there's no objections, try that approach for next meeting. Justine, you're next in the queue.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks Greg, this is Justine. So just a question to Steve, if I may. You mentioned GAC communique not necessarily having a lot of stuff in it this time around. Does that apply to both advice and issues of importance? Because I think that those two pieces are the ones that Council looks at.

STEVE CHAN: I do not know for certain, honestly.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. And regardless, we have to educate Seb, so I think it's a more the merrier situation. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: I stuck this question in the chat, but I don't know if we have any indication of when the Board might next meet with the GAC, so we have some kind of timeline.

GREG DIBIASE: I'm not sure. Maybe something Seb should know. I don't know. Okay. Any other comments on the GAC communique in addition to the volunteers and Susan's proposed process going forward? Great.

So the next thing we had is an update from Thomas as the GNSO liaison from the Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team. Oh, he's gone. I think he gave the update, a brief update preview of what's

going to be in what we're going to discuss at next Council meeting. So maybe we can skip this, but I was going to ask. Okay.

All right. Well, let's table that and move on to GNSO Council pre-ICANN conference webinar feedback. And I think Damon, you had some thoughts about possible improvements there.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Thanks, Greg. So I attended the last pre-meeting webinar and what basically happened was they spent the entire hour interviewing heads of these PDPs and they didn't really ask them about the actual substantive policy. It was more along the lines of what made this a challenging project, how did you get through it, tell us about the team, etc. And I don't think that's a real good service to us or the listeners to that program.

I think that the object of that webinar would be to say here are the main policy issues that we're going to be dealing with in our upcoming meeting. If any Councilors have any issues or questions, concerns, let's ask them now, to showcase those before the meeting and not have the retrospective interviews that we had with those two very good leaders who spent hundreds of hours of their time and were asked, I think off-point questions. So that's my feedback.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Damon. Does anyone have thoughts on Damon's comment? Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Greg. This is Justine. I think it really depends on where you are at the stage of the PDP. Because with the IDNs, I don't pay too much attention to transparency, my apologies, but I think they're both at the same stage of the PDP, which is like towards the end.

Yes, it is important for Councilors especially to know what goes on in the PDP, but it sometimes becomes repetitive if you keep doing it the same way we do it each time. So, I remember in the pre-week for ICANN75 when I was still the vice chair of the IDNs EPDP, that was, I think, what you are expecting in terms of an update. We actually went into the issues, we explained what the PDP was doing, but that was at a very early stage where we're trying to educate what the PDP is about. So, I don't have an answer for you per se. I'm just giving a different perspective. I worry that we start repeating ourselves over time and I'm not sure that is necessarily a good thing or a bad thing.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Justine. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yeah, thank you, Greg. It's Anne. I actually agree with Damon's observations regarding that webinar and I think it tended to ramble a bit, I thought. So, I think we do need to take a look at that. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. Yeah, I mean, putting myself in the queue, I do think it's important to get the feedback from the chair on what worked and what didn't, right, as opposed to just here's what we're going to vote on. I don't know if that necessarily needs to be right before ICANN, but I think that is possibly important.

One other idea, I'm just throwing out there, is maybe we could use that time to get updates from people that want to speak to us. Like, all of our working session was updates from ICANN staff and a lot of that, it was good to have the interaction, but maybe there are some updates that are more of a, just a pure update. So, just a thought. All right, now we have the queue. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, thanks, Greg. I mean, I agree with you in terms of being flexible about what purpose that session serves. I think taking into consideration where things are at ahead of each ICANN meeting and then deciding what the format's going to be, I think there's probably room to do that, right? So, Damon, I hear your point, we shouldn't have this be the format all the time.

Maybe this was a good time for this format because two PDPs were reaching conclusions and getting the feedback from the chairs was a good one. But in the spirit of assessing each one as an opportunity to treat it a little bit differently depending on what Council needs at that point. I like that idea of getting some updates or even just the people who want to come talk, get it out of the way first so we can use the working time here on the ground a bit more productively.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Sam. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. This is Steve. I guess maybe one other thing to take in consideration as you try to structure that session is maybe even considering the role of the council. So from that perspective, you're generally considered managers of the PDP and so maybe an exhaustive run-through of all the recommendations is not sensible, for instance, but maybe there's a reason to identify a select one and manage up to the Council as the manager of the PDP.

So there's maybe a potential for somewhere in the middle, not exhaustive, but select ones that matter the most to the council. So I guess to Sam and Damon's point, it might depend on where PDP is and what the PDP might be discussing at that at the upcoming meeting. I guess, like I said, the point is that the role of the PDP, the Council is a manager of the PDP and so does every bit of substance, is that the right level of detail? That might be too much, for instance, so just maybe consideration too. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Greg. Actually, you took part of what I wanted to say, but I'm building on your suggestion about using the time we have all together

as a Council and person-wisely. If it's a pure update from either the PDP process or ICANN staff or different parts of the community, that can be shifted to not when we have just face-to-face time. In fact, I think if we have that information before we come to Istanbul, any physical meeting, then we can use the working sessions.

If we need to call back any of these communities or if we think there is a dialogue needed, that's when we can use that time really well when we are sitting in a room together. So, that's number one. The second thing is, I guess maybe this is AOB, but bringing back the review that I think Paul really graciously did for us, that coming back into the working session, I think that was very useful as well. Just a reminder.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Chen. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Greg. No, Jen said it much better than I would do, so just adding a plus one on actually using our face-to-face time to do a working session as opposed to the updates. Just adding a plus one. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Bruna. Peter?

PETER AKINREMI: Thanks, Greg. I just wanted to add that we need to focus on what really matters to us. PDP is essential to us. Whether this is a waste of time or not, we need to get that feedback because each Councilor in this room are not at the same pace. So, we need to be able to get that feedback from the chair, the working group chair. And this might bring me to reviewing what is important to us. However, that is still needed and important. Whether it is repetition and stuff, we need to know what is going on, what are the challenges, and what are the things that we need to address before ICANN meeting. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Peter. Okay, I think this is all good feedback. I also want to read what Paul said in the chat because I think it is wise. Maybe the paradigm should be, is there something that Council needs to do? So, in the instance of IANA, that update, we should know it, but I don't know if there was an action item coming out of that for us or something we needed to discuss.

So, yeah. Maybe we will take this back and leadership can commit to maybe making a proposal to meetings out of here is what we are thinking, here are some ideas that were raised at the last wrap-up session, and maybe we can rework the agenda a little bit.

Any other questions or comments on this point? Okay. So, Thomas, you were out of the room when I called on you. You had the update from the Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team. You discussed it briefly, but we ran out of time. I just wanted to make sure,

do you think the update is worthwhile now, or should we wait until the next Council meeting to discuss more substantively?

THOMAS RICKERT: So, obviously, my attempt to run out of the room and hope that my session is over was not successful, and I apologize. I had to step out. Electricity broke down in our house, and I needed to call the electrician that we used.

All right. So, as you know, the Registration Data Policy is a result of the EPDP Phase 1, and the registration data policy has been finalized. It has gone through public comment, and it's about to be implemented soon, and therefore, this document is done and dusted. We have the issue that the document needs to be read in conjunction with the requirements for registrars according to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement 2013.

The Registrar Accreditation Agreement has certain requirements in it, including the collection of the data for the billing contact and other data that needs to be collected to be put in escrow. Now, the registration data policy basically describes everything that the registrars need to do, including the provisions that supersede the requirements in the RAA 2013.

Now, the registration data policy is silent on both the billing contact, which is data that we don't want to be mandatorily collected, but it's also silent on other data that we want to be escrowed. And therefore, we have an inconsistency that will lead to if it's silent, it leads to yes to

have to do it, and no, it's optional for these two cases, and that is not good. Therefore, we need to find a way as Council to help the IRT and the wider community to make this, I would say, cosmetic change. Actually, it's nothing more than a typo, because the substance is totally uncontroversial. Nobody wants the billing contact to be collected on a mandatory basis.

So we would need to find a way to say it is optional for that data to be collected or the billing contact data may be collected, right? So, we need to make sure that we find the best way to enact that. It can be done by way of an advisory that ICANN issue to say, this needs to be read in the way that the billing contact data collection is not mandatory, but I, for one, and the ISPCP who I represent would be fully in line with that to just publish an updated version of the registration data policy and say, okay, we have made this tiny correction.

If the entire GNSO community agrees to do so, maybe that's something that is sufficient without being forced to go through another public comment period, for example. But we need to work out the formalities. I think we can't do it today. I think you should be discussing this with your respective communities. I'd also like to hear what the ICANN compliance folks maybe are saying to that so that we're doing it the right way and that we're not open ourselves up for attacks because we don't really honor the process that's required.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Thomas. So, I guess thinking ahead to next meeting, maybe we'll refine the options a little better with more details and present

those to Council for discussion. Does that sound like the right path? Anne, I see your hand.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks very much, Greg. And Thomas, I have really no familiarity with this. Is there an email available to summarize what you just said, or could we have one? I don't think I understand the issue, so it's hard to figure out how to address it in an expeditious manner, which I think is what you're asking for.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. I think leadership can work with Thomas and staff to send out a written summary so it's a little clearer.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Great, thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks, Greg, for using the floor. And thanks, Thomas, for that brief information, which definitely is important for us to look at. One other issue that caught me by surprise yesterday's presentation from Seb, and luckily we have him here also in his capacity as the GAC liaison, is the information that situated the fact that certain information that

will be required to be able to make some level of determination might have to be at the discretion of some of the contracted parties.

I fear that if ICANN has made this level of investment, and if we have had to get people, especially the BC who I represent, for instance, have had to mandate a lot of members to put in requests so that we could have a system where at the end of the day we can get some quality outputs from, but then we get to a point where we might not even be able to get data out of that system because some of the registrars decline in being shared.

Shouldn't we be flagging that issue at this point to see how it can be remedied? If we build a system and have spent so much time and resources getting it to be and at the end of the day, we might not be able to get the kind of data that we will use to analyze how effective this is, that could be a disincentive for further use of the RDRS. What are your thoughts around this?

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Lawrence. I see Thomas's hand on that, but just real quickly from my perspective, that's one of the things the standing team is doing is citing potential issues like that, for example, there isn't mandatory participation in the RDRS and that's something that the Board should consider. So that's my understanding. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: So thanks for the question, Lawrence. We're discussing two different things now. So this is the IRT, the Implementation Review Team that

takes care of drafting the Registration Data Policy. The question that you raised is with respect to the RDRS. And I happen to be on that standing committee. So it's the same person working on two associated topics.

Now, you are right that the disclosure of non-public registration data needs to be in conformity with the registration data policy. But the registration data policy is the outcome of a policy development process. And therefore, that's something that we can't fix on the fly if you wish, even if there was an appetite for doing so.

But I think that we need to have a broader discussion on the RDRS or maybe have a more in-depth discussion on that very topic, because that's something that we see both in the standing committee as well when the RDRS is presented to other stakeholders inside and outside ICANN. And that is that there is an expectation that data will be produced in response of sending queries into the RDRS system. And that promise was never made.

And I think we need to probably do a better job in explaining what the RDRS can and what it can't do, what it can do. And I think it can become better and better at that. It's a service for requestors to use for their requests to be directed at the correct contracted party that has the data, but whether or not data can be disclosed, i.e., whether RDRS requests is successful, quote unquote, in the eyes of those who want the data, depends on an assessment according to applicable local laws.

And I think that the feedback from you, Lawrence, is very valuable because that's something that I'm going to take back to the RDRS

standing committee to discuss. And Sebastien, excuse me, is in the room. He absorbs all this information as well, because I think we need to do a better job in explaining the limitations of the RDRS, manage what maybe scenarios are that lead to successful disclosure and where that's not the case, so that the requestors can inform themselves before maybe they even submit a request. And sorry for messing up your name. That was no intention, Peter.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, so I don't want to go too far down the RDRS road, but Sebastien, did you have something quick?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, just quickly again, setting expectations. That is what I clearly qualify as being a part of the policy development that's going to have to be reworked. It didn't say that, by the way, in the SSAD recommendations, but it'd be part of the new recommendation, which is not the work of the standing committee, but will be another body that you guys will create.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. And yes, if you were wondering, will RDRS be on our plate for the coming meetings, I think you will be tired of the RDRS by the end of this year, I'm sure. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks. And back to the reg data question. Thomas, if you are giving us a summary, could you maybe not in huge detail, obviously, but just indicate whether there's a specific concern with using an advisory? My initial reaction is a little concern just because there's obviously a registration, accreditation agreement that registrars have signed onto that has certain obligations. And it seems like the intent is to amend that by means of an advisory, which presumably doesn't have contractual weight. And so to me, that seems not ideal if that path were used. So just asking if you do us a really brief summary, could you kind of highlight if there are those kinds of concerns or what is the thinking behind the different options?

GREG DIBIASE: Thomas, do you want to respond?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, and I do agree that an advisory might not be the ideal solution because the policy should be able to stand for itself so that you don't need to read additional papers just to be able to compliant. I just didn't want to jump the gun and prefer one of the solutions. We've learned from staff that an advisory is one of the options at our fingertips. I will include information on what the path to enacting each of the possible solutions is so that you can discuss with your respective groups what the preferred option is.

GREG DIBIASE: And I think to clarify, if I'm understanding correctly, the advisory would be that compliance is not enforcing a requirement, not that the advisory is substantively changing the policy, but regardless, I still think there's concerns with that as well. Okay, great. Peter, you're next in the queue.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, I would just lower my hands down because one day to follow up with that, what's the position or the direction the conversation is happening on the IRT? The IRT, yeah. Yes, clarify that the advisory and the other.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you, Greg. Thomas, just for my clarification, was this not discussed in the IRT or it was discussed and then purposefully not answered, the billing thing?

THOMAS RICKERT: So it was in the recommendations coming out of the EPDP. So we knew that how it would need to be done. It was a drafting error. So we only identified this after the policy was published. So it was a mistake in consistency.

GREG DIBIASE: Or said another way, the policy didn't address the fact that there is a requirement in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, right? They didn't put that in the policy saying, this obligation is moot or superseded by the new recommendations.

THOMAS RICKERT: But to be clear, we are not changing the intention of what the PDP working group wanted to express.

VIVEK GOYAL: Can't you just issue a revision saying, sorry, we made a mistake. Here's a revised one. Should solve all the problems of issuing. That's one of the options that we're discussing.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. That's the end of the formal agenda. I had one AOB on just assigning folks homework on the letter from urgent requests from GAC to look at the proposal from GAC and consider potential responses. We're going to be talking about that in our next meeting. I don't want to get into it here because I think that's worthy of actual GNSO meeting. But leadership will follow up with an email with a link to that letter and reminding folks what the discussion will be. So that's my AOB. Does anyone else have any AOB? Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Jen, for the record. I guess this is something that several of us have already mentioned, but maybe just to flag it again for our attention.

Before the AGEN [ph] meeting, we had a pretty short notice of this dialogue between GAC and Board and Council. And while we're always for different forms of dialogue and informal conversations or ad hoc things, it would be very nice if we had one, more notice, and two, in the sense that I think communication can be improved between the Council and the GAC, and maybe this is a thing for Seb to think about. I don't want to step on his thing for that. Then this might be a way to resolve issues before it becomes something that snowballs. That's number one.

And number two, while we also have improved a lot of informal conversations and communication channels with the Board, we really just issue it to the two Board members that Council puts up there. So seat 13 and seat 14. And I think it's implicit that it's also open to the rest of the Board members, but I don't know if they know that. So in any chance, I don't think it can hurt if we kind of just say, hey, Council would like to have this, whatever form of conversation or dialogue that will allow us to prevent a lot of the thorny issues popping up, I think that's a good thing.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Jen. Yeah, and regarding timing, I think that was proposed by the Board, right? The Board said we'd like to meet before the meeting, and that I think was the basis for the rush, but yes, I think we can communicate that back to the Board and just be having that in mind as a general principle. Okay. Peter, I see your hand.

PETER AKINREMI: Thanks, Greg. Just wanted to raise, I don't know if this is just on the meal, this is just my feeling, that we should find a way to bring the new Councilor of the speed. Because I see that when you join the Council, it's just a SPS meeting looking at different kinds of things, there is no way to really onboard new Councilor. And this is something concerning to me, and I don't know if it's just only me, and this is my feelings, if we can find the mechanisms to be able to bring Councilor out to speed, because this is actually crucial, and we want the imputing conversation, and we have small teams, we have liaison roles, and how will they be able to engage in this conversation?

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, that's a great point, Peter. You know, obviously we have the strategic planning and session in January, and that's a lot of what we want to focus on in that session to bring Councilors up to speed. Yeah, it does seem like there's a gap there, and maybe even creating materials that can get Councilors up to speed. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, mate. I raised my hand to talk about the special session, and just to ask if there's anything that the rank and file needs to be thinking about or doing and giving that to leadership as you guys congeal an agenda. I don't know if there's anything in particular that you want from the rest of us, but I think we should start thinking about that, because the holidays are going to overwhelm most people in terms of timing.

And then to your point, Peter, I think that's really a good thing, and we've never, as far as I know, ever done this. I guess maybe some of the old folks like me around the table could just volunteer and say for any new Councilors that just want to ask questions like, how does this work? What does a liaison role do? How much work is that? What's the interaction? Those kinds of things.

I'm happy to take on those kinds of questions and be available. I'm sure others around the table that have been Councilors for a while would be willing to do that too. And that's informal, but I also think that a boot camp, for lack of a better word, would be good for new Councilors as well, but maybe in the meantime, like just the informal interaction, that would be beneficial, but I'm happy to take those calls or be available. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Paul. I think we'll follow up with more information on SPS, but I think the one topic that will for sure be discussed is this issue of can we modify, how can the Board modify or unadopt a recommendation after it's been adopted? So the issue that came to light in the contingent sets that had been a hypothetical and is no longer a hypothetical. So we're going to spend some time on that.

PAUL MCGRADY: I thought I may need to jump back in the queue unceremoniously, but if it would be helpful to have a straw man to beat up on in January, I'm willing to volunteer to do the first draft and get that to leadership rather

than circulating it to the group as a whole. In case the straw man's insane, I'd rather be embarrassed privately. But I'm happy to do that if that's helpful because I've been thinking a lot about that.

We've got a couple of things that really could boomerang on us, right? That will make the SubPro small team work seem like small potatoes, right? And so I think we just need to give that some thought. So I'm happy to do that if anybody, if you guys think it's valuable, if it's something that we want to collectively build together in January, I get that too, but happy if that's helpful.

GREG DIBIASE: Yes, I think that would indeed be helpful. So yeah, let's work together to get those materials. Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Just to answer, circle back to Peter's question about onboarding. We do send out an onboarding email to all incoming Councilors. So the current Councilors receive theirs in July. I know it was a lot of information. It probably seemed like a long time ago. And in there, we do offer to speak with them on private conversations. And Vivek, I believe we had a great conversation. So some take us up on it, some don't. So Peter, I don't know if you had something else in mind that we should do something in addition to the ridiculous email with all the links that you need and any information. I didn't know if you had something else in mind.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Terri. That's actually helpful. However, do we really actually go through that linked document and read it and digest it and understand what Council is all about? Paul says that, oh, informal, that's great. But we should make this a kind of formal, like we created materials that solely for Council to be able to onboard them, like onboarding training.

So these digest that you're saying can be broken down like a kind of webinar, meetings, recording. We might not necessarily need to change SPS from our meeting because that's solely based on policy activities, administrative activities. But this should be solely, it should be designed. We should have a design materials for new Councilor. It should not be based on just only one person or two person. It should be generational.

I can then cause on how you can bring Council, Councilor, new Councilor up to speed, understanding what matters, what doesn't matter, what we need to focus on, how to digest each material, how to follow EPDP activity, how to be a liaison to different things, how to track conversation. You can have all these things, but sometimes when you're a liaison and you don't even know where to begin, how to frame some issues, these are the things that we need to focus on. Thanks. Sure.

PAUL MCGRADY: I'd like to tell a funny story. So my first 15 minutes on Council was for the IPC a long time ago. And it was, I sat down at the table, was for the administrative meeting where we elect a new chair. And after the end

of 15 minutes, we had elected none of the above. And so my reaction as a Councilor, I had no idea what I was doing or any of it worked. It was just, ah, like, what is this? What did I sign up for? And then we got locked in a room for like six or eight hours by David Olive until we finally elected somebody. It was the worst onboarding experience as a Councilor that I could have possibly imagined. I mean, everything went off the rails.

And so Peter, a hundred percent, I think if we can take the onboarding materials that staff already does and put together a two hour webinar for new Councilors and have some of the older Councilors or even the younger Councilors that have been recount their recent experiences in onboarding, I think that's fantastic. And I see no reason why we can't do that before the January session so that those Councilors, when they show up at the special session, can fully participate up to speed on what all the jargon means and all that. So I'm hoping that you're volunteering to do it with me. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Kind of sounded like you were volunteering to do it, but I'll make a video. Welcome to Council. Terri, I see your chat new hand up. Did you want to just comment on this before we went back to the queue?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, please. I am so sorry. Paul, when did you suggest that that should take place? I just missed a frame. So I just wanted to stay on top of it.

PAUL MCGRADY: So Terry, in the perfect world, we would get that done before the January session so that the new Councilors feel as comfortable as they can. Now that's not a lot of time, but we're also talking about taking materials that staff already has and just essentially putting those into some kind of easy bait curriculum, and we're not talking about something that would be more than an hour or two webinar anyways, and it's for a very small audience, right? So we only have only so many new Councilors, right?

And so again, I don't want to write a check that GNSO Council leadership can't cash. On the other hand, I'm willing to help in that effort if that's helpful to drive that to completion prior to January, because I agree with Peter, the special session is already-- We have a lot of work to do, and if the new Councilors feel more up to speed, they'll feel more comfortable in participating. They won't sit this one out to try to listen and learn. We want them to right away be able to help. Does that make sense? So if leadership wants that to happen, I'm happy to help with that. That sounds like do good work do gooder work, I think I said that right.

GREG DIBIASE: Awesome, thanks, Paul. All right, I'm going to go back to the queue where Susan has been waiting patiently.

SUSAN PAYNE: That's okay. Yeah, thanks. I was going to reach out separately, and then I thought I may not be the only one who did have that email, found it

incredibly useful, can no longer find it because I filed it somewhere safe. I'm also encountering some of the links that I had bookmarked don't seem to work anymore, which again is probably my operator error. I was just wondering, at risk of having everyone's inboxes filled up with stuff they don't need, but can you-- Maybe we all should see that intro email again, and then those of us who are incompetent in our filing can try and save it somewhere better this time. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Susan. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg, this is Steve. So Terri can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think those onboarding sessions with new Councilors, they used to be mandatory. I think that might not be the worst thing. Send that welcome package, have a dialogue with the new Councilors. It's something we used to do, I think, as a habit, and I think we should probably get back to that. I don't think there's any expectation that after sending those materials, having a conversation, you're going to learn everything. That's not how things go. You layer it on. That's why we have the sequence of how things are.

That email goes out before the new Councilors are seated. That conversation happens also before the Councilors are seated, ideally. And then it leads into the SPS, where it layers on more and more information. There's a lot of process and procedure that the GNSO does, and it's not easy. So I'm very sympathetic to what Peter said, but

I think we have some tools in place that we can maybe harden, perhaps, and maybe go back to some previous practices. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Great, thanks, Steve. Prudence?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Yeah, I just wanted to add to my comments that I put in the chat. I really love what Peter's raised today about the onboarding process. And people all learn differently, and everyone has different styles. So presuming that sending a really useful, valid email back with everything you need to read is going to be sufficient may not work for everyone. And even if you go back and read it and read it and read it, having additional supplementary ways or options for people to be able to acquire additional information, or even just being able to have a facility where if someone needs to ask a question, there's someone that will be there, and they'll be like, hey, it's not a problem. I'll answer your question, no biggie, would be really helpful.

I think the more ways that we can have to help, not just new Councilors, but any Councilor who has any question, because we all should be inquisitive as we go through our journey here, and we all should have questions at some point, and we all shouldn't have somewhere where we can point those questions to. And I think that's not a bad thing to have as many different routes and avenues to get that support as possible. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Do you want to let Steve respond first? Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: And now I'm like flustered because I forgot my point. No, I do remember my point. I really like the fact that you brought up the webinar, and I don't know what the format was like before, but if, as what Paul mentioned, veteran Councilors or people with a lot of knowledge could also make themselves available during this thing a little bit more informal.

And I'm also happy to put in some information as well. I'm very happy that as a Councilor, I don't have the new car smell anymore because we have a new batch of Councilors incoming, but it's fresh enough in my mind that I realize what is really helpful for me and what I found a little more difficult. And I'm really happy to help to get this back on. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Awesome, thanks, Jen. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. Stating the obvious, staff is obviously all, who's willing to stand and help with onboarding. And I think also stating the obvious is we're evergreen. Like the Councilors come and go over the course of terms, but we're here whoever rolls through. And so from that perspective, we usually have a pretty decent level of institutional knowledge and knowledge of process and procedures. So we are here, obviously, to help with any of that onboarding. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: So some said, I'm new. And I'm like, I'm old, Steve. I'm eternal. I am time itself.

GREG DIBIASE: I was going to say, it sounds like you're committing to be with ICANN for the rest of your career, is what I heard. Which is great, love that. Continuity.

STEVE CHAN: It dies with me. One of the first things that Farzaneh asked me was how old I am.

GREG DIBIASE: Farzaneh's been doing a fair amount of interrogation. Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. So I remember when I was new to Council, we actually had two webinars. Well, not webinars, like two. Actually, the first was one-on-one. One I had with Natalie. And then we had another one scheduled with me, Natalie, and then Tomslin, because he was from our region and he was our city Councilor. I mean, I personally didn't find the one with Councilors particularly helpful because I'm used to learning things myself.

But I think that's something people here probably have been asking for and have been talking about. So I think we were doing that because it was when we still had COVID, we couldn't meet each other. They thought it's a great way to get people onboard. But looking at what people are discussing, apparently they feel it's still an issue now that we're meeting face-to-face. So probably we can bring that back. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Manju. And thanks everyone for these helpful suggestions. Peter, it looks like you raised a very live topic. And yeah, we'll get to work on ways to improve that. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you, Greg. And thank you for Peter bringing this up and helpful suggestions for everyone. Just a thought popped in my mind that since we are seated on almost this last day, I have tried to sit on all the Council sessions till then to drink from the fire hose and figure out. It might be helpful if I could had a session before a session with somebody one-on-one to say, okay, this is what we will cover in session. This is the way it goes about it if you have questions about it. And then maybe one after it.

So I could say, okay, I saw this happen. I didn't understand why it happened this way. Can you explain me? So the information is fresh in my mind. I get the answers right away and then it sticks, right? So by the time you roll up to actually being seated, we have had all these

things sorted out. So then you get a running start on that. Just that simple thing, if we can put it in, would be very helpful.

GREG DIBIASE: Another great idea. Thanks Vivek. Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: It's on another topic, right? So if you want to close this off, then I can edit. That's if you have concluding comments.

GREG DIBIASE: Is everyone okay with moving on to the next topic? We got a good start here. Okay, go ahead, Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks. Silly requests, really, just for us to bring the informal Council session back to the beginning of the meeting. I do think it's very productive to be able to meet with the stakeholder groups and constituency chairs at the very beginning of the ICANN meetings and so on. So just that, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. And it's usually the night or the early evening before the day of the Council meeting, right? The Council meeting is on Wednesday and it's usually on Tuesday afternoon, Tuesday, like four. So are you

suggesting earlier than that, Bruna, or returning or just confirming that it should be like it was or it has been in the past?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: I would say maybe earlier than that, but I'm also open to what others think about it. It's just because this time I was a little bit lost that we had the initial day with all of the updates and so on, and then we had two days later, the informal session and very early in the morning. Just adding my comment to Farzaneh right now. But in that sense, I was just asking for that if we can do it as early as possible, I think it's a good opportunity to engage with everyone and hear what are the pressing concerns and problems about the Council agenda, that's all.

GREG DIBIASE: Great, thank you, Bruna. Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. The timing of that informal meeting used to be pretty-- there was a reason for why it was where it was. So it took place after the conclusion of all the constituency sessions. Usually, councilors may know more after the course of having those meetings and so that was the chance for the distillation of all that updated information and having that conversation. So, there's a reason why it was at the end of the day and at least for practical purposes it worked on the Wednesday. Maybe it's not ideal from an earliness or temperature situation but it was end of the day for a reason and so maybe that's sort of where it belongs still. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: There seems to be clear consensus it should be at the end of the day with drinks is what I'm hearing. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yeah, thanks. I think, Greg, what you said is correct that normally that session would occur at least I think the day before the Council session. And I agree with Steve. I've seen it work in the past that there's input that councilors receive before that closed session while the meeting is in person. That's kind of important input on hot issues before the closed session.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: One of the reasons it was pulled off of Tuesday evening is we could only get a room going forward if we kept it off the schedule not during the block so there would be no microphones, no remote access. So, if we did want to pull it back to Tuesday afterwards, we're only going to get a room with no microphones and it's a large group of folks. And in addition to that, we'd have no access for remote parties to join. So, things to keep in mind.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Well, leadership will work with staff to figure out the right time. And I think remote access is very important or critical, or it has to have remote access. Terri, is that a new hand?

TERRI AGNEW: I could answer Susan's question really quick. It is constituency day so, Susan, it is a really packed day. And I did check with some of the groups, and they did let me know they needed all of the sessions on Tuesday so it was not possible. We tried every angle first.

GREG DIBIASE: Peter.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah. Another point is, since you suggested Standing Selection Committee, so how do we go about it?

GREG DIBIASE: Standing Selection Committee?

PETER AKINREMI: SSC.

GREG DIBIASE: Oh, it's true. No, you were in charge of coming up with the standing-- I have no good answers so far. Does anyone else have any other AOB? Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Not sure if this is the right time to bring it up, but do we have a webinar where we discuss what we will discuss in the Washington meeting, the strategic meeting? Will we have a zoom call before that to align things?

GREG DIBIASE: I am not sure the answer. It sounds like a good idea, but we'll get back to you on how we will provide preparation materials for SPS. Farzi.

FARZANEH BADII: So, I just wanted to ask. I'm sorry I'm new, so I don't know how you guys work. On internal governance, ICANN stuff like it's not like thorny issues so we can actually come to consensus like, for example, for the ethics policy, or for how ICANN can tackle abuse and harassment, and have the processes in place does. Can the Council come together and provide recommendations? Because there have been many conversations about the new ombuds office, and the Board is looking into how to update the anti-harassment policy as well.

GREG DIBIASE: So, I think the Council has in the past commented things that are maybe adjacent to policy development, but not squarely in policy development. Obviously, our primary role is here in policy

development. I'm not sure that's 100% defined what the scope is, but I don't know if others have thoughts.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, so one of the things we've been doing over the last couple of years that I call it the Council's moral authority, is when there is something that maybe not directly in a remit, we sometimes lean in on it. So, for example, the request for reconsideration at the IPC did. Yeah, it had to do with how the policy was being implemented but that's not something that-- That particular thing was no longer part of the GNSO Council's work. We didn't have a part in, and how that was going to go but the Council still leaned into that and said, hey, Board, we think you should slow down, give us some thought. So, we kind of leaned in there.

So, I don't think it's necessarily doesn't break a rule for us to lean into things like that. And if we wanted to write a letter through welcoming the new ombuds, for example, I don't think there's anything wrong with that. If we want to cheer on the work for improving anti-harassment policies, there's nothing wrong with that. It's not policy necessarily. And so, I wouldn't be opposed if we did things along those lines. I don't it to be that we do it so much all the time for everything that it becomes meaningless.

And I also don't want to give the misimpression that we think we're the Board. We're not. But I do think there are times, and I think councilors should feel free to speak up in times when they think there's something that the Council could be helpful with. But, again, I wouldn't want to do it all the time for everything.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Paul. And then I guess, related to that, we do submit public comments as a Council from time to time. Sebastien, Bruna and then Thomas you want to queue after that. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sebastien Ducos, you GAC liaison. My inner Jeff has been wanting to say so many things that I'm held back because I promised that I would. But on this one, let's not forget that the loud speaker that we have us as GNSO councilor is very, very loud and speaks much louder than any of the constituencies. So, if we have something we're in full agreement with, let's use it. But if it's too loudly, emit a wishy-washy signal because we don't have a position, let the constituency speak and make that point.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Seb. Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks. Maybe in similar lines just said, but I do believe that if the message comes from Council, it's even stronger. And in that sense, you guys might know Farzaneh and I have been engaging a lot with the anti-harassment conversations, but not only that, but also talks regarding the independence of the ombuds person and so on. And I do believe that we could perhaps come up with a message around how ideally the ombuds person's relationship with

the community could be, what would be the most pressing, perhaps urgent points for her to address and so on.

Because Liz is also in need of data and information from the community. Not to talk about cases, but maybe perhaps talk about what possible inputs the GNSO Council could bring to her in order to help her onboard into the position and so on. So, I really don't see this as kind of anything external to our mission, but more like the GNSO Council also looking after its own community and so on. So, just adding that. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Bruna. And if memory serves, when the ombuds met with the Council, I think she even solicited feedback. So, that makes sense to me. Desiree?

DESIREE MILOSEVIC: I wanted to bring a couple of questions, maybe not so related to Farzaneh and Bruna discussing. But just to note that sometimes we need space within the Council to discuss issues that are not just with regards to New gTLD policy development process. And when I look at the ccNSO, for example, which has a separate working group on the internet governance and what is happening with our space in parallel, it would be good to carve out some time and talk about these initiatives and the tsunamis in the way how the internet governance process works and what's ahead of us next year. Because the next year is going to be very important in terms of the review of the World Summit of the

Information Society and how the world sees the multi-stakeholder process develop. So, just a note for that. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Desiree. Bruna? Oh, sorry. Is that an old hand, Bruna? Plus one. Okay. We have five minutes. Oh, sorry, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Maybe a general point. Now, I've been very much in favor of discussing things that are outside the Council's remit in this group, because I think it's good for us to be informed about broader things that are relevant to not only the GNSO, but also, to Desiree's point, to the multi-stakeholderism and other issues that have an impact on us. So, for example, I'd really like to have a discussion and maybe discuss with you how the organization that I'm representing here is working with hosting companies to improve on DNS abuse. Something that can't really be dealt with inside ICANN policy-wise due to the limitation in its bylaws.

But this discussion brings back sweet memories with Marilyn Cate, who some of you will for sure vividly remember. And Marilyn was always very clear on behalf of the BC that this is the GNSO's policy council. So, she wanted the role of the Council to be very limited and thereby leave more power and impact to the individual constituencies that are represented in Council.

So, I think that if you take this back home, you shouldn't be surprised if there are people or maybe even a majority inside your organization that says that the Council shouldn't be dealing with these things, right? So,

I think we should be doing that. I think we shouldn't be overstepping our policymaking role and embark on other territory. But I think when it comes to strengthening the cooperation between the various groups or welcoming the ombuds, things like that, that I think is good to make us one as an organization. So, I'm all in favor of that, but let's just not be surprised if we get a reality check from other folks in this community.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Thomas. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yeah, thanks, Greg. It's Anne. I really just raised my hand to say I think what Paul just put in the chat, Council should really only be speaking if we can speak with one voice. And I know that there are several occasions on which we've raised a question on the agenda, whether or not Council should provide a public comment, whether or not Council should send a letter to the Board because we agree. For example, on the IPCs RFR, the standing issue, everyone seemed to agree we needed to communicate with the Board about that.

But I would also potentially, if it's a big issue that we really want to put input to the Board, there's this tool we've never used. It's probably more formal than what people really want, but it's called the GNSO Input Process, which is quite specific about it's to cover non-policy matters.

And I put a link to it. Staff could take a look at that. But generally speaking, I agree that there's tremendous workload on the policy side.

And now we have also the improvement, continuous improvement work to be done. And I think it becomes a question of priorities as well. But the input process does exist. We've never used it, but it exists. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. Okay. We have one minute left. If anyone else has any other things they'd like to raise. Okay. Well, great. Thank you all for the input in this session and the hard work-- Oh, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Just the last minute, and I'm not expecting an update in the last minute, but we do have a comms update for the next call. It will be really good, because we were saying everything about we need to show people we're doing the work. So, are we showing people we're doing the work? That would be nice.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. We'll note that for the next meeting. Okay. Restarting my spiel. Thank you for all your hard work this week. Really excited to have the new councilors on Board. Great suggestions by Peter for getting better understanding. And we will be sending some follow-up information on next meeting as well as the SPS. And thank you so much. I'll bring this meeting to a close.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]