| | |
|---|---|
| TERRI AGNEW | The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council Meeting taking place on Wednesday, the 11th of June, 2025. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Nacho Amadoz, who I don't see in the room, but we will check on him. Jennifer Chung. |
| JENNIFER CHUNG | Present. Thank you, Terri. |
| TERRI AGNEW | You're welcome. Hong-Fu Meng. |
| HONG-FU MENG | Present. Thank you, Terri. |
| TERRI AGNEW | You are welcome. Samantha Demetriou. |
| SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU | Present. Thanks, Terri. |

| | |
|---|---|
| TERRI AGNEW | You're welcome. Greg DiBiase. |
| GREG DIBIASE | Present. |
| TERRI AGNEW | Prudence Malinki. |
| PRUDENCE MALINKI | Present. Thanks, Terri. |
| TERRI AGNEW | You're welcome. Desiree Milosevic. |
| DESIREE MILOSEVIC | Present. Thanks, Terri. |
| TERRI AGNEW | Thank you. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts? Lawrence was not in person for this-- |
| LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS | Present. |

| | |
|---|---|
| TERRI AGNEW | Oh, Lawrence made it. Perfect. Just for full disclosure, if there is any connectivity issues, Vivek Goyal will be his proxy. But right now, we are perfect. Vivek Goyal. |
| VIVEK GOYAL | Here. Thank you. |
| TERRI AGNEW | You are welcome. Damon Ashcraft. |
| DAMON ASHCRAFT | Present. |
| TERRI AGNEW | Susan Payne. |
| SUSAN PAYNE | Present. Thanks, Terri. |
| TERRI AGNEW | You are welcome. Osvaldo Novoa. |
| OSVALDO NOVOA | Present. Thank you, Terri. |

| | |
|---|---|
| TERRI AGNEW | You are welcome. Thomas Rickert. Thomas was sitting down there. So, I do believe Thomas is here. I'm stalling. We'll come back. Okay, Julf Helsingus. |
| JULF HELSINGUS | Here. |
| TERRI AGNEW | Farzaneh Badiei. |
| FARZANE BADIEI | Here. |
| TERRI AGNEW | Peter Akinremi. Peter Akinremi is not in person, but we do have a proxy, who it will be Julf Helsingus. Also, if Peter doesn't join, it would be in case of connectivity issues. Tomslin Samme-Nlar. |
| TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR | Present. |
| TERRI AGNEW | Manju Chen. |
| MANJU CHEN | Here. Thank you, Terri. |

TERRI AGNEW You are welcome. Bruna Martins dos Santos.

BRUNA MARTIN DOS SANTOS Present.

TERRI AGNEW You're welcome. Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY Here.

TERRI AGNEW Anne Aikman-Scalese.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE Present.

TERRI AGNEW Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS Present.

TERRI AGNEW Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW You are welcome. And Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU Present.

TERRI AGNEW Our guest today will be Kurt Pritz, Small Team leader. You do have the policy team supporting the GNSO in the room. There will be an open mic at the end of the session, where attendees' microphones will be activated. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. All are welcome to use the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat and select "everyone" if you'd like everyone to see your chat message.

Counselors if you'd like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. Helpful hint, turn off your Zoom microphone because you'll be using the table microphones if you're in person. Virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

During the open mic portion, those in the meeting room will be invited to queue at the standalone microphone, which is over here to my left. Those participating remotely will be able to raise their hands in Zoom and unmute their microphones when called upon. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. And just for the record, we do have Nacho Amadoz in the room. Perfect. And Thomas Rickert is also back in the room. With that, I'm going to turn it over to GNSO chair Greg DiBiase. Please begin.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you so much. Welcome, everyone, to our GNSO meeting at ICANN83. We have a lot to cover, so I'm going to dive right in and start with asking if anyone has updates to their SOI.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. I have an update. I was elected to the Arizona State Bar Board of Governors. I'll begin my term in June, and that basically means I'm on the board for the State Bar of Arizona.

GREG DIBIASE

Very cool. Great. Oh, sorry. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Greg. This is Justine. I should probably say at this point that I've been re-elected to the ALAC for another two years.

GREG DIBIASE

Wonderful. Anyone else? Would anyone like to amend the agenda? Hearing none. I'll note that the minutes for our May meeting were posted on June 2nd, 2025. If any councilors would like to go back and review those with that, I'll move into Item 2, which is a review of projects and action items. We did not have any work that changed status this time. However, in our last meeting, we thought it might be helpful to Council and any observers to note what we accomplished in between the Seattle meeting and now. So, I was going to quickly run through that.

So, we've sent the Transfer Policy Recommendations to the Board. That received full consensus and were delivered on time. The Latin diacritics PDP has been meeting and is proceeding ahead of its schedule. We voted to approve an aspirational statement which recognizes and reinforces the Council role within the greater MSM. We voted to confirm the leadership of the SCCI. And finally, we started the small teams on both DNS abuse and accuracy. And those teams have already been meeting and doing productive work, so great work there. And with that, we'll go into the Consent Agenda, and I think we have Nacho for that.

| | |
|---|---|
| NACHO AMADOZ | Thank you very much, Greg. So, the only item in the Consent Agenda is the deferral of the WHOIS Implementation Advisory Group work. Being there is a Consent Agenda, we don't need to read anything and we go straight to the vote. Right, Terri? |
| TERRI AGNEW | You are correct. So, here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say Aye. Hearing no one. Would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say Aye. Hearing none. Would all those in favor of this motion please say Aye? Including Julf twice, for yourself, and for Peter. |
| ALL SPEAKERS | Aye. |
| TERRI AGNEW | Thank you. With no abstention nor objection, the motion passes. Back to you. |
| GREG DIBIASE | Thanks all. Let's move on to Item 4, which is our Council discussion about prioritization of upcoming work. Typically, at most meetings, we have some working sessions where we look at what is on our plate and how to prioritize. With the shorter June meeting, we didn't have that. And we also have the possibility of new work coming. So, we thought it'd be prudent to real quickly go through some slides on some subjects that are possibly close to |

moving into a new stage of work and then discuss on what Council views as a priority. And I will note, we did struggle with this box on urgency, priority, or defer. I want to be clear that all this is a priority, but some things do need to go first.

So, the first box we had is on Rights Protection Mechanisms phase 2. As you'll recall, we've done completed, or the RPMs Phase 1 is in the implementation stage. And we recently deferred RPMs Phase 2, which will concern the UDRP. The potential next step here is to start up a charter drafting team to outline the work. This is work we have committed to by starting the RPM PDP, so we need to think about how that affects our priorities.

Next, the topic of DNS abuse. As noted, we reconvened the small team after waiting to give the amendments time to be implemented and for Compliance to develop metrics on their effectiveness. We have an RDDS. The standing committee on RDRS will be delivering a report back to Council, which will advise us on how we want to approach the SSAD recommendations that are still pending before the Board. We have accuracy, the small team on accuracy is convened and started to look at topics where there may be a path towards consensus based on the survey results from the community.

Going down, we also have a carryover from the Next Round of gTLDs. There was a recommendation concerning whether future rounds will be continuous. The recommendation said that there will be distinct rounds, but in our notes on that recommendation, we noted the Board's desire to talk about potentially moving this towards a more continuous process. So, we don't have to reinvent the wheel every time there's a new round for New gTLDs.

We have the Expiration Policies, the ERRP and the EDDP. This is the policy that governs expired domain names. The Council took a look at this about a year and a half ago, I want to say, noted that it seemed to be working well. And there wasn't a strong call for looking at this work. However, we did do a policy status report to get a better idea of how these policies are working. And that public status report is currently in public comment. And when that is done, that will come back to us to take a look at whether more work on those policies is warranted.

Next. And I think we're almost done here. We have Transfer Policy Dispute Mechanisms. That was the one piece that the Transfer Policy didn't work on. The Transfer Policy recommendations that we recently submitted to the Board are more around how domains transfer from registrants. But there was a note in that report that more work could be needed on dispute mechanisms, and they're not as fleshed out as possibly they could be. And I guess I'd also note in this bucket the concerns Farzi raised and her work on the human rights assessment. So, noting that there may be a corollary there.

And then scroll down. Is that all we have? Okay. So, then putting all this work in context, it's a little daunting. I'll note that we have one PDP already in flight, Latin Script diacritics. It's relatively narrow scoped. However, we typically do not have more than two or three PDPs at the same time because we're always thinking about community bandwidth, we're thinking about staff bandwidth. However, there's a lot of potential issues on the table. And I guess the last note on that is if we do move towards more tightly scoped PDPs, which is something we've been talking about. How can we make this process more efficient? Perhaps we can go from two to three to three to four.

But I'll stop talking there and get people's opinions on what stands out to councilors here. And I guess the last note, we don't have to make a decision now, but I think we should start thinking about this and be ready for when the small teams on accuracy and DNS abuse deliver their reports back to Council towards the end of the year and when the deferral on RPMs Phase 2 ends. Okay. Enough talking for me. Any thoughts from councilors? Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Greg. Jen for the record. I guess some preliminary questions when we're looking at this, I think some more information might be needed. It may be another column that tells us the level of resources that each one might need that would inform us when we have a discussion on how to prioritize.

The second thing. Maybe it's my assumption because the two small teams currently in flight, the accuracy one, and also the DNS abuse one. I don't know why, maybe it's my bias, my thinking is Council thinks that these two items are actually quite high priority, which is why we have a small team on it. So, I don't want to hedge what we're going to decide later on, but I think given that we have one in flight, the Latin diacritics, possibly there's two spots open. I don't know if we want to prioritize what's going to come out of one or both of the small teams.

And then, finally, I guess, going back to my first point, looking through this list, are there things that would take, not even resourcing, timewise might take shorter to see if we can knock that out of our table first? So, sorry, a cluster of things, but just questions.

GREG DIBIASE Yeah, thanks. I think that's helpful, Jen. And, this document's a starting point, right? This is the first time we're gathering it. And I think as the small teams, for example, develop, we'll have more of an idea of what to put in that resource requirement box. And so maybe this can be an evolving document that helps clarify our thinking. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Greg. Yes, Susan Payne, IPC. First of all, just a quick comment, which I guess is more from me, and then I'll move on to some of the feedback we got from the IP Constituency. But just a quick comment about the RPM's one. Phase 2, obviously, is something the IPC considers to be extremely important, and we do want to get it right. So, I think we're definitely on board with the need to reach out to that.

But it did just quickly look at the resolution from our last meeting where we did defer RPMs again for another six months. Obviously, we can reconsider that at any time, but we did defer it for six months, and we specifically deferred the launch of a charter drafting team in that motion. So, I'm thinking we can kind of park that one for a little while and we don't have to, unless people feel that something changes and we need to revisit that timeline.

Then in terms of the IPC feedback, this is sort of somewhat preliminary, but definitely I think there was strong alignment that DNS abuse and accuracy are ones that we feel should be prioritized. And RDRS, but I'm not quite sure at the moment what that would be, save that, obviously we have that report coming. We don't yet know what that report says, not sure what, if any work actually then has to happen. But it seems the principle of what we do next in relation to RDRS seems important to us.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Susan. And yeah, I think that's a good point. RDRS might not have policy. We might get the report back from the standing committee say this makes sense and pass it on to the Board. I guess we're just not going to know that until we get the report. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Okay, thank you. From the BC perspective, I think DNS abuse and accuracy are important. Given the community interest in these two topics, within these four days, I think there are at least four sessions on DNS abuse. So, there is a community interest in seeing something being done and done quickly, especially with the Next Round coming up. And for these, if we have tightly scoped, we know what needs to be done, right? There is already work in progress. Like Susan said, for others, while they're on the list, we don't know what will come up. It might not need any work. So, we should keep that in mind and not treat all of them as large chunks of work. So, we have to pick one of them. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Vivek. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Greg. This is Sam. Just offering maybe a perspective on, in a list like this, what could maybe go towards the bottom of the list. I think two candidates off the bat for that are the gTLD's question about assessment in rounds, just because we have a New Round opening and we know it's going to take a certain duration. So, we have a preset timeline before I think we as a GNSO community need to address the next policy question on that. So, that's one that can probably go a little later. And then maybe also the transfer dispute procedures, while the Transfer Policy is going through its implementation phase. So maybe we buy ourselves a bit of time to open up space for these higher priority items that others have named.

GREG DIBIASE Great. Thank you, Sam. Bruna, you're next in the queue.

BRUNA MARTIN DOS SANTOS Thanks, Greg. Just challenging, perhaps the justification for the DNS abuse one. Because I think we have a rather concrete trust from community to start a PDP and so on. And the reason here is WSIS+20. So, I don't think that's as connected to the ongoing conversation as it should be. So just perhaps a request to change that.

GREG DIBIASE Okay, we can certainly do that. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT As you know, I'm term limited at this AGM. So, I suggest that upon my departure, Council starts working on everything simultaneously. But joking aside, I think that it would make a lot of sense for us to start with DNS abuse, put that at the top of our list for the following reasons.

One, the small team currently looks at potential options for narrowly tailed PDPs that likely produce outcomes quickly, and that we can then have a constant stream of tangible results that we can show to the outside world and also make a real difference. So, my personal favorite, looking at the options that we have on the table at the moment, is to do something about bulk registrations, because there's a lot of harm that can be mitigated if we took that on rather today than tomorrow. And I will also suggest to the small team when we meet next, if we can maybe send something to Council in the interim, even before we have our final report, so that we can start the first PDP in the very, very near future.

The second reason for me suggesting this is that, as you know, the European regulator is the epicenter of regulation coming out and also addressing the DNS industry in particular. And currently, there's a regulatory pause in the EU. And I think with us showing that we're making progress, that we're taking these things seriously, we can potentially influence the appetite for new regulation from the EU as well. So, those would be my two points.

And although this is not on the list, we discussed this topic in the informal session, and it's not directly related to PDP work, but the question of how law enforcement can interact with contracted parties at the global level is something that I think we should put at the top of our attention.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Thomas. Yeah. That's a newer idea, so it's not on this list, but maybe that's something we can talk about in our wrap up where that lands, because, as you noted, it's a theme in a couple areas of ongoing work. Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks, Greg. Paul McGrady. I have a different view than Sam on the Next Round's issue. I actually think that one is the hottest priority here, because if we don't solve that before the end of the application window, we will be by default going into another round, another holding pattern of time indefinite, with no end attached to it. The last time we did that, it was 12 years. If we can get this work done, it's a very narrow sliver of work that needs to be done. Then we can move to that steady state that the Board has been talking about.

As far as I know, there's nothing in the final report of SubPro that says a round has to be a certain number of days, weeks, months or years apart. It doesn't say how long the rounds have to be. A round could be one day and a prioritization number could be given based upon when that application is received in that one day. And so, I don't know that there's a policy change that needs to be made there, but we should explore that.

In addition to not wanting to default, go into another round that can last weeks, months, years, there are some good reasons for trademark folks to care about this, because once the New gTLD application process does get to a steady state, and it really is next to file, has priority, then when new gTLDs are out there will be part of the search and clearance process. Trademark owners will automatically look to see if the gTLD is available and will likely reject candidates when the gTLD is not available. But if they have to wait weeks, months, years, or even months, it's going to be very difficult to clear new trademarks that are meant to be big global brands. So, that's a reason to do it.

And then, for those of you that don't like trademark lawyers, here's a reason why we should all care. Which is the sooner we get to that one-day-round steady state, auctions go away. And auctions are an albatross on this community that nobody thinks is a really great thing. And so, we should feel very urgent about getting rid of that PR problem that ICANN and that we all have. So, again, I think it's a very tiny sliver piece of work that we could do in conjunction with folks on the Board, but it's something that if we don't need a policy change, then it can be done well before the Next Round even opens. And then there'll be predictability that the community can move forward on. But I do think it's red hot on fire priority. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Paul. And I'll kind of note and tag that back to something Jen said on how helpful a resource box could be here. Because if it really is something that's potentially as simple as you described maybe that affects the priority. So, I put my hand in the queue to give two perspectives. So first, from, I think, a chair Council management perspective, I do want to note that the RPMS Phase 2 is something that we've committed to as a Council. We've done Phase 1. This has been on our plate in a while. Others in the community have started work on this. So, I think from my Council chair's perspective, that warrants priority.

From a registrar perspective, the registrars have been definitely open to work on DNS abuse. In fact, there's something that they've been actively working on already to flesh out ideas and help any project hit the ground running. We have less of a priority on accuracy and did want to note that if others think accuracy should go forward, we'd stress that we think it should focus on contactability or there appears to be potential path to consensus on whether that's an issue worth exploring, as opposed to other topics that were raised in the survey.

And then, I guess, finally, I would say that, depending what the PSR comes back on the expiration policies, the last time we talked about that, there was consensus among the registrars that that policy is working fairly well and doesn't necessarily need to be reviewed at the same urgency as some of these other things. Okay, Tomslin, you're next in the queue.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Greg. Just listening to the prioritization, I was just wondering whether we want to also consider what happens if the output that comes out of the DNS abuse team is multiple PDPs. How does that affect our overall planning, or rather, prioritization?

| | |
|---|---|
| GREG DIBIASE | Sorry, say that one more time. |
| TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR | So, the question is, if we get a request to actually start multiple PDPs out of the DNS abuse small team, how does that affect our prioritization planning? |
| GREG DIBIASE | I think that's up to us, and maybe that's something we define in the resource requirements. But yeah, I think they can go sequentially, right, like we did RPMs and other things, and in which case, that'd be one ongoing PDP at a time. That's my initial thought. Any follow up? Manju? |
| MANJU CHEN | Thank you, Greg. First of all, you have pronounced SCCI wrong in your opening remarks. I commented in chat, but it was ignored, so I had to raise it in my voice. And I totally echo Thomas' sentiment of starting everything. Because I'm leaving, too. You guys do the job. But yeah, jokes aside, I think for NCSG, the priority, while we definitely kind of have this reservation of and pressuring us into doing DNS abuse as our first priority, it's a community priority. But to be honest, I think we all know where the majority of pressure is coming from.<br><br>But we can join that boat if there's an issue that NCSG has been advocating, which is the hijacked domains. We brought this up in |

the line of Transfer Policy, too. There has been no complaint mechanism or any kind of mechanism for registrants when their domain is hijacked and used on other purpose that is not the intent of the original registration. It happens in transfer. It happens in domain name abuse, too.

So, we think if we can include this in the DNS abuse kind of PDP, we were talking about multiple phases of tiny scope PDPs. If that topic is included, we are willing to join this priority of DNS abuse as the first priority. But we definitely think registrant right is a very important, very essential part in the discussion of DNS abuse, aside from human rights discussions. And that will be, for now, NCSG's position. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Manju. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, just quickly, in response to Tomslin's point, which is a very valid one. I note that Sam has written in the chat that the small team should also speak to that. But I think it's something that we should maybe start thinking about, at least. Steve, I guess, made the point during our informal meeting that we can have one PDP with different sections like we had with IRTP 1, I think it were four sections of the IRTP. So, that would save us some time with the process steps that the PDP needs to take.

And since we have the same set of people pretty likely that are going to volunteer for the topic of DNS abuse, maybe we can consider how we elegantly do the charter drafting or something so that we can put out things sequentially and not wait for one outcome for all the topics, but play with it. Maybe start different things in parallel, see what goes fastest depending on what we need, so that we can shoot out the first result, while other parts of it may take longer.

So, I'm not sure whether the sequential approach is the most appropriate for this one, but maybe ICANN staff can also help us understand what flexibility we have and what options there would be for us to kick this off once we get recommendations from the small team to consider.

GREG DIBIASE Thanks, Thomas. Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS Thank you. Rather, I think this is more of a question as regards the ongoing work around urgent requests that is being piloted by law enforcement. Just wondering, I note that for the last couple of weeks, if not months, there has been a lot of appreciable progress in the consultations some of us have been a part of. And while they have broken the walk into short term and long-term efforts, I'm thinking that there might be or my thoughts are that sometime in the near future, there might be some kind of report or action that might be required from our end at Council under what bucket are we looking at this particular phase of work. And if it's already captured here, I think that's also something that we should move up our priority list. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Lawrence. Great question. And I think from my perspective and staff's perspective dealing with this, that's already ongoing work in an IRT. So, that's in the phase of implementation, and it's already undertaken by Council. So, I guess the differentiation here is this is a list of work that we could potentially take on a new, or take on a new aspect of it. But certainly, that's a priority. And then I'll also note Thomas had noted that the themes of authentication are running through a couple threads and a couple policy areas. And so, we're thinking about how to potentially scope that or address that concern that Thomas raised. And that could potentially be a new bucket.

Okay. So, the queue is clear. I think there's some great feedback here. Definitely some coalescing on certain topics. DNS abuse seemed like the foremost amongst them, but this is something we can continue to think about as the work on the small teams continues. Great suggestions from Jen, and I also thank Paul on nailing down the resource requirements because that will help our analysis. So, let's all continue to think about this and prioritize. And I guess, well, the next step is to get more granular on resourcing and things like how do we sequence them that Tomslin raised, so we can make an informed decision on what's next. And like Thomas, I'm leaving Council too, so I'll be writing checks, policy checks with similar vigor. Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI Do we have an open mic today?

GREG DIBIASE Yes.

FARZI BADIEI I'm going to make this comment during open mic then. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE Okay. Seeing no other hands, let's move on to the next item, which is a project. Board Readiness Small Team has been undertaking some interviews in the community to help understand how we can improve policy to make it "Board ready". I think this work has been going on almost a year, if I'm not mistaken. And we have Kurt to present a status update.

KURT PRITZ Hi, everyone. Thanks for having me at the meeting. There's the slide. So, here's an update on our work. Some of the slides are a little bit repetitive from their last date, but I thought that the deck should stand on itself own since we're posting it for public consumption. And if there's a casual reader here, she should have some context to it. So, this is the list of team leaders. If you want to ask somebody to get something done, always ask a busy person. And all these people, besides doing this, are involved in, as you know, Council small teams and are in the critical path of their own careers with the New gTLD launch imminent and other things that are going on. So, we should thank them for doing this, too.

You'll remember that the mission here is to perform a study that will inform the improvement or creation of policy development practices that will improve Board readiness. And what we mean by Board readiness is Board readiness is measured by the likelihood that our recommendations, our GNSO policy recommendations, will be approved by the Board. Anytime the Board pens or rejects a recommendation, that causes a month or years long process and so reduces our effectiveness and efficiency.

And as you probably remember, our scheme here is that we identified stakeholders and parties that could contribute to be interviewed and to amalgamate those interviews. So, for each set of stakeholders that were interviewed, we created a specific or tailored set of questions for them. And we've invited to interviews past and present Board members that either were liaisons to PDPs or just sat on the Board and received information either from their liaisons or staff. Or the report also questions for staff members that supported the PDP, PDP chair and PDP participants. Or conducting these interviews and then identifying causal relationships to identify any gaps between the recommendations and the fact that they're rejected. And so that would lead us to recommend possible adjustments or improvements to the Policy Development Process.

We've also built into this process a series of feedback loops so that interviewees agree with the results of the interview, and they get to review the results to make sure there's no mistakes in interpretation of what people say or mean. And we just concluded a point where we finished a set of interviews and went through all that synthesis and analysis and took a pause to look at what we've done and then make adjustments. Because we're going on to make the last set of interviews, and we made some adjustments to the questions. It's probably on later slides. Made some adjustments to the questions to perhaps either improve the results or the effectiveness of the interviews, or to test some hypotheses that we've developed.

So, you probably know that each interviewee receives a packet of information that staff helped us compile before each interview. So, there's an intro to the program, a brief historical summary of that PDP, with links if they want to dive in to refresh their memory, because some of these things happened years ago. Everything in ICANN happened years ago. And a summary of the Board's reasoning for rejecting recommendations.

And we also furnished them with a list of questions that we plan to ask them during the interviews, with the caveat that answers to questions may take us down rabbit holes and explore interesting areas. So, we often deviate from the questions. And all the interviews, I've got to say, are pretty interesting and fun for everybody, I think. Then we record those interviews with the permission of the interviewees and use those too create our set of notes and then destroy that record. And the interviewees, we get to review the notes before we make them part of the record.

So, where are we? The red means we've completed this stuff since we talked to you last time. So, we've completed all our work on the registration data, EPDPs, both phase 1 and phase 2. And we're now starting subsequent procedures. And we've, as I said, amended the information packet to refer to that PDP, but also change some of the questions. So, we've completed the sets of interviews with Board members, chairs, working group members, and ICANN staff members, compiled findings.

We wrote a document that's our statement of findings to date, and we wrote a document that's our recommendations that are that's kind of a little too terse for publication. But we all stared at it and I hope we think, maybe we should ask some of them, but I think there's some value add to be had here. And so, we had hoped but probably will not conduct any interviews at this meeting because everybody slammed. The first interviews are not scheduled yet, but hopefully the first interview will be scheduled next week. And then we have them slotted in between now and July 18th. So, over the next month, we plan to complete all our interviews.

I just want to go back and say we've also been contacted by people from the IDN EPDP and the INIGO PDP that think they have some things to add. So, if we have some time, we might talk to one person from each, because I think there might be something of value there. But if not, no. So, our schedule is to complete the interviews by July 8th. We're compiling the report now as we're going because we have an in-process document.

And we should finish some form of the report by the 1st of August and go through a few feedback loops, both with our team and also with the interviewees, as we think is fitting, and then take another week to finish the final report. So, it's kind of a rapid conclusion schedule. And then that September 5th date would meet the 10-day document deadline for presenting to the Council. Although it might be more fun to present in public in Oman, our schedule we'll have us finished by the September Council meeting. So, that's the schedule.

So, this is the money slide. Some of the discussion points we have, and some of the areas in which we think we're going to make recommendations is that the findings recognize, and many PDP participants and others recognize the value in some form of PDP Board consultation as part of the PDP process. But also, we're all concerned that we want to preserve the bottom-up process and we don't want the Board putting their finger on the scale during the process. So, there's great value in that collaboration, but with caveats, and with that recognition.

The Board liaison role is not certain. I don't know. Is there a staff document that defines the Board liaison role or describes it? But it's varied. We found it's varied greatly across PDPs, which is probably appropriate because it depends not only on the PDP and the subject matter, but also on the personality of the Board liaison. We found that PDPs and the Board often have different objectives. One example is a PDP might be very anxious to reach consensus, and a Board is very anxious to comply with bylaws and meet its fiduciary duty to not spend too much money. And sometimes those objectives diverge, and it's important we think that for recommendations to be accepted, objectives should be the same. That's a management training course element.

Also similar to that, the PDP team and the Board often operate with different sets of information, so when you operate with different sets of information, you might come to different conclusions. One is implementation, operation and cost details. So, we have, for example, the ODAs and ODPs and other forms of operational details that are fleshed out too late in the process for the PDP to consider. And how can we reconfigure that?

There's also the Board received staff reports, GAC and ALAC inputs. So, GAC and ALAC Advice come in after the recommendations are done often, so that could lead one to different conclusions. And the Board might get legal advice that differs from the legal advice that PDP gets. So, once again, that's sort of a management rule that if you want to reach similar conclusions, you're operating with similar sets of information.

With the report, we will not be surprised if our findings discover that there's difficulty or a challenge in managing the roles of the GAC and the ALAC as they participate both in the PDP. And then they later on give advice to the Board. And we come to some conclusions about how best to manage that if it can't be completely managed. And then we've also solicited feedback on the efficacy of the representative versus open PD. models, which is interesting.

So, that's some of the topics that the report covers. And that's it. I told you it was a money side. So, first off, I'll ask our team members that are sitting around the table if they have anything to add, Thomas or Jennifer, or Susan or Justine. And then take any questions.

GREG DIBIASE Thanks, Kurt. I see Damon in the queue.

DAMON ASHCRAFT Sure, Kurt. Thank you very much. I really appreciate all the effort here. I have two questions. The first one is maybe a quick one. Maybe I just missed it. Are you planning on interviewing any more Board members other than just two? And the second question is that we had briefly touched on the topic of having a Council liaison to the Board. I know it looks like in your report, you've looked at PDP liaisons to the Board for individual PDPs, but have you discussed the idea or thought about the idea of maybe having a general Council liaison to the Board that could always be in touch with them on this topic of Board readiness, amongst other things? Thanks.

KURT PRITZ

We will interview Board members that were involved in the subsequent procedures PDP. So, that's at least one that's been requested so far. And I don't quite understand your second question. So, you said the word general council. And so that confused me.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

I misspoke. The GNSO Council, to have a representative from the Council report to the Board, and that was a topic we touched upon in Seattle. I don't think you were in that meeting. So, it was more of a general role. Is it something that you thought about?

KURT PRITZ

No, the look on Susan's face says no.

SUSAN PAYNE

I suppose I would say I don't think we've talked about it in the context of the Board readiness so far. I guess it's something we could bear in mind, isn't it? It could be a question we ask people on whether they think that would have made a difference. We do have liaisons from the Board to the PDP.

KURT PRITZ

So my other team members sitting in the Council will understand that issue and we'll make it a topic for our next meeting.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you. I think Paul's saying it well in the chat of what that potentially could be a sub but for the Board instead of the GAC. Interesting. Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSEVIC

Thanks, Kurt, for the work that the team and you have done. I just wonder when you mentioned rejections, that you looked at the Board rejections and recommendations. How did you go about choosing which one to place in the interview? And is there something recent or?

KURT PRITZ

So, we chose to interview people on these PDPs, and like I said, we might add more, one or more interviews. For these PDPs, I can just get into the detail. For phase 1, there were only two rejections. So, those were easy to identify during those interviews. For phase 2, they essentially rejected the whole recommendation. So, the interviews targeted that. For subsequent procedures, it was a little more difficult, and we did a test interview because Susan was part of that PDP. We did that.

And what we've done in the question is group the rejections, so it helps. Some were rejected because the Board thought the wording was off and the small team corrected the wording with some collaboration. Some thought the rejections violated the bylaws, like the PICs. And there was another set of recommendations about costs. So, we grouped them and tailored the questions in a way that will allow the interviewee to pick which ones they're passionate about. So, we're not going to try to cover all 38 rejections, but each PDP participant was passionate about a certain area, usually, of the PDP. So, they'll want to bring up certain areas. And so, we're providing a framework for them to bring up the ones they want to talk about.

DESIREE MILOSEVIC Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE Thanks, Kurt. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE Thank you, Kurt. We appreciate all the work for the group there. This is Anne. Is the idea that, ultimately, once the report is received, that we might be able to get a checklist that PDP could use to check it against its own Board readiness. Or what do you anticipate coming out of?

| | |
|---|---|
| KURT PRITZ | I think it might be a recommendation for augmenting or changing how the charter is written, or it might be a separate chapter in each PDP to review a certain thing or explore a certain thing in detail. For example, if we anticipate GAC advice on certain areas, that PDP team might get into that area in more detail and create a record that this area where we're getting advice from the GAC liaison or the ALAC liaison was discussed thoroughly to provide the Board with a record that this issue has been discussed. So, it gives the Board a tool to rely on when addressing GAC or ALAC advice. So, it'd be a variety of tools that the Council could choose to adopt or not, or each charter could choose to adopt or not. |
| ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE | Thank you. |
| GREG DIBIASE | Thanks. And I'll give my two cents, that sounds like a good strategic planning session to talk about what to do based on the results here. Jen? |
| JENNIFER CHUNG | I was about to put my hand back down, but thank you, Greg. I think Kurt really answered Anne's question already, but I think having something that the Council can use well, especially when we're starting to look at more focused PDPs, how we're going to do that in a variety of ways. I think the learnings coming out of this small team is going to be really valuable for us to dig into, not only just |

because it's very interesting for us to look at, and then the second part is, how do we then implement all of this into the PDPs that we charter going forward. That's the money question.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Jen. Manju?

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Greg. Thank you, the small team, for this fantastic work. Just trying to probably partially answer Jen's question. The SCCI is going to start its review of PDP 3.0 at the end of this year, according to our plan. So, I think this will be a timely starting point for us, in a sense that when we start, this will be one of the golden nuggets or low-hanging fruits that we can start working on. And that's probably how we're going to implement them, right? We're going to incorporate it into our review. And when we have our recommendations to Council, it will be a fully holistic. Well, avoid using that word. Anyways. Just that's my effort of trying to answer that question. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Manju. Anne, is that a new hand? Okay. Great. There's no more hands in the queue. I'd also like to note staff's work on this. I think this is very resource intensive to schedule these interviews and dealing with schedules and things like that. So, I think that's worth noting. And, yeah, we look forward to the report and the time frame provided by Kurt. So, thank you so much, Kurt, and the rest of the team.

Okay, let's move on to the next item, which is an update from our Council Accuracy Small team. And before that, maybe it's worth a quick note on what small teams are and how they operate. The Council has developed this idea of a small team to dive into an issue and do intensive work and then report back to Council on ideas and recommendations they've come up. So, I want to be clear, these small teams don't make policy, they're merely thinking about issues in a focused way. That might be a little more productive than with every single councilor at the meeting. But their work is always brought back to Council, reported on, and Council, as a group, decides what the next step should be.

So, this is our first update since the team has started, and I think there's only been two, or three meetings. So, the first is accuracy. And Paul, do we have you to do that? Oh, and Farzi, great. Note that we accept observers. Everything's recorded. So, we're not doing this. The small teams are not working in the shadows. Everything is available to people that would like to watch our work. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks, Greg. Damon says we've met three times. I'm going to take your word for it, Damon. It's been a short amount of time, but we're making good progress. I think we had some, yeah, we got some slides here. Basically, what the small team is doing is taking a look at the responses to the Council, requests for inputs from the community on the accuracy issue. We're also taking a look at some other third-party materials that had bearing on accuracy and are attempting to come back to the Council with some speedy recommendations on some things that we can do fairly quickly to address these concerns.

One of the things that we did right at the beginning, though, was we, I call this my three-ring circus, we tried to parse out things that we could agree on and things that the small team would probably never reach agree on, so they wouldn't spin our wheels doing it. On the left ring, we have folks who believe there's a lack of evidence to support and that support the entire inaccuracy issue. Some that believe current requirements in the RAA are sufficient. Some who believe that further policy work is not immediately necessary and that we should await full implementation of NIS2. And that accuracy means contactability under the RAA.

On the right ring, we have inaccurate registration data remains a significant problem. Current requirements in the RAA are insufficient to combat inaccurate data. Further policy work should begin immediately. Accuracy should include identity verification, and inaccuracy is linked to DNS abuse. So, as you can see from those two, they're pretty far apart, and I think they represent a lot of the wheel spinning that's been going on in the community for years, and maybe why we've not advanced at all that quickly on this particular issue.

However, the middle ring on this beautiful fake Venn diagram, because it's not really based on math but it looks nice, is the things that we think we could agree on. And so, in our middle circle, the small team agreed that accurate registration data is important to the domain name system. A starting point for a definition is what's currently in the RAA and the policy requirements. In other words, we don't start from scratch. More data is always welcome and needed. And that we should consider additional improvements to accuracy, keeping all the stakeholders in mind. So, there is a bias towards action and a bias towards not getting bogged down in the same old arguments. And so that's been the tone of the small team.

We are going to do another slide here. So, we took a look at several third-party pieces of information. One of them is the very weirdly entitled INFERMAL study, which sounds halfway between an inferno and a gerbil. It's just a strange word, but there it is. And one of the things that jumped off the page of the INFERMAL study was that they believe that shortening the time frame from registration, data validation for that process and verification resulted in, by moving that up, either at the time of registration or shortly thereafter, that they believed there would be a 70% reduction in malicious domain name registrations.

Which I don't know if that's true or not, but it is definitely something that jumped off the page and seemed very much worth pursuing. Because if we can get 70% fewer malicious domain name registrations by making a tweak in the process, that certainly is worth running down. We have not come to any conclusions that

that's what we should do. It's just one of the things that we are looking at as we move forward. I will say, however, that if we end up doing that, and I will have the roll call from today's recording, if we end up doing that and we in fact, end up with a 70% reduction in malicious registrations, I'm getting each of you a T-shirt that says "I'm 70% less malicious". I think it'd be a great T-shirt. So, we are looking at that.

The other suggested area for further investigation, as I call them the golden nuggets, is the addition of clear and user-friendly education tools before, during, and after the registration, which outline the importance of providing and maintaining accurate registration data through the life cycle of the domain name. In other words, if you own it, it seems like you should let your registrar know that and provide them with information that is accurate. Some information on how registrant data is protected. I think there is concern among some that if they provide personal information of domain name registration, they may get phished as a result or something like that. And so, we can explain to them how registrars protect that data.

And then the consequences of providing inaccurate data within our policy framework. So, everybody seems to think that better informed registrants and users of the DNS are better than uninformed ones and so we're exploring what that would look like. And then, lastly, there is some talk of further work on the CC.1 recommendation suggesting putting a notation in the RDDS record to show when a domain name is suspended due to inaccurate data.

We're not talking about a major overhaul. Overall is what you wear when you're doing square dancing. We're not talking about a major overhaul. They're just a simple notation into the record. And so those are the three things we're looking at.

Is that our last slide? I think it is. In terms of what's next, the small team has in front of them an extremely preliminary set of recommendations looking at these issues. And by extremely preliminary, I mean it is in their inbox, but we have not talked about it as a small team. So, if anybody listening, anybody in the room or listening elsewhere, goes in and sees what we're up to, if you look at those, please note they are as preliminary as they can be. We've not settled on any of that language, but we are moving quickly.

We're moving quickly for a couple of reasons. One is because the community is telling us to move quickly, and two, I evaporate after Oman. And it is a personal goal to get this work done into Council well before that happens. And so, we're moving fast, but we're a happy, friendly, happy bunch. Please listen in and give us your comments at any point. We're happy to take them. Thank you. Open for questions.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Paul. Tomslin is first in the queue.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks, Greg. And thanks, Paul, for that. I'm just going to check my understanding of the first golden nugget. Are we bringing the data validation early in the registration process, or are we shortening the timeframe for the registrant to comply with the validation? I don't know if that makes sense, or if there's even a difference.

PAUL MCGRADY

Yeah, so we're looking at that, right? But the primary thing is shortening the timeframe to comply. But also, with that, we'd have to think about registrant protections in that space, too. But that is what the INFERMAL study said. I think it was something like if we went from 14 days to five. Am I remembering that, right? I'm looking at Caitlin. She's looking at me. Anyways, there's some number that they looked at that resulted in the less malicious. So, yes, we're not. All we're talking about is advancing the time frames, not changing the process, if that makes sense.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Tomslin. Yeah, I put myself in the queue also to just comment on point one. From the registrar perspective, there were concerns about the methodology of this study, and I were hesitant to take this conclusion as fact. This is one study. However, the registrars, in our survey results highlighted contactability as something that is worth looking at, and I think verification and validation falls under that heading. So, with the caveat that we want to push back on any preconceived notion that the timeline should be shortened or that that is an issue before we actually look into it, the more general header of contactability is something that could warrant more work.

And then the second point I would note, and this came up, I think, as a side note in our meeting with GAC. Gemma I think asked about current procedures on verification and data accuracy, and the Registrar Stakeholder Group has produced really good documentation of what we do today. So, this is just a pitch if anyone or their stakeholder group would like a follow-up on that, reach out and we can provide that. Farzi, you're next in the queue,

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yes. So, I just wanted to mention that also we have our concerns with the INFERMAL study. We are discussing it at NCSG. But this recommendation to shorten the time is actually-- We have to discuss it more, but it doesn't seem to me-- it seems to me like a solid solution that doesn't end up with violating privacy of domain name registrants or their access. So, from the first look, it looks like it's actually good. But then I was discussing it with somebody, and that somebody said, "What if there's a hospital or some kind of essential service provider that they don't have the time, or somehow they miss the deadline and their domain gets suspended?" So, these are the things that we need to think about and talk about a little bit more.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Farzi. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY

Yeah, just to say thank you to Greg and Farzi both, and to also assure everybody that it's not like the small team is going to come back and say, yeah, we like that INFERMAL study, let's just do that. And then the Council is somehow going to vote on that. I mean, this is essentially we're coming back to the Council with a set of ideas that may turn into community discussions that leads us somewhere, or it may turn into targeted PDPs or whatever.

But it's not like in July you're going to get a list of us of things that we have decided that we really think you guys should implement on Thursday or anything like that. So, absolutely, we are listening to all those kinds of inputs from Greg, from Farzi, from others. And we're not jumping to the end. We just thought, gee whiz, 70%, that sounds like that's worth pursuing. So, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks for the clarification, Paul. Sam, I saw your hand, but it's down and you're good.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

It was just to back up Paul on what he just said, in case you could get to it.

GREG DIBIASE

Okay great. I see no more hands in the queue. Thanks for that update, Paul. Glad to hear you'll have that report in before you evaporate. Okay. Moving on to our next item, which is an update from the DNS Abuse Small Team. And we have our chair, Jen, to present.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Greg. Perfect timing. Magic slides. Okay, I think we can go to the next slide. The first two really are just a recap of what we're doing, why we're doing all of this. I don't think we really need to dwell too far on this, but just for the sake of people listening in right now in the room as well. We reconvened the DNS Abuse Small Team in April. We have a new assignment form to evaluate the effectiveness of the contractual changes, especially the ones that now it's a year plus. And we're going to consider further policy development. I can't speak anymore. It's afternoon, if warranted.

The small team that is reconstituted is tasked to do four things. First is to look at the DNS abuse mitigation efforts across ICANN, including those currently being done by the CPH and other community groups and also industry firms that are looking at this topic. There's things out there. There's NetBeacon. All of that. Review the recommendations proposed by the small team in 2022, and also assess the impact of contractual amendments on the DNS abuse efforts. Finally, look at the insights from the INFERMAL study and related studies and see how they can help inform our next steps.

Let's look at the next slide. Well, this is the current timeline still, and it still has us looking at delivering the final report sometime around September to October. But I think in the three meetings we've had, and also listening to a lot of the conversation that has been happening in Prague, there's a lot of momentum or will in the community for us to move a little bit faster on that. I think also when the small team reconvenes again on the 20th, we can actually gather this information and see how we can look at adjusting this timeline. So, this is a current timeline. We don't have an updated one but do expect perhaps there might be efficiencies in in this one.

So next slide kind of just walking us through what we've had done since we started meeting, three meetings again. We looked at the insights from the INFERMAL study. We looked at the Compliance data for one year plus from the contractual amendments, and we looked at how industry and also the white paper that NetBeacon put out actually not too long ago. We took a quick look at that as well. There was some topics that were proposed in that particular white paper to address DNS abuse.

The small team is currently looking at a preliminary gap matrix. It is looking at the gaps that are identified in the source documents, namely the INFERMAL study. There is also the NetBeacon white paper. There's also the data from Compliance. And also, I think there was a blog on exactly what the contractual amendments so far has impacted and, I guess, the effectiveness of that.

So, also based on the Monday session from the CPH community session on DNS abuse, we've actually added to our matrix a list of the gaps also identified in that community session. So again, small team members, staff also have been keeping their eyes and ears open, especially during Prague, to see what else we might be missing.

The current homework out for the small team members is to socialize this gap matrix with their SGs and Cs and to see two things, really. Maybe the next slide is a good thing. We'll take a look at that. So, to socialize it with their SGs and Cs and to do a preliminary kind of if there's anything missing there, if we need to do any prioritization and also see what the conversation is and how we're moving the needle currently when we're meeting here in Prague.

This is a current working draft. Again, we're seeking feedback both from broadly across community and especially Council is looking at this. I don't know if the whole Council has looked at this matrix just yet. It's also really important for me to stress again, this is a preliminary analysis. The gaps identified are those that are identified in the source documents. Now, we still need to apply two more things. We need to apply what the small team gathers from the SGs and Cs. That analysis hasn't been done yet. And the second thing is, again, a first cut prioritization exercise that might start in the separate SGs and Cs, and then probably taken back to the small team for further discussion.

It is an initial interpretation of these issues. It's not a final assessment. And the overall aim and I guess maybe the goal that we're working towards is to organize these identified gaps in a way that supports understanding, prioritization and eventual action. All of this will identify issues that will be in an issue report. So, the issue report will then dive deeper into understanding the context in a lot more details that surround the gaps in terms of, I guess, the context, in terms of how we're going to look at it. And this issue report can potentially feed into future PDP work.

I don't know, staff, if we want to take a look at the live one or-- Oh, we're gone to here already. I've been not looking at the screen that much. So also, staff has done a quick clustering of these gaps you can see on the screen. Now we're back to the other one. Can we go forward? Yes, we can take a look at this one first. I don't mind if it's the matrix or the slide. Yeah, this is all good. Are we playing chicken right now with the slides? No, it's all good. So, I'll talk to this slide.

So, we did a preliminary clustering of issues. You can see that there are, I'm not going to read it out, but you can see up there there's a list. It's based on the nature, the responsible stakeholders, and also the overarching clusters that could be further investigated in an issue report. The gaps also might overlap in some cases. Because we're looking at different source documents, so there's multiple source documents. What we also need to do is consolidate these clusters, how we are going to address it. It is a draft. I don't know right now if we want to go back to the open matrix to see if there's anything that small team members want to start discussion on before we go further on.

JENNIFER CHUNG

We should go to table. Yeah, perfect. So, I guess I don't know right now if there are any preliminary thoughts so far. I think at least for those that were in the meeting we had with the GAC when we gave that update on what the small team is doing. I think generally they've been quite aligned with what we're trying to do as an end goal where we have at the end of this whole process. If we go to very focused, very tightly scoped PDPs that would address some topics that are top of mind for Council, top of mind for the community, I think that is something that we're all rowing towards.

Another thing about the matrix is I think it's very easy for us to take this matrix but then turn it into a document for each of your communities, your SG and Cs to look at in two ways. The first thing is if you see there is overlap or if you see there's consolidation that's needed, I think that's one thing we should probably do. The second thing that we do, and we're asking this as feedback in general as well, if there are any gaps that are missing on this list, we would like to also know this.

The caveat, again, is not every single thing on this gap matrix might result in a topic for a PDP. Some of these gaps could be characterized in something that could be taken outside of the PDP process. It could be an industry best practice. It could be something else. But right now, when we're trying to understand, at least from this focused exercise, we need to know that we do have all the gaps identified, and we need to prioritize and cluster it in a way that allows us to look at it in a more holistic way. I don't know if anybody wants to opine on this right now. If not, I'm going to talk a little slower to see if there are any councilors who want to--

GREG DIBIASE We've got a queue building if you want to go to that.

JENNIFER CHUN Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE Hi, Jen. It's Anne. Thank you. This is incredibly complex work and thank you for leading. You guys are being super productive. I think it's amazing. I have just a terminology question, so it's not really on the substance of what you're doing. If we could go back to slide three. And I'll try to be really brief, but the question that I have is about delivery of a final report from a small team. Have we used the term final report in relation to Small Team work? Because it can be confusing, I think, to the community, because final report normally notes something that happens at the end of a PDP. Just a question about terminology.

STEVE CHEN Thanks, Anne, for the question. This is Steve Chen. That's actually the terminology we used for the first small teams. Final report. But I do know the problematic or potentially problematic duplication in terminology. So, we might end up using different terminology for that reason. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yes, Farzaneh Badiei. So, I think that the caveat that you said, you mentioned, Jen, is very, very important. The gaps that have been identified here, they are not-- We have to do a lot of analysis in considering whether we are going to have some recommendations considering those gaps. For example, one of these gaps is reactive versus proactive measures for DNS abuse and proactive measures for tackling DNS abuse sometimes has some human rights impact, for example. So, it is very important to consider that even if we identify the gaps, not all of them are going to be addressed. And we have to come up with a prioritization mechanism to address them.

Another thing that I wanted to mention is I encourage other stakeholder groups to also send us the gaps that they-- I don't want to mess up your process, so should I go on? I think that we need more reports, we need more sources from different stakeholders so that we can have a comprehensive gap analysis and not just rely on a few sources. So, we need diversity of views. Thanks.

| | |
|---|---|
| JENNIFER CHUNG | Sorry, just a quick response, Farzi. Thank you for mentioning this regarding the sources. I think in our previous call, we've also encouraged, I think Peter, who brought this up as well, to identify these sources for us as well and send it towards the small group mailing list and I guess staff for us to take a look at and further consider as appropriate. So please do go ahead and send us that information. Thanks. Anne, is that an old hand? |
| ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE | I apologize. They put the hands down automatically for us in IRT, so I keep forgetting. I'm sorry. |
| JENNIFER CHUNG | No worries. Tomslin? |
| TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR | Thanks, Jen, for that update. You mentioned that you'll probably be sending this, as part of this recommendation, it might be an issue report that will come out, or a request for an issue report. So, I was just wondering whether you would just group-- your recommendation, it might be that you'll group all the gaps that you've identified and request for a single issue report for all of them, or you will probably break them into buckets for different issue reports. |

JENNIFER CHUNG

I'm looking over to staff to see what the process might be. I don't know what the resourcing might be regarding separate issue reports or a single-issue report. So, I don't know, Steve or others, if you have any thoughts on that.

STEVE CHEN

Yeah, thanks, Jen. This is Steve from staff. I think, at the end of the day, it's up to the discretion of the Council, but I have my own thoughts, if you want to hear those. To the extent you have a complete list in front of you, I think it's actually better to aggregate that into a single-issue report, but that doesn't prevent you from structuring the work in a way that might make sense. So, that could be peeling that off into separate PDPs. It could be doing in-phase work. But I would actually advise you to, if you're going to do the issue report, you have a comprehensive list, do that in a single-issue report. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG

So, I was going to ask if that is related to your previous comment about either phasing or separate ones. So, I think Steve's response gives us a better understanding that having it in one issue report doesn't prevent us from structuring how we work going forward. Does that answer your question?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks. Yes, it does. And I'm only asking because it seemed to me that the community is expecting the small team to make the decision on whether there will be multiple PDPs or just a single one. And from what I'm looking, or what I understand from your update, that decision might come from a later scoping process after the report has come out.

Yeah, so what I'm saying is, it seemed to me that some parts of the community were expecting or are expecting that the small team will make the decision on whether we have a single PDP or a number of small PDPs. But from the update, it looks like your recommendations just feed into a request for issue report, which means that it's after that process that a scoping work will be done to determine how many PDPs come out of that. Is that correct?

JENNIFER CHUNG

I'm looking at Steve as I'm answering, so please correct me if I'm wrong. I think there's a two-parter to it. Before we do the issue report, there's a little bit of a first-cut prioritization that the small team is going to do, but the issue report is going to actually give us a more complete picture of what all of this is. And then afterwards, the issue report itself, not every single gap that's identified, as remember, my caveat was, not everyone's going to turn into a topic for a PDP, even if it's very, very tightly scoped. It could be addressed probably by other means. So, that doesn't prevent us from making that conclusion. So, I think a little bit of before and also after.

And I also am looking at Greg. I don't know if that decision also then rests with the Council because the small team will give the recommendation report to Council and there should be further discussion, full Council level as well.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, full Council level. I also think this could go a lot of different ways based on what the small team brings back. So, I don't think we need to put it in a box necessarily of how this will go forward. But what Tomslin is describing, I think, is helpful in describing what are potential options at our disposal. That's how I'd frame it.

JENNIFER CHUNG

All right. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Jen. This is Justine. So, I noted that this table is supposed to be taken back by the small team and even councilors to socialize with our group. So, I'm doing that with ALAC. And I noted that you said that the small team is going to go through an exercise of prioritizing, whatever feedback comes back in. While I'm seeking feedback from ALAC, I'm also getting them to indicate what could be priorities for us as information for the small team as well. So, I thought that might be useful for all of us to get that sort of information as well from our groups.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Justine. That is extremely useful. I didn't want to be prescriptive on the homework, but just for information, I think I've asked the RrSG to do that part station, so it's good that you're asking ALAC to do that. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. Jen, I think you and the small team have done a fantastic job so far. And so, I just wanted to commend you for that. And for a topic as important as this, I think there's almost a temptation to overanalyze certain things, worry about, well, the number of PDPs, more analysis, etc. And at the end of the day, whatever your recommendation or support is, not everyone's going to like it. And that's okay. So, I would say I'd love the timeline, just keep it up and certainly don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I think you're doing a great job. So, thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Always a great motto to remember. Thanks, Damon. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Jen. This is Sam. And yeah, just to kind of pile on to what Damon said. The end result of the small team, very much similar to what Paul said on accuracy, is not the end result. That's not the policy recommendation that comes out the other end. It's just areas for future community work. And so, I expect that there might be some items on the gap matrix that are not fit for policy work, and we'll mark those as such.

And then in terms of the exercise of like prioritization and all that kind of stuff, it should be sort of light touch, but I'm envisioning that there might be topics that are discreet enough, they don't have a lot of overlap. The recommendation could be that they could potentially occur in sequence, pending community and staff bandwidth, obviously. But that's the thing I think we're envisioning as the small teams' recommendations and then it would then get kicked over to Council for the more logistical work of chartering and things like that.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thanks, Sam. Yes, definitely. And when we get to chartering, that's going to be a tightly scoped charter as well. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL Thank you. I think one good thing about sharing of the gap matrix with everybody and seeking feedback is because there has been so much work done on DNS abuse in different pockets within ICANN community. I know BC has been championing this. There's much work done in CSG for this. So, it will be great to collate all this and put it into this single space, so nothing is left out. Nobody can then later say we were not able to provide inputs in it, or it is missing something. Whatever of that moves forward is a different thing, but it's a great place to capture everything and then start the discussion.

So not only for this, but for future work, that can be one repository of all the requests from all of ICANN, what needs to be done on DNS abuse. So, I would say it's important to capture everything and not filter out things when we get feedback from different constituencies.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Vivek. I think that might be the end of the queue. So, I'm going to say back to you, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Jen. And thanks, everyone. Great discussion. Yeah, I think we're making progress and bringing a lot of potential topics to light, which even beyond this, the more immediate work, I think is pretty cool. Okay, let's move on to our last item, which is an update on reviews. So, I'm not an expert in this area, and it's something that just arose. So, Paul, feel free to jump in and correct me where I get little things wrong.

I think last meeting, the Board, a couple members from the Board as well as Sophie and Chris talked about this idea of taking a closer look at reviews generally. So, ICANN has these bylaw-mandated reviews. We're falling behind schedule as a community on completing them. And it's not just the ATRT. There's other reviews as well. So, the Board passed a resolution on this topic, deferring. ATRT4, which is the Accountability Transparency Review, to start a dialogue on how to improve reviews.

There was some commentary on this or concern about delaying ATRT4 again because it could be construed as a violation of the bylaws and it had already been delayed again. There were some questions on whether ATRT4 itself could serve as the vehicle to do a review of reviews, but there was concern that the scope of an ATRT cannot be dictated in advance of the ATRT, and the ATRT could be free to have other topics. So, a lot of number of threads on this.

Earlier, today, actually, the SO/AC leaders met to discuss, and they talked about an idea of interim bylaw update that deferred the bylaws mandated timeline. So, to basically put us into compliance and then amend the bylaws to allow a one-time review of reviews currently required by the bylaws but have a time gating on that review. So, it can't go forever. The reviewer reviews happens. But if it doesn't reach its conclusion by a certain time, then we're back to where we were before.

So, this is, I guess, all new information. The community is looking for feedback. ICANN is looking for feedback. And maybe how I'd phrase it is two parts. I guess the first bigger picture is, is it worthwhile to take stock of reviews and look at whether they're fit for purpose? It's been 10 years from the transition. And then the second question is, if so, does this approach of a preliminary bylaw change, which extends the bylaw, the deadlines to start these reviews and authorizes a review of reviews makes sense to folks?

And so, I guess I'm expecting councilors to have the answers on the tips of their fingers here, but I wanted to introduce this topic as something that we need to start thinking about and potentially coalescing around an opinion that we could communicate back to ICANN. So, I'll stop there. And then, maybe before I open the queue, Paul, you were the SME on this. Do you have any glaring corrections before I open the queue?

PAUL MCGRADY I love it. Yeah. Hey, Paul, your fingerprints, right? Yeah. So, no, I think that this is-- I'm glad to hear about the discussion of an interim bylaw because there is something to the notion that if we have bylaws, we should comply with them. So, that makes sense to me. It seems like a good way to deal with the traffic pileup. I've been using this metaphor, which is the problem with these reviews is that by the time you have them and then implement them, you have to start the next one. The timing was off on these. And so, we have a pileup on the freeway. And I think what the Board did is simply try to keep other cars from crashing into the back of the pileup while we cleared the blockage.

And so, the pause makes sense. A bylaws amendment to give the Board the breathing room they need to fix the problem makes sense. I think that as we talked about with the Board members when they came to visit, a community-wide process on how to fix this makes sense, rather than having it being handed down by Fiat from the Board, that makes sense. But I will say that as long as it's done with a sense of urgency. Because we do want to get the reviews redefined, back on track, fit for purpose for where we are right now. We're significantly past where some of these reviews were initially conceived of and kicked off. Some of them should be retired. There may be new ones that we are not doing.

And so, I do think that the big takeaway here is to not panic. And to continue to work with the Board to get this done in a speedy but thought-through way. I do know there is fiery rhetoric out there about this is the end of accountability and ICANN and all this other stuff, but it's coming from the same people that basically say that about everything. And so, I do think from a Council's point of view, I'd like for us to keep our heads calm and pitch in here and be ready to go when the community dialogue opens on this and to be helpful participants and all that.

So again, fun for me to say because I'm timing out, but I think Council will have an important role in however this community dialogue and however we fix, the problem looks. So anyways, for what it's worth, happy to take any questions about how we got here and anything else. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Great. Thanks, Paul. So, we have a queue. I will note that we are a little over time and I do want to save time for the open mic. So, I'm going to cut the queue at Osvaldo here, but maybe this is something we can talk about in our wrap-up session, too. So, Anne, you're first.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thanks so much, Greg. And thank you, Paul. I'm just very happy to learn that the victory, I would say, of the SO/AC chairs in the meeting where it was resolved to work on a bylaws amendment right now that the community could agree with. And I do have one question about that. But I guess I wanted to say first that I think there are plenty of possible routes for addressing this. But as the community thinks about ways to provide input to the Board on how to conduct a review of reviews. I think we need to keep in mind the fact that ultimately that is very likely to result in yet in another bylaws amendment.

And so, at that point in time, there will be a need for the empowered community to react to. Be on Board with that and approve that. So, whatever process is chosen going forward, as we consider it, we need to understand that it will most likely result in another bylaws amendment that the community will need to react to. So, I'm very happy that we could sort of rectify this process by a bylaws amendment right now. I do wonder how long it was discussed that the period would run that if we don't reach some other agreement on review of reviews, that the ATRT4 and other reviews kick back in. Was there a discussion of how long this would go?

GREG DIBIASE

No. This is all very preliminary, and I think we'll continue to talk about it. Manju.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Greg. So, in NCSG, I guess, unlike what you think of other cellular groups who are focusing on other more important issues, we have been discussing reviews in the NCSG. And one of the points we-- Actually, two points we want to raise. I think first is that, although we-- I think we're tentatively supporting the idea of a review of reviews, but we are hesitant to see if there are new mechanisms to be developed for conducting this kind of review of reviews. Because if we're creating another process for the process, it's going to be taking more and more time. So, we would like to see if it's possible to use any existing mechanisms or tool that we already have to conduct this review of reviews. So, like you said, maybe do ATRT4 as the review of reviews.

Another thing I think we have all experienced as the ICANN community, and it's been a problem. We don't know. We think that the more important problem or more important issue that really led us to this discussion of reviews, that community has been blamed in the sense that we're not doing things fast enough. But we've been discussing this for a while, too. Sometimes, even if we did our part fast enough, for example, we finish the PDPS in one year, two years, the implementation is taking four years, five years.

And that's not the part of processes that the committee is in charge of.

And in the sense of ATRT3, also, it was done in time, but then the implementation is just taking forever. And that's why we are discussing of delaying or postponing ATRT4 again. So how do we fix this problem of implementation taking longer than the processes itself? I think that would be like a vital point that we have to take into consideration when we're discussing this.

And the third point to bring, not as NCSG, but as the chair of SCCI, I think we have discussed with the SCCI that there's a process in GNSO that we haven't been using, which is the GNSO Input Process. And as Paul has been saying, on this issue, Council can play a vital role in leading the opinion of GNSO. And to do that, I think GNSO Input Process would be a good tool for us to form a GNSO-wide input to the Board on reviews. Understanding that probably we won't have very unified opinion, but if we do, I think that would be a good tool to try to unify and try to send a GNSO-wide input to the Board on this issue. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Manju. And we'll end with Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Thank you, Greg. I'll try to be quick. I just want to point out that I think that every organization has to periodically review its process and its organization if it wants to keep up to date with the environment. And that's something that I think is lacking in ICANN. It hasn't been done in a lot of years. The last year, well, the GNSO review should have been done in 2021. It hasn't been done. Then we have this holistic review that was proposed by the ATRT3, and we couldn't even go ahead with a Pilot Holistic Review. So, I think it's very important that ICANN prioritizes reviews of each organization process and tries to do it as soon as possible. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Great. Thank you, Osvaldo. Okay, that is the end of our scheduled time. And we will now move on to an open mic. Where is the open mic? Is it there?

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you. As Greg said, this is now open mic time. Those in the meeting room are now invited to queue at the standalone mic over here. As folks are heading, those participating remotely are able to raise their hands in Zoom and unmute their mics and we will call upon your name.

JEFF NEUMAN

Hi, everyone. Is this on? Here we go. My name is Jeff Neuman. I think some of you know me. As to the new code of conduct, I work for a company called JJN Solutions. We're a consulting firm. I do a bunch of legal work, and especially I work a lot on UDRP. I'm a panelist. I do complaints and I do responses and have done about 70 decisions.

The reason I'm up here is I was glad to hear that some of the stakeholder groups and constituencies did put the UDRP review on a higher priority, and I guess I'm up here to plead that it stay a high priority and it's something that happens very soon. The UDRP has been in place since 1998. It's never had any kind of review. In fact, the first motion in the Council for the issue report was 2011, even before New TLDs launched, which is interesting, right? It's been 14 years by the day it's been kicked down the can.

And in fact, initially it was a proposal to have RPM phase 1 and Phase 2 run in parallel because they don't have issues in common. I noticed in the last deferral, the rationale was, well, let's wait until RPM phase 1 is completely implemented. Well, that was one of the rationales. And I was a little upset to see that because, again, they could have been done in parallel.

I am a member of the Internet Commerce Association. I'm not speaking on their behalf at all. It is an association that represents domain owners and the domain owners that own more than several million domain names, so a pretty substantial portion of the industry. They want to see a UDRP review, a tightly scoped UDRP review. And in fact, I want to draw everyone's attention, if you're not already aware, to the joint paper between ICA and the World Intellectual Property Organization.

A great effort that took place over a year, that raised a whole bunch of issues and then brought IP owners, panelists, respondents, complainants. I was not involved in that. And essentially got together to see, okay, what are issues that-- We all support the UDRP, what are issues that we think we can come to some agreement on? And if you can imagine IP owners on one side and domain investors and others on the other side, they came to agreement on a list of about 10, 11 issues that can be discussed where they think agreement is possible.

And so, my recommendation is that hopefully you'll decide to initiate the review and take a look at this paper that was done to help you tightly scope a PDP. I'm not saying you have to use that exactly, but they went out there and did the work. And I think it's very valuable. It's open for comment now, actually. So, to the extent that you all do read it, please do comment. It's a great piece of work from organizations that you would never expect to work together. And so please keep it as high priority. It's time for review. There are certain things that do need to be reformed. And so, thank you. Sorry for taking so long. Apologies.

GREG DIBIASE Thanks, Jeff. That's really helpful context. And we'll make sure to be considering that in our prioritization exercise. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yeah. I'm here not in my councilor capacity. I'm here as somebody who has observed the work that we do at ICANN. And I have a concern about overlooking, especially the non-commercial registrants' rights and protecting them and domain name registrants, as well as which will affect if we do not protect them, it will also affect their users. And we are talking about educational places and not-for-profits. And the way that we prioritize the work usually is mainly about how to punish the domain name registrant. We are not really prioritizing protecting the domain name registrant, especially the non-commercial domain name registrant.

And I see that as a concern, because also when it comes to transfer policy review, when we see that there is a gap to help the domain name registrant when they get their domain name hijacked, we don't see that as a priority to come up with the dispute resolution mechanism as soon as possible. We need to pay more attention to how we can actually protect the registrants because the internet is-- Okay, maybe I'm getting a little bit theoretical here, but we keep saying that, oh, why do we have centralization in social media platforms, and why do we not have all these distributed internet, and what happened?

Well, what happened was that we made maintaining a domain name really hard for people and made it hard for them to protect themselves. And I think that we need to pay specific attention to these issues. And by the way, I just want to remind you that one of the only guys that worked on domain name registering issues at

ICANN got fired two years ago. So, this is how much we care about them. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Farzi. And we're sure to be considering that perspective in our prioritization. Great. Anyone else have anything for the open mic? Okay. Seeing none, that brings us to the end of the agenda. Thank you to everyone for all your hard work during this meeting and in the interim. I think we accomplished a lot since Seattle. We're putting a lot on our plates. I like the ambition. And congrats, everyone, on a successful meeting.

TERRI AGNEW

We can end the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**