
ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and GNSO Council
Monday, October 27, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello and welcome to the joint meeting of the ICANN Board and the GNSO. My name is Wendy Profit and I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I'll also post them in the chat for your reference.

This is a meeting between the GNSO and the ICANN Board, so we will not be taking questions from the audience during this session unless they are members of the GNSO community. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand. When called upon, we have a roving mic at the table.

Virtual participants will be given permission to unmute and zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Speakers, please state your name for the record, the language you speak, if speaking a language other than English, and speak clearly and at a moderate pace. I'll now hand the floor over to the ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

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.

TRIPTI SINHA	Thank you, Wendy. Welcome, everyone, to the joint meeting of the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council. Let's start with introductions. Becky, if you would like to go first, please.
BECKY BURR	Hi, I'm Becky Burr.
NACHO AMADOZ	Hi, Nacho Amadoz, one of the two Interim Co-Chairs of the GNSO Council.
TRIPTI SINHA	Tripti Sinha, Chair of the ICANN Board.
TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR	Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Interim Co-Chair.
CHRIS BUCKRIDGE	Chris Buckridge, appointed to the Board by the Non-Contracted Parties House of the GNSO.
JAMES GALVIN	James Galvin, SSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board.
TRIPTI SINHA	Thank you, everyone. Why don't we start? I'll start by reading the questions that the Board sent to the Council, and hear your

responses, and then I'll turn it over to one of you. You just guide me on who's going to take the next question.

We sent you a question a while back, and it says, what does the GNSO Council believe should be the Board's and ICANN Organizations policy priorities in 2026, taking into consideration our new Five-Year Strategic Plan, the WSIS+20 Review, and the recently launched Cross-Community Group on the Review of Reviews. So, with that, I turn it over to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks, Tripti, and we thank the Board for this question. When we looked at it from a GNSO perspective, we found it to be a difficult question to answer in the context of the GNSO's narrow remit of managing the gTLD policy development process. The priorities of the Board and ICANN Org are not within our control, as in the GNSO Council. However, in addition, the Five-Year Strategic Plan, the WSIS 20 Review, and the Review of Reviews present prioritized work in and of themselves.

The Council's perspective, and its narrow remit, executing its work in an efficient and effective manner is supportive of the Strategic Plan. By prioritizing its existing portfolio of work, and while doing so, committing to enhance the agility and effectiveness of policy and advice development, the Council will contribute to progressing Strategic Objective 1.

In this respect, the Council believes that the Board and ICANN Org should prioritize and commit to supporting the efficiency and effectiveness of the PDP, including allocating additional resources where warranted, providing its guidance where warranted to ensure that GNSO policy recommendations are Board-ready and implementable.

The Board, considering Council adopted GNSO policy recommendations in a timely manner, and also implementing Board adopted GNSO policy recommendations in a timely manner.

On the WSIS part of the question, the Council appreciates the Board and the Org efforts to raise the profile of the technical community within the WSIS+20 process. The Council believes it is important for the Board and Org to continue to advocate for the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance in various fora in 2026.

The SOAC Advisory Group should continue beyond the December 2025 WSIS+20 proceedings and can provide valuable input to ICANN staff regarding 2026 communications with the UN and other bodies involved in Internet governance.

The Council's Internet governance team developed the WSIS Action Line mapping to ICANN activities to assist the GAC, the Board, and Org in advocating for the multi-stakeholder model and will track and update as needed in 2026.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you very much for your response. I'll respond to the second part first and then turn it to Kurtis to respond to the first part. First, we appreciate the fact that you fully support ICANN's engagement in WSIS+20. Clearly, your encouragement of SO/ACs to be involved in the upcoming meetings and to ensure that the technical community is front and center and clearly part of this WSIS+20 outcome.

We very much appreciate that. In terms of adding more resources to PDPs, that falls within Kurtis' domain and also implementation of the recommendations. I'll turn it over to Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

First of all, apologies for being late. I was in another meeting that ran over a bit. On resources to PDPs, I think we will resource them and staff them as we need to. I think that's a discussion we're happy to have to GNSO, what we could do to make that more effective, efficient, and if there is any other resource needs for making that.

I just wanted to highlight something that we have been talking about when it comes to policy, I should say, not just PDPs. We've been discussing with the policy team, so that's Rasmus Weinstein, who runs the SVP policy team, and Teresa Schweinhart's team who does the implementations, is to better understand the policy and highlight and disclose where we are in policy developments for each policy or policy track.

Track these, highlight next steps, where have we spent time to also understand and have data on, where do policies get stuck, why do they get stuck on, to better understand the question of efficiency, but also be completely transparent on what they are, and then do the same for implementation to fully understand and showcase that.

Now, I missed the beginning of the answer, so if there's anything else in the question, I apologize, because I was walking in as you were reading that out.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thank you. No, we didn't miss anything in that. I think we will also come to some things that we are doing that also contributes in that Board readiness that you mentioned that ties into implementation, but we will give an update on that as well. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

I'm going to ask my colleagues, Becky, Chris and Jim, if you'd like to respond. Oh, Chris already has his hand up. Go ahead, Chris.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thank you, Tripti, and thanks, Tomslin, for that answer. It's quite a specific question. Just you mentioned the advisory group should continue beyond the December point. So, this is not the open WSIS+20 engagement network. Sorry, I'm not using the right terminology there. I take it you're talking about the smaller group

of SOAC representatives that have been meeting in a more sort of I don't want to say closed, but less public way.

And I guess I'm just asking if you have a sense of what role that group would have, going forward, because I think in its current incarnation it's been quite focused on getting us to the WSIS+20, engaging around the WSIS+20 discussions, understanding the consultation timeline and the opportunities there.

I'm certainly not discounting that that sort of a group could be useful going forward in a more generalized Internet governance engagement plan, but I'm just curious to know if there's been some more discussions in the Council about that and if you can speak to it a little.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks, Chris. It certainly hasn't been a wider discussion in the Council, but I do have members from the Council's IG team in the room, and I think Desiree is in the room. I would like her to answer that.

DESIREE MILOŠEVIĆ

Thank you, Tomslin. Thank you, Chris, for that question. We believe I think the Council had participated in its informal group, the SOAC group that you also participate in, but the Council also had an informal group itself, so we had double efforts. The group that produced this mapping is within the Council informal Working Group, and then we also participate SOAC.

So, the proposal was that this informal cross-organizational ICANN one continues to be involved in more broader Internet governance things, because this, as we know, may end at the end of December. So, rightfully, you have asked the right question, and the idea is that the broader work within the SOs and ACs with the help of staff continues past December.

TRIPTI SINHA

Any other questions, Becky?

BECKY BURR

No, I just want to thank the members of this community and across ICANN who have been so helpful in being supportive and active on behalf of the multi-stakeholder model throughout this process. I think for those of you who are at the opening ceremony, you heard the Ambassador. Your voices have been heard. He's impressed with the enthusiasm that this community has demonstrated, and all of that puts us in very good stead going forward. It won't.

Internet governance questions will not end at the end of December. Rather, they will probably go on forever. Thank you, and keep it up.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Becky. I will turn this over to you now for the questions that you asked of the Board.

NACHO AMADOZ

Thank you very much, Tripti. Our next point is on the PDP and GGP manual red lines for adopting GNSO recommendations. During the Council's last Strategic Planning Session, the Council came to the general agreement on an approach for the ICANN Board to reverse its adoption of a GNSO recommendation, and that discussion included two Board members that were present, and we agreed that the next step was to identify the proper place to document this process.

So, the Org coordinated internally and determined that the recommended location for the updates, were the EPDP, the PDP, and the GGP manuals. Those edits seek to balance the need to set expectations for both the Council and the Board, but also not to seek to limit the Board's fiduciary duties and, at this point, we think that there are several next steps, but we need first to determine if these edits are generally appropriate. We could consider how we discuss them, if there is the mutual agreement to the proposed edits, and see what's the way forward.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you for that, and my colleague Becky will respond to you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, and first of all, thanks to the Council for taking this on. We discussed this when Chris and I were with you in D.C. at the strategy, and we really appreciate your initiative on this process. We agree that the PDP and the GGP manuals are the appropriate

places to capture the process going forward, and that the EPDP manual doesn't need to be revised since it refers back.

The Board hasn't done an in-depth review of the red lines, but it does appear that they answer the question, and they manage the balance that we need to provide some guidance and some predictability without constraining the Board's ability to fulfill its fiduciary obligations.

Just let me say in closing, we certainly appreciate that this should be something that is used, a process that's used rarely and carefully, and I think as the interactions between the Board and the GNSO Council continue to improve, as I have seen them over the past several years, we'll get better and better at this, and need to use it less often, but it is really important to have it there, and we really appreciate the work you've done. We're interested in hearing about next steps, but yes, it looks like we're all moving in the same direction.

NACHO AMADOZ

Thank you very much, Becky, and we also appreciate the time you've committed and your participation, so the next steps might be to agree to the edits and then go on and publish them for Public Comments.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Okay. The next question from the GNSO Council is really not a question, but rather an update on the Board readiness initiative

that we, as the Council started as you know, during the 2023 GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session, the Council agreed that it should seek to limit the likelihood of the Council approving PDP recommendations that the ICANN Board is ultimately unable to adopt.

To that end, the Council discussed the desire to ensure it submits Board-ready policy recommendations to the Board to the extent possible, and generally speaking, a policy recommendation is considered Board-ready when the recommendation is likely to achieve Board adoption, that is, the recommendation has been approved by a GNSO Supermajority Board and will most likely be considered by the Board to be in the best interest of the ICANN community and ICANN Org.

So the Council enlisted a Small Team to develop a questionnaire to administer to Board members, PDP Working Group Chairs, Working Group members, and ICANN staff to discuss their experience with recommendations that were not adopted and synthesized the learnings into actionable ideas to propose to the Council. The Council thanks the Board for the participation of some Board members and I believe Becky was one of those.

In this exercise the feedback was and is very valuable to us. The Council is currently in the process of discussing the recommendations that came from that Small Team. As we plan for how to implement those recommendations we require further discussion amongst ourselves, but at this time we're looking to

discuss those in January during the SPS that the Council usually has.

And the added benefit of that is some Board members are present, are usually present, and so we hope that the conversation that takes place in the SPS will give the Council a good direction in how to move forward with those recommendations.

A second point to the Board Readiness Initiative the GNSO Council and Board have developed a much-improved working relationship that is based on mutual respect and dialogue rather than relying on sternly worded correspondence.

Progress on things like the pending software recommendations likely could not have been made in the same way without the new working relationship. However, there is some concern from Councilors that the letter the Board sent to the Council in regards implementation of certain IGO or INGO recommendations where there was misalignment between implementation staff and the IRT.

Some Councilors believe that it was improper for the Board to have weighed in on the topic before the Council even had a chance to consider the topic. While the Board letter was not overly prescriptive that is, it provided paths for both Options 1 and 2, it still can be construed as the Board putting its finger on the scale and the Board not fully recognizing the Council's role and

potentially eroding the Council and the Board's working style of recent times.

So, the Council hopes for open respectful and predictable lines of communication as an important component to ensuring Board-ready recommendations.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you for bringing this topic to the table. First, I'd like to say that the Board very much appreciates the work that's being put into making sure there's Board readiness in the recommendations and also that they are implementable. So, we do appreciate that and also in improving our communications there has been a slight hiccup. So, to add more color, I'm going to first turn it over to Chris Buckridge who will speak to Board readiness and then to Becky who will speak to the IGO and NGO issue. Chris?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Sure. Thanks, Tripti, and thanks, Tomslin. We obviously as the Board thank the Council for considering this important topic and for acknowledging and recognizing how important this topic is and thank you also for keeping us informed of the developments as they progress. We also appreciate and wish to continue the informal transparent communication between the Board and Council going forward.

I know that myself and I think Greg are planning to, we're doing our best to be in Barcelona for the SPS with you in January and it is a

really valuable opportunity for us to connect the Board and the Council in a sort of more in-depth and informal way. We thank the Board readiness Small Team for its work on producing the recommendations and we're looking forward to hearing more from the Council as it considers those recommendations and the corresponding implementation plan.

I assume we'll be in on some of those discussions as we join you in Barcelona and we welcome being part of those discussions as is deemed appropriate such as at the SPS. Board and Org and Council all need to work together to drive clarity during PDPs and some of the challenges that we've had are the result of losing this clarity. So, issues that are knowingly deferred or emerged during implementation continue to cause issues as these processes proceed.

It's a recurring challenge. It's part of what drives the criticism that ICANN faces regarding the pace and timeliness of policy development and implementation. And we also know that the Strategic Plan, which we've already heard referenced in many sessions and many times today, calls for ICANN to support the community to improve policy development and implementation.

So, this is very much a focus of the Board, something we see ourselves as being held accountable for and we look forward to the collaborative work with the Org and community on this front. So, I'll pass to Becky regarding the IGO issue.

BECKY BURR

Thanks. So first of all, let me say that the Board really appreciates the way in which the community, GNSO in particular, but all parts of the community have been working on the next round, the 2026 round IRT. It's been moving at a fast pace. Those meetings come up with incredible regularity. And I know that your representatives, the Council's representatives have been extremely proactive in bringing issues back to the Council.

As part of our enhanced communication, we have tried to avoid tossing letters through the transom, over the transom without context. But we also do feel that an important part is making sure that as you consider issues, you have the Board's views, where those matter to the extent they matter, available to you.

This issue came to us in our workshop in Madrid, so in late September, mid-September, I guess. And there was a sense that there was some urgency given the impending publication of the Applicant Guidebook. We talked about it and we basically concluded that wherever the Council came out, that we would leave that decision to the Council.

We could live with and work with whatever position the Council took. We thought it was fair to let the Council know what we were thinking about. It was not meant to be prescriptive. I have to say, the notion that we can't tell you what we're thinking before the Council acts, I'm not quite sure what to do with it, frankly, because that's what we're, you know, for years you worked in a vacuum,

things came to the Board, the Board reacted after everything was done. That was a bad outcome.

So, it was not offered as a directive. We clearly intended to communicate that the decision was up to the Council, and I think we did communicate that. I guess I understand the timing sensitivity, but, and now I'm not speaking for the Board, I'm speaking for me. Come on, guys. We're just sharing information with you.

We need to be able to do that. You need to be able to share information with us. We need to have frank conversations. It would of course been better, because it almost always is better to have that as part of a conversation, but given the timing, that was very difficult to do.

So, we elected to send the letter. That's actually probably my fault, so you can, I love this, it's my fault I'm leaving, you can blame the letter on me. But I hope that our improved relationship and communication, enables us to communicate as expeditiously as we need to. And not stand on principles that are a little bit mysterious. We should treat each other with respect. I do respect the Council, and I do think the Council is entirely capable of acting, fulfilling its obligations in the best interest of the community. So, we were just trying to share information.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks Becky and Chris for those responses. And we, us Council was certainly happy for that open line of communication that we've established to continue. And I don't think the Council was saying that do not share information. I think like I said earlier, it's probably because the letter was construed as the Board prescribing its preferred option that the Council should take rather than it being seen as just information sharing. I think that is where the issue was.

BECKY BURR

Well, that's an interesting gloss on it. I guess I still think in Board liaisons you want the Board members to participate in the discussion and share their views. Honestly that letter was intended to communicate nothing but here's what we're thinking about it. It's the GNSO Council's decision.

We're going to share some information about what we think we will need to do depending on which way you go. And it was intended to be informational and nothing else. To the extent it was written in a way that enabled it to be construed as prescriptive, I apologize. I'm almost certain that was definitely my fault.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN

I just would like to add and suggest, especially from my own point of view, I view this as a learning opportunity. A few years ago, we created the Small Teams so we created an opportunity for greater

dialogue. I think that we need to look for opportunities for these informal communication paths. We're used to the letters always being a formal statement and we sort of tossed that in there after all the Small Team negotiations and people fell back into old habits. But I think the important thing to take away from this is we are all interested in more informal, open dialogue and communications.

The letter was just, you know, we used an old mechanism that brought in all of the old interpretations but going forward we're going to have more of these. They'll probably be letters. That was the appropriate mechanism at the time for the sharing. So, let's just pick this up and take it as a learning opportunity and look forward to more opportunities to share information however we do it so that we can come to a good, successful place. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thank you, James. I think we had one other point to make under the Board Readiness Initiative. Oh, sorry. Yes, Thomas.

TRIPTI SINHA

You can just come to the table.

THOMAS RICKERT

I'd just like to look at them. Thank you so much for waiting. And I'd like to build on what the two of you said. And I think it's sort of funny that we're now in a situation where, Becky, you thought

you'd done exactly what we've been asking for years, i.e., the Board say what the Board thinks, and there are misunderstandings.

So I hope that we're now all leaving this meeting not with you being deterred from making sure that the Board says what it thinks, but as you said, Jim, that we see this as a learning exercise. So, this is sort of a new thing. And I think that there's a certain risk with whatever communication you have between individuals, between groups, that if you write something and you give folks enough time to mull over it and conspire about what could have been meant or what should be read between the lines, things go wrong. And this is exactly what happened here.

So let me just say that I'm speaking in personal capacity, but I'm sure that the other Councilors see it exactly the same way. We do want you to share. You will see that in the Board readiness recommendations that we came up with, that we want more communication. But maybe in the interim, until we got used to how to read letters as we move on, we should make sure that if something happens, somebody picks up the phone, writes an email, hey, Becky, what's with this letter? Is there something that you would like us to do in terms of option A or B?

And then you would have said, no, we're easy. You just do your thing. And then I think everything would have been good. So, you know, just to make sure that there's no misunderstanding moving forward, but that we should read your letters, you know, like a kickoff for further communication, then pick up the phone if there

are any perceptions that things might not be running in the right direction.

BECKY BURR

Well, please definitely read the Board's letters as an invitation to further communication. Otherwise, we'll have to start using disappearing ink so nobody can mull over it.

TRIPTI SINHA

And let's not forget, we're all here for the same purpose and we're all trying to achieve consensus and get to the right place and make the right decisions. So, absolutely no one's trying to be prescriptive. So, I think this was a good discussion and let's move forward in the spirit of collaboration.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thanks. Absolutely agree with that. And still under the Board readiness discussion, we had one last point to make under that, which was in relation to the timeliness of implementing recommendations that are adopted. So, the Council commends the Next Round team for the tremendous effort and energy it has expended towards implementing the SOPR recommendations and putting the program on the right path to launching in April 2026.

At the same time, the Council is concerned about the pace at which policy recommendations are considered by the Board as well as implemented by the staff. The Council recognizes the critical role that it plays in the efficient consideration and implementation of

policy recommendations and as such is not intending to point fingers at the Board or staff developing Board-ready recommendations benefits the entire ecosystem.

At the same time, the Council does have some concerns about the pace at which it is, which its recommendations are processed through the subsequent steps, that is the Board consideration and implementation by staff. What we wanted to say today is to the extent the Council can help in any way, it stands ready to do so.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you very much for that. So, I think the first step, as you said, you are bringing more Board-ready recommendations, so we very much appreciate that. As you know, many factors go into evaluating each and every recommendation and once that's approved by the Board, the implementation begins. We certainly have our efficiency, that's been built into our strategic plan as well. I'm going to turn it over to Kurtis to comment on implementation aspects and Becky, if you'd like to add any further thoughts on that as well.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

As I said, what we want to do is create, I forgot to say this last time, so we're planning for ahead of the Mumbai meeting, some format meeting, the policy update document, I forgot what we call it now, that we publish before each meeting to what I talked about before, the status of policies, but also have the status of implementation

and actually highlight to be transparent, this is where we are, this is what we're blocking and this is what we're observing on.

I think working on that, we can also see where there are perhaps commonalities between where there's been challenges in policy development or those match, I'm just making this up now, but if they are matching, for example, in challenges in implementation, there might be something we can learn from that, if there is challenges in implementation that are holding up policies and there comes a trend, we can build on that and we can try to find efficiencies and how do we become better at implementing these policies and where do you work on this.

And that's really what we want to do is provide that level of transparency so that the community knows this on both sides. And I keep saying this, that I don't actually think we can separate policy development from policy implementation. I think this is an end-to-end process and we need to treat it as such. I know internally there are two teams dealing with this, but when we're looking at efficiency, we're looking at how we can improve this, it's an end-to-end improvement and we need to look at that entirely.

And my last point about this is that there is a lot of opinions about this, there is very little data and we're trying to generate the data so we can actually look at this and have an opinion on what does improvement mean, where are there really inefficiencies and how do we develop that, because I think that's really what we need to start looking on this data side as opposed to beliefs.

BECKY BURR

Let me just say, nobody is going to claim that there is not room for improvement in almost anything we do. I think, you know, Kurtis came on Board last year and I think sitting from the perspective of the Board, I've seen enormous improvement.

I think if you look at the work of the 2026 round staff, both from the sort of policy review, it is true that the Board took a while to get to that policy review, there's no doubt about that, but ultimately we were able to move through it pretty efficiently and the Implementation Review Team has been doing a tremendous amount of work in a short period of time, really extraordinary. Extraordinary commitment from the community, extraordinary commitment from Org and I hope you will agree that the Board has been working pretty hard on this too, so my encouragement is not to say there's no problem, but to say take every opportunity that comes to you for continuous improvement.

We've got a lot of work going forward, we may have a couple of PDPs on abuse that are opportunities for enhancing the policy development process and enhancing the policy consideration process and enhancing the implementation process, so there's no end of opportunities to make this better. We're all in it together and we all have something to contribute to making it better.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thank you, that's good to hear. I think the last question we had was, we were hoping to hear from the Board on the RDRS gap analysis paper that we have heard about but we haven't yet seen.

BECKY BURR

Thanks, so the Board is going to consider a resolution on Thursday to continue RDRS for up to two years, December of 2027, and as part of that process we'll also be publishing an analysis of sort of a policy alignment. I know that we have referred to it as a gap analysis, but we've really thought about it and we think that it's that's not quite the right description.

It really is about sort of analyzing the sort of how we align existing policy that we have, and not existing policy, existing policy, well yeah, existing policy, existing policy recommendations that the Board has not yet acted on, and the RDRS standing committee's final report, how we get from where we're where we are right now with these various, the SSAC recommendations that standing out there yet to be dealt with, some SSAC recommendations that have been, you know, that have been adopted by the Board but not yet implemented for a variety of good reasons, and then the work that the RDRS standing committee has gone through.

So, the paper that the alignment analysis will be put out on Friday, and it sort of works through current, whether current policy implementation, existing policies, new policies, or some combination of these things are needed to ensure that RDRS

includes key components that the Board and the community together have identified as necessary for a long-term solution.

So for example, as part of the SSAC recommendations, the community recommended, the Board has not yet acted on, but the community recommended that all registrars be required to participate in a data request system. So, the Board is not, the Board has said that it actually agrees with that. I think you've probably heard me that say that more times than you would like to hear in the GAC room and in here, but that's a that's an existing policy recommendation that the Board needs to act on and figure out how we map from SSAD to a living future RDRS.

We'd like to talk about how we get from where we are now to a requirement for registrars with affiliate affiliated privacy and proxy services to also respond to RDRS requests. There is policy work that has been done, but not fully implemented with respect to privacy and proxies. There are some unacted on policy recommendations in the SSAD group related to privacy and proxy services out there, but it's not clear that there's a straight path.

We may need policy to get to get there. Meanwhile, we do have registrars who are voluntarily doing this, so we're developing information and experience with how that works.

The Board has been pretty clear based on what we hear from the community and this aligns with what we're hearing from the RDRS standing committee that there's a need for APIs and ways to streamline integration both for registrars so that they don't have to

be duplicating processes and for users to make the system better, have a better experience.

We have policy recommendations, well, we have policy that the Board actually adopted regarding consideration of Urgent Requests, but we do have to think about SLAs to implement that. We have the new issue that we identified as we thought through Urgent Requests, which is the necessary precondition of having law enforcement authenticated if you want to get a reasonably prompt response from law enforcement.

Then we have heard some requests for voluntary participation by ccTLDs in the RDRS or a successor program. The alignment analysis that we're putting out on Friday, seeking Public Comment on, we'll look at what policy we have, what policy recommendations we have, what are there missing pieces or what's the path from getting to here to where we want to be consistent with all of the policy roles that the GNSO plays and the like.

That input is going to, we hope, inform the Board and the council's collaboration, consultation on those pending consensus recommendations for the SSAD. We had a pretty good experience breaking ground on the supplemental policy process in connection with the next round. We think that some of that will have to be, we'll need to do some of that with respect to the open SSAD policies.

So, this is an input to be used by the council, by the community, and by the Board as part of the consultation we expect to have, not me, the Board expects to have with the council. Given what a very good experience that process was, we're sure we've learned from it so long as Paul McGrady's still here and willing to run the Small Team, we'll all be in great shape.

So, that was just a shout out to a wonderful job on the Small Team work. Thank you, Paul. So, that's what it is and we will look for community input on it and we hope that it will be a tool that will enhance the Board and council's work together on potential supplemental policies.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR

Thank you for that update, Becky, and that was really helpful because like I mentioned at the beginning, the council was generally in the dark about what the paper was. We just heard that it's a gap analysis paper, we didn't even know what it was called. So, thank you very much for that update.

TRIPTI SINHA

All right. I think that brings us to the end of our questions. Is there anything else that you'd like to?

WENDY PROFIT

We have a question from one of the GNSO members in the Zoom chat. Farzi, are you in the room?

BECKY BURR

Do you want to ask it in person?

FARZANEH BADIEI

I'm so sorry, I messed up the schedule, so I just connected from outside, so can you hear me?

BECKY BURR

Yes, we can hear you.

FARZANEH BADIEI

I am so sorry. So, I just want to know if the financial stability of RDRS is also being considered. Becky, you're mentioning all these other factors, but one important thing is that we can't have this system to be funded by ICANN forever, so when are we going to consider charging the requesters, having a charging scheme, and doing the financial stability part?

I think that all the recommendations in EPDP, has to be considered as a whole, and maybe we can have a chat with the community to see what should be prioritized. I don't know if it's the job of the Board to prioritize, but if you want to prioritize, it would be good to be with the community.

BECKY BURR

Thanks, Farzi. I have to say up on our television, we're seeing Farz Dusa. They have somehow smashed together Farzi with Digital

Medusa, and you now have a new name. Thanks for that question. The alignment paper is not and should not be seen as the Board's views on the full package of SSAD recommendations that are out there, and of course, the SSAD recommendations that are out there do include a recommendation regarding user payments.

It wasn't an area where-- the Board will need to act on that policy. It will need to make a determination about whether it believes that policy recommendation is in the best interests of ICANN and the ICANN community. It has not done that yet. There is no Board position on that, but the fact that there's this alignment analysis out there doesn't say anything one way or another about it.

So yes, as part of the discussion of that whole package of SSAD recommendations, the Board is going to have to have a discussion about it. It's going to have to decide whether it can accept the policy as is, whether it can accept the policy with changes, or whether it feels it needs to reject the policy consistent with the bylaws, in which case the Board will follow all the processes. It doesn't. It needs to do that.

It's required to do under the bylaws, but the point is the alignment paper focuses on places where we see a need to figure out a path from place A to place B. It doesn't address or dispose of any policies, but it is certainly not intended to be comprehensive. We understand there is a full package of recommendations that includes that item. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Okay. Are there any other questions or comments? All right. We're very close to the end of the session. I just wanted to say this has been a good exchange. I wanted to comment on two points before we close, which is one in terms of improving our efficiencies on looking at recommendations that come out of PDPs and subsequent implementation of those recommendations.

As Kurtis said, he is looking at how we can bring about efficiencies, realign processes, and it's on his set of objectives to do so, and it's very important to the Board as well. Regarding the miscommunication, as has been stated by my colleagues and from your council members as well, that it's important that we get to a place where we can have a free exchange of ideas. We're all in this together. We're trying to get to a good place.

So if a letter comes from the Board that could potentially be misconstrued, I urge you to give us a call and have a chat. Most likely things will get settled amicably. So we all work in good faith, and this has been a very good exchange, and thank you very much for the meeting.

And before we adjourn, I did want to say, as you know, that we have three departing Board members, and Chris is not on stage. Is Maarten here? Oh, Chris is here. Chris and Maarten, could you stand up? And Becky, if you don't mind, could we give them a round of applause? And Becky? They've all played very key roles

in this space, as you know, and we will miss them dearly. Thank you all. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]