
ICANN82 | CF – GNSO Council Wrap-Up
Thursday, March 13, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 PST

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. Please state your name for the record, and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor back over to GNSO Chair, Greg DiBiase. Please begin.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you so much. Welcome, everyone, to the GNSO Council Wrap-Up. This is a rather informal meeting where we just discuss things that came up during the week and think about next steps on some topics. We put a list of topics together, but by all means, add to these in AOB if other things occur to you. And so, unless anyone has any questions, I think I'll dive right in.

Okay, number 1, call for volunteers on the GAC Communique response, an effort led by Seb, if I am correct. So I'll pause there and see who would like to volunteer for that effort. Yeah, do we usually do hands? Yeah, okay, hands.

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.

PAUL MCGRADY

Can I ask a question about that? Seb, do we have any information on what's going to be in the Communiqué?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

So, I've been monitoring mainly following on Sunday. I haven't seen anything yet that is of direct concern to us, and I'll keep on monitoring. I haven't seen the Communiqué going up. So, no, I don't know.

GREG DIBIASE

Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL

I would like to volunteer. That's what I'm basically doing.

GREG DIBIASE

Okay, great. Okay, staff, did you capture the hands, volunteers?

STEVE CHAN

So I have Susan, Sam, Manju, Jen, Vivek, Desiree. No, no, never too many.

GREG DIBIASE

Great. Any questions or comments about GAC Communiqué response or this process that will be organized by Seb? Okay. Oh,

sorry, I was looking in the-- oh, and you're in the thing, too. And Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Greg. I don't know. I think, at least in the chat, I see Susan say there's no expected GAC advice, but issues of importance. So, that's good. That gives us a little more time, and usually, it's like asking staff to see when the Board might be meeting the GAC again and see if we have a timeline to get this through, and if we have a longer timeline, then obviously, you can go through Council the usual way instead of having to rush. So, do we have any idea about all of that?

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Jen. This is Steve from staff. We do not, but I think you made a good point. If there's not actually GAC advice, it does operate in a different timeline. I think the first meeting that the Board has with the GAC is about clarifying questions and come to mutual agreement on only the advice. The items of issues of importance is separate in a separate meeting. So, there's a longer timeline, to your point. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, and I'll just repeat Julf's question in the chat, because it's a good one. Do we respond to issues of importance? And I'll repeat Susan's answer, because it's also a good one. We do where we feel there is something to say. Anything else on this topic? Oh, Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yes. So, I think that we should be a little bit ready. So, the usual suspect topics is going to be DNS abuse. And I'm sorry, I'm guessing. I'm going on the record guessing. So, it's going to be probably DNS abuse related because we kept hearing. And also, I wouldn't be surprised if they want to talk about accuracy. That could be one of the issues of importance. I just wanted to-- So, we have to continue the conversation about reviving the DNS Abuse Small Team, and also, but the group is going to work on that. Just giving you a heads up, this might come up.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Farzi. Oh, Seb?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Yeah, so, for the record on this, but this could be together a few years back, we decided to disband the DNS abuse small team, and I'm not sure who was still in that. Paul was on it, but there's a number of counselors that were gone since, and pass on the baton to the CPH DNS abuse. So, if we do take this back onboard, we'll have to go and inform them that we're doing so.

GREG DIBIASE

Sure. And I think, I could be wrong, we never disbanded it. I guess it's semantics. It's starting up again. Okay. You, yep.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Seb, I thought the assignment was done, and so that's where we left it, in terms of the small team. And while we didn't disband it, but it was understood that the assignment was done, and we had their recommendations as well.

GREG DIBIASE

Right. So, I think we do a new assignment for the small team. Okay. I guess it's a pretty good segue into a conversation we started on Council prioritization of potential work. It seems like we're aligned on small teams for both accuracy and DNS abuse, which is going to be a considerable undertaking. I think especially with urgency some are putting on these topics. So, there's a lot of potential work.

The question that I think we didn't discuss in detail was the RPMs phase two, and what is our timing on that? And there was an issues report, right, an issues report, but there were some in the community that had concerns with the issues report. We talked about forming a team or volunteers to look at the issues report, but then, I don't think we did anything after that. So, I guess I'm looking for feedback on thoughts on when, how we should address this topic, keeping in mind what else is on our plate. Anyone have initial thoughts? Oh, Caitlin, correct my errors here.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

No, no, no, just an update. So, our colleague, Julie Hedland reached out to the previous group of volunteers who wanted to look into this further, and I believe that included Susan, Damon,

Prudence, and Justine. If anyone else is interested in that topic, you can let us know, but I think Julie has already done some work about getting that team to meet and then report back to the fuller Council.

GREG DIBIASE

And that team is looking at the old status report and making?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Looking at potential next steps for RPM's phase two, yes.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah. Well, I'm not opposed to that team undertaking this work if they'd like to, but there's a lot on everyone's plate. Let's see, Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, I suppose it would be really helpful for that small team/group, whatever if we had a good sense of what everyone's, stakeholder group and constituency feels about the, that particular work. It's essentially the review of the UDRP that is the thing that's on our plate and has been postponed. You know, not hearing a huge number of people calling for that work to be the highest priority. But obviously, I'm an IPC member and members of, well, some members of the IPC may well feel that this should be done.

Many probably feel that the UDRP is working quite well, so they don't have a firm a strong belief it should be it's an urgent matter.

But obviously, there could be other constituencies and stakeholder groups that have strong feelings one way or the other, and it would be really useful to know, particularly if there are groups who really want this work to be pushed forward. That would be really useful information to know so that we're reflecting the kind of will of the community.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Susan. And I guess I'd also note from a process perspective these periodic reviews of existing policy is supposed to happen, right? That's a recommendation in the policy that these are periodically reviewed. So, I guess that's a factor to consider, even if people think the UDRP is working fairly well, as is. And I guess I'll just say what I think the registrar perspective is similar, Susan, we think that, yes, this review should happen, but also there's a general sense that the UDRP is working well. So, I'm not sure if that's helpful. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah, thanks, Greg. This is Sam. Just to your point, I think that broad question is a little bit hard for the groups to maybe wrap their arms around. So we might get better feedback if we have a bit more specificity to it. So, like, when we say, should there be a policy development process kicked off to review the UDRP, like, would it be a whole scale review?

We're looking at every single aspect of the UDRP, every policy matter is up for review, debate, discussion, or is it looking at

specific aspects of it, updates, things like that? Just having a little more specificity so people know what kind of, like, what they would be getting into in undertaking this work might be helpful. And I don't mean to put a lot of work on staff if that is what the end result of that would be.

GREG DIBIASE

That is a great point. Before I go to Ann, I'll ask if staff has feedback on that. Wait.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Greg. This is Steve from staff and not the staff expert on this. I, hopefully, I'll get this right. But, this is an interim step, I believe. The Council committed to looking at the charter. This is scoping and making sure that the scope that had been agreed to, I don't, I want to say, 2013. It was a while ago.

So, the Council already committed to the RPNs PDP. They completed phase one. And as a result of that PDP, they committed to looking at the scope for phase two. And so, that's where it is. They wanted to make sure that the scope before they kicked off phase two was fit for purpose, appropriate. And so, I think that's where we are in the process. We're not kicking off the work yet. It's looking at the scope and determining what it should be or even if it should be done at all. So, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Yeah, thanks. That's very helpful, Steve. And actually, this is not a comment on UDRP, per se, but on the general topic of prioritization. I was hoping that the projects that were all listed on Tomslin's one slides, there were five on one slide and eight on another slide. If we could just get an email to Council list that dates those topics so that maybe we could come back with some rankings on issues of importance and urgent or important and long-term and kind of take the temperature around the table as to the order of conducting the work.

GREG DIBIASE

I like that idea. Thanks, Anne. Paul, oh, you're going to go down, Paul? Oh, she said it. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Sam, again. Just to follow up to Steve's point then, that actually is super clarifying that what's ahead of us as the Council is to review the charter, to determine what the scope of the review would be, right? So, that's not what we need to go back and ask the stakeholder groups and constituencies. I think we can take a page out of the accuracy playbook and come up with a uniform set of questions that we bring back to our groups. I don't think we need to have it be as long of a process or as like heavyweight of a process.

It can just be something that, like for us in the registries, like I'll just take it back to a bi-weekly, I'll send an email in advance, be like, come prepared to speak to these questions. And asking, what are

aspects of the UDRP that should be reviewed at this point in time? I think that could be really helpful and we can bring it into a Council discussion later on. Consistent but fast, is I guess what my message is.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Sam. Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Because we have this decentralized networks and platforms that like Mastodon that allow the user to have their domain name as their ID, I'm wondering if that issue report could consider if UDRP at all needs to be changed to consider this like emerging technology that people have their domain name as their ID on this social media network and how that affects them.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Farzi. Okay. So maybe there's an interim step in defining when we're talking about RPMs phase two, what exactly is the potential work we take on? And I think leadership and staff can take that on and then maybe combine that with Anne's suggestion of gathering up the topics again and trying to figure out a way to do a, I don't know, I don't want to say formal, but an actual prioritization exercise. How does that sound to folks? Steve.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Greg. I think one of the things that the Council had discussed, I guess on the, I don't even remember, working sessions,

I'm thinking now. But I think one of the things, rather than just distributing the list, one of the things that had been talked about is trying to provide some additional context and information about each of these potential projects, like potential duration, complexity, like these different factors that might help the Council in decision-making, and then other factors that might feed into prioritization, like whether or not there are externalities that might be pushing the Council in one direction or not. So I don't know exactly what that's going to look like, but I think it was more than just a list, like providing a little bit more context and information to help with informed decision-making. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Steve. And I think that's something Sam was alluding to, too, right, when you were talking about RPM's phase two, like what is the scope of the work we're talking about. So that makes sense to me.

Okay, so some homework for staff and leadership. Other thoughts on prioritization at this point? Okay. Oh, Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Are we moving on to topic three on this agenda? Is that what you were going to do that, or are you just wrapping up the conversation?

GREG DIBIASE

I was about to do that, unless you have more points on, too.

JENNIFER CHUNG

No, I just thought we were going to have a little bit of discussion, or maybe that will be done next call, probably next call. I'm walking this back, my brain's not working. I was thinking of all of the buckets of work we were looking at, and then I remembered that staff was going to let us know. So that will be done in the April call, or is it going to be after that?

GREG DIBIASE

I'm not sure but I can commit us to, but we will prioritize the prioritization work deliverable.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Not that this is a priority, but it is still a hanging thing that I think it's on Council to deal with. It's a single-character HAN. I'm always that person who's like, hey, don't forget about single-character HAN. So just putting that back on our thing, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Great, and I think that was captured in the slide in other work. Okay to move to three. Participation and timing for bilateral meetings. So as a couple people noted in the informal call, the GAC call could have maybe had more dialogue, and there was also a note that it would be helpful, or no reason to not go through the slides in the working session. Like we talked about what the topics were. Why not go through the slides as well?

So I think that slides is one thing, and I think that's very straightforward. And so we talked a little bit about how to improve bilateral meetings. I don't have anything really specific to say at this point. I'm looking for input from others, other than, I guess, working with-- oh, setting up a call before. That's another thing we said we'd do, because we used to do that in the past. Desiree.

DESIREE MILOŠEVIĆ

Yes, in addition to setting up the call, I wonder whether we can chart a little bit. Are we going to meet up with ccNSO and when with regards to the holistic review coordination work? And also, I know an annual basis, we have a one-to-one with ALAC that we didn't have in a long time. And whether that fits into the Prague or October meeting, I think something we should think of, depending on the topics we want to address.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Desiree. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Thank you, yeah, it's Anne. With respect to the GAC bilateral, how much time do we have between our working session normally and the GAC meeting so that there's time for slides to be prepared or modified? Is there enough time allocated? And is there a way to make sure that we have time between the two so that everyone's on board with those slides?

GREG DIBIASE Yeah, I mean, there was not a lot of time this time, right? It was like 30 minutes.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE That really didn't work so well.

GREG DIBIASE Yeah. Good question.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE I mean, yeah, if there's any way. And it puts a lot of pressure on staff too, so.

GREG DIBIASE Yeah, I guess we'll note that as something to think about as when we're scheduling. Seb? Oh, Steve.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS So yeah, we'll have a limited amount of time, whatever it is, 30 minutes, an hour a day, it'll be limited. I think that strategically, because we have those questions long in advance, and I did warn to the fact that the work was ongoing and we may not have a position, but we may want to discuss here is having a more thorough answer than we had last time, which means within rules and etc., to be able to give a range of where the discussions are.

So on a topic like accuracy, we don't say this is what we're going to do. Because we don't know exactly what we want to do, but maybe

say different people within the Council or different groups within the Council, think of this, think of that, etc., to show and demonstrate that we've been talking about it, that work is happening, which wasn't what it looked like on Sunday, without having to give any conclusions.

Now, the groups around the table need to be comfortable with that. Again, I'm not citing opinions and putting names and faces on it, but it might be a way to give a better answer, demonstrate that work is being done, demonstrate where directions are going, but also not giving the answer they want because we don't have the final part.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Seb. Thomas, then Manju.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, I don't want to overcomplicate things, but maybe we really need a small group or at least a good exchange on the mailing list on how we're going to plan these meetings. And it's bilateral things, then with the Board, as you know, we've discussed that we want to have informal meetings with them. I think this is all great. But I think we need to have some strategy as to what topics we want to raise, maybe not only for the next meeting, but maybe have something on shelf for the next two or three meetings, so that if we have virtually nothing news to report, that at least we have something content-rich. We've discussed this earlier in the draw that we can pull out.

So I think with looking at the number of new delegates in the GAC, maybe it would be worthwhile for us to just explain what the GNSO is about. I'm sure that they've heard about what the acronym means, but that it's a bicameral structure with these stakeholder groups that have different interests. And I think we can be open about where the points of contention in this community are, so they better understand why we are struggling. And I think there's nothing bad about that. And I think it would be perfectly okay for us to ask for maybe 30 minutes to explain just that. And I think that will help them understand that we're not just stubborn, but that we're working hard and that sometimes it takes us a little longer to produce tangible results.

The other thing is for the Board, I think that we should really pick them up, or I think that the relationship between the GNSO and the Board is excellent at this stage. And I think we should make good use of that. Just when we said goodbye after the session that we had with them, I mentioned more or less jokingly, although that I'd really like to see us discuss standard response times between the board and the GNSO, but also between ALAC and the GAC and others, because there's this constant issue that we are sending stuff to the Board and then there's some use to the phrase that it's disappearing in a black hole and you don't know when it's going to surface.

So why not discuss with them whether they're open to the suggestion that standard response time should be a month, two months, whatever the figure might be, so that we know that by a certain period of time we can expect an answer. And if the answer

is that, yes, we're working on it, it will take us another 15 months to get this done, that's better than being entirely in the dark on this. So it's these practical matters, just two examples on what I think we should maybe brainstorm about, put on a list, and then put a proper communications or engagement strategy around.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Thomas. Yeah, so I'm seeing a lot of support in the chat. Major plus one. I don't know why we wouldn't start the meetings with, here's what the GNSO does, like a more thorough of that and here's how it works with GAC. And then, yeah, to your idea of getting ideas to talk about, I think that could be rather simple. We can have a doc that people could add to, right? And build in between and then work with Seb to make sure that GAC was okay with these topics. Great, Manju.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, I also hugely support Thomas. I just didn't put it in the chat. My comment is mostly a response or like a reflection to Seb's suggestion of us laying out different theoretical opinions on some issues when we're talking to them. While I think it's a good approach, I also will be cautious of us representing each stakeholder groups as a Council. I mean, the GAC are meeting other stakeholder groups anyways, right, they have meeting with CSG, they are meeting with the CPH. We are trying very hard to let them meet with us too.

So another way maybe, just ask them, well, we encourage you to talk about this topics and those sessions because they will have a more thorough view that they feel more empowered to share with you than Council as a whole to share with you how they think. And that also might help us to finally get a full session with them, that's my personal ambition, but that's my comments, thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Manju, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thank you. And a huge plus one to that from Manju. I think that's a really good point because I think some GAC members still don't really understand that we on some topics, we haven't got a unified voice. And so we have to work quite hard to come to a position that we can all kind of live with, agree on. Sometimes we don't all agree, but we can't start airing that kind of discussion in front of the GAC. If they want to know what the GNSO thinks about a particular issue, they have to talk to all of the bits of the GNSO, really, and they don't.

But mine was more of a practical comment, was just that the room set up for both of those meetings is horrible. I think the GAC one we probably can't change. But maybe we can change the Board one. Why is it in that huge, great big room with the Board and a handful of people on a stage and no one else is allowed to speak? Can we find a way where we don't use that room and the Board

come here or an equivalent room and we all shuffle up and we're all just sitting around the table and everyone can chat?

GREG DIBIASE

So I'm going to go to Seb real fast and then back to the queue.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

So on Thomas and Manju's point, I fully agree 100%. Let's not forget that the loudest comment was from somebody who knows Arina working really well and probably doesn't need to be taught. She knew exactly what she was talking about. I still am. On the room, I think that actually at some point we did discuss that there was an issue with translation maybe. That might be why we're there.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Seb. And Bruna, real quick before I go to you. On Manju's point about it's strange to say both sides, what would be ideal is if there was an issue got cared about, there were two opposing sides, we found a compromise and we can just explain what happened after the fact, right? Something like that. Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS

Thanks. Two things on the Board thing. I believe both sides of the NCPH, we have been doing informal meetings with them. Maybe it's something we can also request, an informal meeting perhaps with a subset of the Board where we can discuss things in a rather more relaxed way. And then also use that request as a preparation

for the GNSO and Board meeting. That's maybe a way of dealing with this request.

And adding to the list of requests that we're discussing right now, I would maybe like to hear a little bit back from the pilot holistic review, both our representatives there, but also the team. I've heard a couple of things yesterday. I don't want to put them on the record, but it will be really interesting to hear some updates from it.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks Bruna. And that's actually next on our agenda too. So, Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure, I agree with Bruna. And I think as far as like a subset of the Board, we should really utilize more our GNSO appointed Board members. To liaise more and get more communications going with them.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Damon. Bruna, is that a new hand? Okay. Other suggestions or ideas? Oh, never mind. So I think we have some notes to work with on that. And we'll work with staff and Seb to refine the process. Okay, going on to reviews. I think there are two questions we may need to start considering. So the first regards the timing of ATRT4, the accountability and transparency review that is mandated by ICANN's bylaws. And this has been delayed

because the work coming out of ATRT3 has not completed, right? And so it's from a practical people's time perspective, it seems not productive to start ATRT4. But at the same time, the bylaws do mandate this and this is a measure of ICANN's accountability as an organization.

So we've had feedback from the Board that they want their input on how to address this conundrum. And then on a related note, in the pilot holistic review, I know they've run into some questions about how to proceed. I don't think I'm well versed enough yet to describe what those are, but maybe noting that we want to understand, right? We'd like updates from the pilot holistic review if they're reaching an impasse that affects the work and then affects the timeline for the ATRT4, like I said earlier. So I'll pause there and hopefully I didn't mess up. I'm not the most familiar with the reviews. So hopefully that's all accurate and I'll go to Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks, I'm going to ask her a super dumb question and then I'm going to propose something. Super dumb question is for each of these reviews, does this Council have a liaison to that review or are we just getting our information back from the review team on an ad hoc basis? What's that? I'm sorry, say yeah. Bruna, do you want to turn on the microphone and say that?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS

No, just for the holistic one, we have three representatives there, right? Three GNSO nominees for this group. That's why I'm just.

PAUL MCGRADY

In terms of that's the population of the review team, right? But the Council doesn't have a liaison to that review that I know of, right? Or any of the others. And as I look through, it's all in section four of the bylaws that lays out all the different reviews and there are a lot. And the holistic review is maybe meant to wrap all those into one, some this idea that we need to be faithful to the bylaws and also make this stuff predictable. I don't quite understand the idea behind the holistic review.

And so here's the big idea, which is I think that the reviews are such a big part of what's happening within ICANN. And a lot of people can't distinguish between the Council's work and the reviews work. And they may think that we're somehow holding up the reviews even though we're not the review team. That it may make sense to like in a Seb like fashion, have one person. And it's easy for me to say, cause I'm leaving. But to have one counselor who commits to fully understanding all the reviews and what they're up to, where they are in the process and be the point of contact for the Council to for us to ask questions and for us to understand how they're moving. Are they moving in parallel? How far ahead are they? Could they be wrapped under one umbrella review?

Because as I heard the Board talk about this issue, the idea the mental image came to me of pharmacy, right, like the reviews are our medicine. But I feel like if we have five medications, we're getting one on the third of the month, one on the 17th of the month, one on a day of the month that we don't know when we're getting

it. And two on the 25th. And some of the pills are, some of the bottles have nine pills, some have 74 pills. We don't know how and what sequence we're taking our medicine because we don't understand when that medicine's arriving, which prescriber sent it to it. Like to me, it's jumbly, right?

And so in order for the Council to engage in a dialogue, a meaningful dialogue with the Board about what we should do to sequence these things, I think we need to not only just get a, like a presentation once a year from staff who are keeping track of all this, but really having a subject matter expert on Council that understands that. And so that's a, somebody who really, really, really likes weeds would be great at that. And so for what that's worth, because it's easy to just jump.

My initial thought after listening to the Board was, I just jumped to the intuitive conclusion. Well, we should have in the even years a review and the odd years an implementation, and it should all be one review and it should handle it all, right? And that sounds great. That's probably not practical whatsoever, but that's just a high level reaction to trying to bring order to it.

And I'm not being critical of us because we're busy with our own work, right? But I don't even know that the Council knows enough to even go to the table to talk to the Board about how to get this part of our community unbroken. If that makes sense. So anyways, that's my big idea. And it's from a place of ignorance and everybody, and again, it's easy for me to say, cause I'm out in November, bye. But I think it would be great.

FARZANEH BADIEI

You need to check the chat right now, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY

What was that? Yeah. Councilor Emeritus. Yeah, thanks, Damon. I hate you too. Anyways, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

So yeah, I mean, if there's more than seven emojis, I think that's binding. And I'm not an emoji law expert, but it seems pretty compelling. So that's an interesting idea. I think from my perspective at a minimum, I'd like to have them come to Council and present in hopefully easy to understand language what are the issues they face. Cause yeah, I agree. It's pretty confusing. Okay, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Hi, thanks. It's Anne. On the topic of reviews, in the meeting between the Board and Contract Party House, I think it was that meeting that Chris Disspain brought up an idea for being able to try to commence ATRT4 on time, but changing the scope a little bit because certain members of the Board were very excited about the idea about completely revising the reviews and amending bylaws, etc., etc.

But I would have to say that I'm of the view that this would be a very bad year to delay ATRT4. With everything that's going on in internet governance, I think that ICANN generally wants to

maintain its accountability structure, things that were put in place pursuant to relinquishing the affirmation of commitments, etc. And I thought Chris had a pretty good idea about how to rework the purpose of ATRT4 a little bit and stay accountable in terms of the timing.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Anne. And yeah, so to my last point, I'd love for him to tell it to all of Council if it's still viable. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah, thanks, Greg. I mean, I wholeheartedly agree with the need to do a deeper dive on this to get the folks who are experts to come help talk us through it. One of the reasons it's so confusing right now is because there is a schedule of reviews that's very clear in the bylaws, as Paul pointed out. However, the output of ATRT3, the last one, was to really change a lot of that, right?

So all of the things that are called, there's specific reviews and then there's organizational reviews. All the things that are organizational reviews which looked at like reviewing the NomCom, reviewing the GNSO, all those, they're meant to be replaced by continuous improvement. I'm pretty sure the holistic review, when it is functional, is meant to look at the efficacy of that continuous improvement scheme, the things that are put in place, as well as some other functions about like the way the community groups work together and things like that.

It also, ATRT3, that is, also recommended eliminating some of the specific reviews. So I think the WHOIS RDDS review, and the Security Stability Resiliency Review, they got changed as the results of that. So the landscape of reviews is going to change. We're just literally very much in flight of that. And the concept of the holistic review has been a little hard for everyone to wrap their arms around. And that seems to be one of the core issues that's causing a lot of confusion right now and also creating this open question of like the overlap with ATRT4 and should it change the timeline of that.

It was a little hard. I don't want to be critical. I think it's great to use the in-person conversations to deal with issues as they're popping up. But it was a little hard to have a meaningful conversation to the Board's question, responding to the Board's question for input on this because most of us who aren't like steeped in this like Chris is are having a hard time following it, right?

So I think one of the things we need to do is I know that Chris and Sophie Hay, who are the leaders of the Pilot Holistic Review Team, which they're changing their name, but still, they had an in-depth conversation with the Board and with the chairs of ATRT3 who made this original recommendation. They're probably a great place to start for it to have them come and brief us and get us up to speed on what was decided there as we start to tackle this. But yeah, definitely agree with everything everyone said. And if we want to dedicate someone to track all of this work going forward, that's probably a really good resource.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Sam. So I guess I want to go back. I agree with all that. I think these are great suggestions. I think what I'm hearing regarding what should the Board do on this conundrum of we're coming up against the timeline or the timeline's already been deferred is that we don't have enough information, like we need to understand the issues better. Are there others that have a firm view that there's advice we can give before we take this deeper dive to try to understand reviews better? So I'm seeing no one. And it sounds like the first step is-- oh, sorry, Desiree. Oh, no.

DESIREE MILOŠEVIĆ

It was me. Yeah, I just lowered the hand. Well, I would suggest that we probably try and have some kind of informal call with the Board because perhaps we can look at the structure that might get changed and the scope of it that could be lessened in order to either speed up some things or to have the ATRT4 cover less. So I think there is a question on scope that we don't currently understand which affects the timeline. So as long as we could have some informal discussions as well for them to present it, it could be the representatives of the GNSO. I think that would be a valuable input for us.

On the other hand, we do need to work together with the ccNSO and they have already asked us these questions last year. How do we work together on this? So I wholeheartedly support what Paul

has said. We need to have someone on our side. In addition to Sam, who knows as well what some issues are to track this.

GREG DIBIASE

Better. Okay.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

I'm not sure what happened.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, thanks, Desiree. I guess my only note there is I don't think the Board knows either, right? So there's a meeting to, I guess, level set, but I think the Board is looking for feedback and until we understand it better, I'm not sure what feedback we would have.

DESIREE MILOŠEVIĆ

Yeah, the ccNSO looked into this as well. And so I think maybe we can have a discussion, well, with the leadership of GNSO and ccNSO leadership to maybe liaise on these issues as well.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Desiree. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks. So I was just going to say, Sophie Hay, who's one of the co-chairs of that Pilot History Review, does happen to be here. She's not here to speak to us, but she is in the room. Like, if you wanted a super high level, I'm sure we could persuade her to give us

something really high level, or we could just ask her here if she's willing to come and give us a proper briefing in future.

GREG DIBIASE

Sophie, can you solve this issue definitively?

SOPHIE HEY

I'm making absolutely no promises on that. So it's Thursday, so very much not prepared to give a proper update right now, but I do want to say, yes, I'm very happy to come back and talk to you all about what's going on in the Pilot Holistic Review. At the moment, these discussions about what's happening in terms of our remit, we're in a slight challenge with our deliverables in the terms of reference, making sure we understand to what extent there's a structural review of ICANN overall. And then there's also the bucket of reviewing the continuous improvement.

So again, putting it at a very high level, there's two components. One part, the continuous improvement, where we're taking the assumption that yes, the SOs and ACs are fit for purpose, and we're working on improving that. The second part is going, do we start with that assumption and the SOs and ACs are all fit for purpose, or does this need to be something bigger going on at ICANN?

So again, and again, I'm in the GNSO, so we all know exactly how much fun talking structure is. So at the moment, what we're doing is we're trying to get some clarity on what our scope and remit is, to make sure that the community is understanding and onboard

and going, yes, this is what we want you guys to do, and making sure that we have that clarified in our terms of reference.

I don't think staff will get upset with me if I say that one year is not going to happen for the Pilot Holistic Review, especially given the timing of it. But it is a big bucket, it is important work, and it does come into play with other, with the specific reviews as well. So I can do what I can to answer questions. Again, bearing in mind that it's Thursday, and we're in a wrap up session, but again, very happy to come back and talk to Council.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you so much, Sophie. Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS

Just following up, I think the Board liaison with the review is Leon. Yeah, because following on what this was suggesting, maybe the informal could be with Leon, just to talk about the holistic review and then just a quick chat, and then after the updates we might get and so on.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Bruna. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah, thanks, just another suggestion for this informal, right? So maybe leading with the Pilot Holistic Review, and then having, whether it's the liaison or a few more Board members present, to

put that into the context of the larger question that they're grappling with. Because I think they're also grappling with the larger question of the timing of accountability and transparency reviews specifically, and what the next accountability transparency review should cover, and if that needs to look maybe a little different than it has in the past. So I think if we can get everyone to agree to an informal call, we might need like 90 minutes on it, because we might need a little bit of time for each thing and then time to reflect and discuss amongst ourselves. But I would suggest trying to get that done soon.

GREG DIBIASE

So my question would be, would we wait until after we get a briefing from Sophie to schedule an informal meeting with the Board member?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

No, my vision is her briefing is part of the one big informal call. You know what I mean? They kind of kick off, yeah, they kick off, and then the Board members are there to put that information into the context of the larger stuff that they're grappling with. Because it seems like it's all a bit connected, and I think trying to consider them all as very separate things might just create more confusion down the road.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks. So I'm going to stop and look to staff and make sure we're not-- I know you guys don't have the answer if this is possible, but does it seem potentially feasible?

STEVE CHAN

This is Steve, yes. I would also like clarity on this, so I very much welcome this briefing too. I'm chatting with colleagues, and I think they actually agree this is a good approach, trying to pull everyone together and gain clarity and all gain some insights on how to move forward on this. So we'll make it happen, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG

I was hoping that the person who made this suggestion in chat would say it, but I just wanted to put this on record that I think, Sam, great idea about that, but also it doesn't have to wait until the April meeting to have this. But I'm kind of grappling with the idea of we have this huge thing of an informal call with Sophie and then all of that. Do we need some time to digest it? I don't know how fast everybody else's brain works, but my brain doesn't work that fast. Or is it really just a session for us to get level set and then just chew on some ideas first?

GREG DIBIASE

So I was thinking it's level set and understand what the questions are, right? Which I think would be advantageous to learn the

questions at the same time as the Board. I don't think there's an issue with that. But I think you were saying, Sam, of this.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah, and sorry to jump the queue. Yeah, hearing everything that's laid out in front of us, knowing what the questions are on the table, knowing what kind of specific items they would value our feedback on. And then I was just saying build into however long we book for this call maybe some time for us to share some initial thoughts on it, but not necessarily feel like we have to have everything solved at the end of that call. And if we schedule it in close enough proximity to one of our monthly calls, we can just carry it over as an agenda item for that. Once we've had a little bit more time to A, think about it ourselves, also go back to our groups, get their views on it as well.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Sam. Yeah, and then I saw I guess-- oh, Manju.

MANJU CHEN

Sorry, just being the time zone person as I've always been. I don't like the idea of 90 minutes call because in the composition of us on the Board and our representative on the PHR, I don't think the time will work well for us who live in the APAC. It's most definitely going to be night, at least 9 p.m., 10 p.m. for me, which means 11, 12, 1 a.m. for Tomslin. And if we're going to 90 minutes for that, it's not going to work for us. So I'll definitely strongly against 90 minutes call. We can do two calls, whatsoever. I just like, please take into

consideration to people who don't live in a favorable time zone.
Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Manju. Okay, take that into consideration. So my next question is, because it looks like Paul is violating emoji law and refusing Damon's nomination. Is there any counselor that's interested in volunteering to be a point person on this subject?

PAUL MCGRADY

No, no.

GREG DIBIASE

Yay!

PAUL MCGRADY

I can do it between now and October and we might be able to get a little, our arms around it. But I mean, I think this, these reviews are never going away. And so it would be extremely useful for somebody to decide that they want to do it in the next term. I don't think having a freshman counselor do it is a good idea, because they're trying to figure out who Terri is, right? No, it's early. Maybe I can put my arms around it, but if there's somebody that can see themselves doing it, that's a returning counselor, that can see themselves doing it in the next term, I would love to work with that person and hand it off, because I think that's wise. Because it's not going to get fixed before November.

GREG DIBIASE Right. So yeah, no need to volunteer now, but be thinking about if this is something you'd be interested in diving into further. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI I wanted to say this during AOB, I'm sorry if I'm going off topic, but I have a feeling that we are going to face a lot of issues since a few counselors are term limited and are their way out. So for example, Desiree is our ccNSO liaison, and Paul is retiring. I mean, not retiring, sorry, limited. And so I think that we need to think about, I don't know if this procedurally is a good idea, but why can't we use non-Council members as liaison? Like Seb is not a Council member, he's a liaison to GAC.

GREG DIBIASE I think there have been non-Council liaisons. I'm not sure. I think the first option would be to see if there's a counselor that's interested, but if not, then I don't know, this could be something we can consider. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS I put my hand up on the chats to help afterwards, so no.

GREG DIBIASE Great, thank you Bruna. Okay, any other thoughts on reviews at this point? Seeing none, let's go to Latin Script Diacritics PDP Timeline. And Prudence, are you helping us with this one?

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Yes, hi everyone, Prudence for the transcript. Okay, so as you guys know, the PDP just started this week and we had our first session. However, I just need to give you some visibility to something that's super early, super new, but I just wanted to let you guys know what's in the mix. So there's been a request to see if we can speed up the process potentially and to try and give a partial result that can be added to the applicant guidebook. So just specifically relating to the issue of diacritics and ASCII, like TLDs.

So the idea's been floated around that we're going to potentially split the PDP into two phases, with phase one being an accelerated phase, just having one like sole recommendation or maybe like a couple with housekeeping stuff in. But with that sole purpose of identifying or just stating somewhere where if there's an application for a string and that application's going to be rejected primarily because of a similarity determination, they're going to put that on hold until the determination of the phase two content.

And then the phase two is going to be the substantive information that was going to be the original policy. So that's where we are at the moment. Staff, they're currently figuring out how they're going to implement this, if this is feasible, if this is possible. But I just want to make sure that you guys had visibility and I'll provide a further update once any further progress is made. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Prudence. Interesting. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks. Indeed, interesting. I'd love to know what that timeline would look like properly because you would have to do a public comment period which would have to be whatever it is, 42 days or whatever, and then review those comment, the public comment input and then finalize a report, and then Council would vote on it and it would have to go to the Board. And that all has to happen in time for it to go into an AGB. That needs to be finalized I think by December. And so I'm all for you getting your work super accelerated but we've talked in the past about can't we just get X done. And actually there's a really quite a long timeline to follow, to make sure you take all the procedures.

And I would hate some expectations to be raised in your group that will then later get dashed and they will feel like they were being strung along. But you know, we talked a lot about this issue and the fact that it wasn't something that was going to get solved in time for the next round and it shouldn't hold the next round up. So yeah, I mean, interesting, really, I can't think of the words, support the idea of you all wanting to work fast but I just don't know that it's realistic. So it'd be really helpful to have a proper breakdown of how that timeline would work and if it could. And I'm not sure it could.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Susan. This is Steve. And when we heard about this idea, we reacted like you, this is terrifying to us. And so that's why we haven't committed to anything, we're just taking a look at it from a

staff perspective. Obviously consulting with a lot of parties, especially the Next Round Implementation team and also our legal team because the expectations are that the applicant guidebook in its totality is going to be published for public comment in May. And so if we're trying to get out an initial report for just even this phase one, like that timeline doesn't work.

So how do you even inject this part of it into that applicant guidebook? Can you do it separately from the fully formed applicant guidebook? So the weeds here but what we're doing is talk about this internally and seeing if it is at all feasible. And we're trying to set expectations as low as possible right now because we're not sure. So hope that helps, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks Steve, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Like Steve and Susan, when Prudence started talking, I was very alarmed but then when she kind of started explaining, I am understanding where they're coming from. I think this is really to do with registrant rights too as well because they don't want to be told right off the bat, this is not possible for you. And I think it's a really little bit of hook there is for them to understand this work is being done but you can still apply for this and then that will be determined after this bulk of this work is done.

And I think that possibly can work but maybe it does sound like a lot. So maybe the thing is for Council is for Latin diacritics PDP and

staff to actually work out what the timeline actually looks like for that little hook to be put into the AGB and all that if that's possible. That gives me a lot more, less alarm, less alarm because we're looking at too much speed. It's actually quite difficult to actually envisage all the different impacts it might have. Thanks Prudence.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks Jen. Any thoughts, Prudence?

PRUDENCE MALINKI

So thank you, everyone, for your comments and feedback and suggestions. Again, it's super early days but the idea is to prevent applications that could potentially go through from not going through based on the outcome of our work. So the idea is a good one or the ethos is good. But again, we don't know. We don't know, we're at the early stages of trying to figure out if it's even implementable at all or even feasible. So the minute we figure out if it can happen, we'll keep everyone posted. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks Prudence. And I'll also note that I like that on your first day of your first liaison, you're getting this interesting topic. So well done. Any other questions on this topic? Edmon? Can I counselor? Yeah, please.

EDMON CHUNG

I guess just on the topic, the motivations are clear, right? Because the rounds are perceived to be few and far between and therefore

people want to apply. So just as an experience from the IDN working group, there was a discussion about a situation whereby if you apply for a name and the language is not ready yet or the language label generation rule sets are not ready yet, you can still apply. But knowing that it will not be processed until the LGR is ready. So maybe something along those lines, as a short thing that has already, because it has a precedence, this kind of thing. So maybe that's something you can think about.

GREG DIBIASE

Great, thanks Edmon. Okay, let's move to AOB. These were the topics that counselors thought of, but I'd also like to open it up and see what is on other folks' minds. Not seeing any hand. Oh, Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI

So I wanted to talk about the open mic session. I think it's great that we have open mic session. And when I was not on the Council, I made good use of it. But now I'm on the Council and nobody contributes and nobody comes to this open mic session. I think we should think about like maybe raise awareness that we have these open mic sessions, especially to our colleagues in GAC and ALAC and SSAC if they have something on their mind that they want to discuss with us.

GREG DIBIASE

So that's a great point. I mean, do we do other than post on the schedule? Is there any type of communication?

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Greg. This is Steve. We actually identified the same issue that Farzi did. And we've tried actually, because there was an open mic that we included with the working sessions before too. So we tried in different places and we tried to communicate it. I think we might have included in the leadership digest. And people just don't show up. So we can try something new, but just, I guess we haven't not identified the issue. We haven't not tried to solve it, but we haven't managed to do so yet. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, maybe that's another thing we mentioned in our bilateral, right? Say in the bill, thank you for inviting us to the GAC room. Our session is on this day and there's an open mic session at the end of it. If you have feedback. Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS

I'm sure there was someone before me, but it's okay.

GREG DIBIASE

Jen, did you put down your hand? Were you in the queue? Yeah. Oh, Manju. Was anyone in the queue before Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS

I think so, but it's okay. Maybe I'm imagining things, it's all right. Just about the counseling formal as well. I commented this on the last time. It would be really nice if we use that session to hear from

community as we did a couple of years before. Like we invite other SGs and Cs leaders, but we dive too much into our work. So maybe it would be important to bring back this lot for them to also bring issues to us. And I know that's part of the invitation, but maybe we can try that once again.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Bruna. Yeah, and like you said, we invite them, but I don't know if we do a good enough job, but explicitly saying this is your opportunity to bring your stakeholder groups issues to Council. Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks. Paul McGrady. So we used to say there was going to be an open mic, and then we ran out of time, and people would sit for two hours, and it really made them unhappy. And I'll say in terms of like, if I were not on Council, and I wanted to say something in open mic, and I don't know when that's really going to start, I wouldn't come and sit through two hours of a meeting that I didn't care about most of the stuff.

And so one thing to consider is having a 30-minute open mic session at the beginning of what we're doing, but have it be a separate event in the schedule so it stands out. And we run a queue, and we cut it off at 20 minutes in so that we don't go over time and mess up our own meeting. That way people can come. They don't have to wait two hours to talk to us. They know when it ends. It's finite, and the best advertising is to have a thing in the

program. And maybe run that experiment in the fall, because I don't think we do an open mic at the June meeting. We might, though. We could, but maybe run it at the next meeting, see how that goes, and if that increases participation. And if it doesn't increase participation, then maybe we can just say, this is a product without a purchaser, and we can quit doing it. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Steve?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Sorry, this is not Steve. Do you not have a computer? Yeah, again, I can't see anything. So we tried a variant of what you described, Paul, by having the open mic at the beginning of our session, with the only caveat, obviously, is that if nobody shows up, or if there's only one question goes quickly, then we go into our agenda. If we split it, then it means that we're going to wait for half an hour, or 45 minutes, or whatever it is, and then start our agenda. So maybe we need to think about it.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thank you, not Steve, for that comment. So why not do it the way the Board does? I mean, you don't have to have the entire Council there for open mic, right? You can have three or four up, and so if nobody shows, then it adjourns early. Everybody's got 15 more minutes, and then we start our Council meeting on time. I know I'm talking about adding another half an hour to our calendar, but it's better than having people disgruntled that they can't talk to us.

And not everybody needs to be there. Could be leadership in two or three subject matter people that are for the hottest topics.

THOMAS RICKERT

Or a chatbot.

PAUL MCGRADY

Everybody will have to be certified as being a human to be there.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Paul. I will note that we're often struggling to get rooms, like we're even fighting for our informal sessions, if I remember correctly. Is that, no? All right, I'm making that up. Steve. Actual Steve.

STEVE CHAN

Not Seb, here on the mic. Just to call back to one of the things that we did pilot, it was actually, I think we called it the GNSO Town Hall. And so we actually dedicated, I want to say, like a good 45 minutes, 60 minutes, in advertising it to try to get folks to come to the open mic. And I think they had some mixed results. So it's not necessarily a new concept. We can maybe revive it again. But yeah, it's something we have tried. It's not exactly attaching it or putting on the front end of the Council meeting. But it was, I think, in line with intention of creating dedicated space and advertising it and providing advanced awareness of the opportunity to speak to the Council.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thank you, not Seb. I think that the optics of having it just before the Council meeting, I think, are great. Because then it's not, at the end, after all of our business is done, and we're like, thank you for your comments, we're leaving now, right? Instead, it's like, oh, thank you for making us aware. You know, we're talking about that topic and then stick around for the Council meeting, right?

To me, it seems like it would be, I don't know, people may feel more listened to if we do it in that particular order, for what it's worth. And I'm taking up way too much time on this topic. But I just think this is something that it's nice to do. And we can format it in a way to make the opportunity for real. And then, like I said, if people don't show up, then that's our answer. And it's nice, we think it's nice, they don't, that's fine.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Paul. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Greg. Beth, who is here in the room with us, reminded me of something, which is that when the GAC did their open mic for this meeting, they actually solicited topics in advance. So they sent it out and people filled out a little, I think it was a Google form, saying, hey, this is my name, this is who I'm representing, and this is what I'd like to talk about. We could consider using something like that to at least gauge the demand, right?

Like we send that out the month before the meeting. Do you think you are interested in showing up at a GNSO open mic? That'll probably help us figure out how much time we want to dedicate to it. I think 30 minutes is a really good starting point. It feels comfortable. But it'll help us know, as we're building the agenda for the rest of the meeting, like the rest of the two-hour Council meeting, how much wiggle room we have, right? Like if we think it's only going to go 15, if we think it's going to go full 30.

And then just a tiny point on the actual timing. If, assuming the blocks of time in the schedule are going to remain consistent, meeting over meeting, I would say if it's possible, with the rooms and the texts and all that stuff, instead of just like tacking it on the first 30 minutes of a two-hour Council meeting, instead of starting at 1:15, we start at 1:00 and plan to go to like 3:30. And that way, right, does that work out? That way, we're starting a little bit earlier and it doesn't like bleed over too much into making like a super, super long session.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Sam. Desiree, but maybe Terri has a specific answer to that question.

TERRI AGNEW

Hi, unfortunately, we're at the mercy of our texts and lunch breaks and different factors in that. And for the June meeting, it'll actually start at 1:45, our Council meeting. It's already kind of planned out for that.

GREG DIBIASE

So this is not feasible for June, at least. Desiree.

DESIREE MILOŠEVIĆ

So I support what Sam just said, getting some kind of an insight, what people want to talk about, and maybe framing question that we would like to hear from the community on could be another way of gauging some inputs that we think is important. So if there are no topics and no show-ups, at least we know that there's no interest for these topics to be further discussed. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Desiree. Okay, we are at time. Does anyone have any last minute comment? We have room for one.

Okay. Thanks, everyone. I think this was a super productive meeting. We got a lot done. We put a lot onto our plates, which I think is a good thing. And everyone have safe travels back home. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]