

---

ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum – GNSO Council Meeting  
Wednesday, June 16, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:30 CEST

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Scott.  
Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody.  
Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on 16th of June, 2021.  
Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank  
you.  
Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

---

**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.**

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:            Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:      Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZ:                 Here. I'm here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:      Greg Dibiase.

GREG DIBIASE:              Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:      Kristian Ormen.

KRISTIAN ORMEN:            Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:      Tom Dale.

TOM DALE :                  Here.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE : Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Marie.

Mark Datysgeld.

MARK DATYSGELD: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: John McElwaine.

JOHN McELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE : Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART : Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Osvaldo Novoa.

I don't see Osvaldo in the room. I will circle back.

Wisdom Donkor.

WISDOM DONKOR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Farell Folly.

---

FARRELL FOLLY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE : Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Juan Manuel Rojas.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Here. Thank you.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Olga Cavalli.

OLGA CAVALLI: Here, Nathalie. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Jeff Neuman.

JEFF NEUMAN: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Present. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: And I note for the record that Osvaldo Novoa has also joined the call.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you so much, Osvaldo.

GNSO staff is also present in the room.

I would like to remind everyone here to please state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. A reminder that we are in a Zoom Webinar room. Councilors have all been promoted to panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once they have set their chat to all panelists and attendees for all to be able to read the exchanges.

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, as this is a work session for the GNSO Council, meaning attendees do not have access to their microphones nor to typing in the chat. Please note there will be an open mic session at the end of the meeting where all lines will be opened for questions and comments.

---

To view the real time transcription, please click on the "closed caption" button in the Zoom toolbar. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

Thanks, Philippe. And it's now over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Philippe Fouquart here. Hope you can hear me.

And I hope that you are well, wherever you are. Welcome to this ICANN71 council session. And let's go to our agenda. Any update to statements of interest? Okay. Seeing no hands, thank you.

Moving on, any changes to be made to the agenda? Okay. Thanks.

I would just note that the minutes of our previous meetings have been circulated to the list, noting the May-- the minutes of the May meeting and the April meeting.



---

With this, let's move on to our review of the project list and the action item list. And I'll turn to Berry for this. Would you help us go through this, please, Berry?

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Philippe. Berry Cobb for the record.

I really don't have much to review for both of these today other than what was shared on the GNSO Council's list.

I would like to thank Maxim for his diligent review of the program materials. I think his question that was sent to the list is highly encouraged from others to get to that level of scrutiny to have a clear understanding of what is our current workload as well as what is in the pipeline and when key aspects of projects occur.

For those that may not have been tracking on the mail list, one of Maxim's questions was in relation to the Phase 2 EPDP RDBS Phase 2 recommendations that the council adopted and passed to the Board and in relation to the initiation of the operational design phase, which once the Board had resolved to launch the ODP, that forced a change to the program tool that, therefore, extended out the time line from a program management perspective for when the Board will eventually consider the GNSO

---

Council's final report and the recommendations contained within.

So ultimately that did cause a shift in timing, and that was very important to call out.

So I do encourage other council members to spend the time to get into that level of detail. I'm always available to answer specific questions or to show you especially how to read the program management tool. I know that it's a difficult eye chart to look at.

But it does try to provide a compilation of every project and recurring activity that touches the GNSO. Unfortunately, you know, it's not always 100% comprehensive, but we strive when we do get new information to update that as we're moving along.

And really that's kind of all I have to say in regards to the program tools. I think the action items were pretty thin and are mostly a part of the agenda today.

So thank you, Philippe.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Berry. This is Philippe here. And I would just note and add to what you just said, that encouraging people to have a look at it.

And coming back to the discussion we had earlier with the GAC, is that, indeed, there are a number of elements that may need -- or which people may want to give some thought about providing some visibility on this. And that's also the other reason why we need to do what Maxim has done, indeed, to make sure that all this information is available to all those, which it has interests for.

This being said, I'd like to turn to the floor and see whether people have questions or comments on this.

Okay.

Seeing no hands, thanks again, Berry.

And just, by the way, I didn't say it at the very beginning but we're all thankful and resent for the people in the Americas in this European time zone reference that we have for this meeting. We know that's a tough task.

---

So with this, just moving forward, consent agenda. We have none for this meeting.

And we'll go to something that's actually related to what we have actually on the radar that falls under our remit, and that's Item 4.

And that's the initiation of the framework for continuous improvement in pilot.

So as you would recall, we had a number of exchanges with the SG&C leaders on this; proposed a way forward earlier this year. I think we had two -- two calls on this, and a number of updates to the draft framework as it relates to our actions on the non-PDP-related efforts.

So what we have here in the motion is a proposal for a pilot. I understand that there was changes suggested to -- to this motion and considered (indiscernible).

So with this, I'll turn to Tania to further elaborate and help us going through this.

Tania.

---

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you, Philippe. Tatiana Tropina for the record.

Hello, everyone, from the European time zone.

As Philippe said already, this motion is related to what we discussed about Action Decision Radar. And this is the way as we suggest to the Council to address those issues which, you know, have this one -- zero to one month time frame, and they have been there all the time; however, we have not been dealing with them.

For some of them, you know, they just depend on somebody else's decisions, like ATRT3. Some of them have been there for a long time, like Work Stream 2, and there are different community efforts which we are trying to align to address each issue.

Some tasks are pretty big like, Work Stream 2; some tasks are rather mundane, you know, like for Statement of Interest, the forms for the Statements of Interest.

So what you see in front of you here in this motion and in the document and close to this motion is the framework for continuous improvement, which this motion is supposed to initiate.

---

As Philippe already mentioned, this is going to be a pilot project. So a small group is going to address on the few, very small tasks, and then we can see whether it works, whether it doesn't work, whether it's effective or not, how we're going to continue, are there any changes needed.

What is very important to remember about this motion and initiation of the GNSO Framework for Continuous Improvement in the form of pilot is that as a result of initiating this pilot, these items, which are, you know, like a sword, you know, hanging there, which I expected to be addressed as part of this framework, and some of them are quite huge like Work Stream 2, as I said, policy implementation, PDP 3.0, in part community, ATRT3, and so on forth, they would be moved to the section of the Action Decision Radar which has no timeline associated with them. So basically we are sort of killing two birds with one stone. We are addressing some of the items, looking whether this is an efficient way to address them; and, secondly, we are moving those big items which we have to address, but we haven't addressed yet, to the no-time-frame range, and then we can deal with them when the time comes, except when there is a sort of external-to-GNSO decision taken on them. Like, for example, the Board is going to decide something on Work Stream 2 or, I don't know, ATRT2 or GNSO review. So of course they can come back then.

---

What else is worth to mention? Well, I guess -- yeah, so it would be about the pilot. As I said, and this is worth to remember, this has been shaped in consultation with the stakeholder groups and constituency chairs because we did get feedback, and we listened to this feedback because initially this framework was supposed to be like, you know, just some ongoing process. We heard the comments about limited capacity. We heard the comments about representation, concerns about consensus designation and whether this framework would try to replace, I don't know, policy-making. We listened to this, and we limited it with the point that there would be pilot but then there would be reassessment. And if this is not needed, then we can discuss and the Council can implement any other solution or change this one. So it's just kind of a safe compromise for all of us, I believe.

And with this, I will pause here and ask the councilors if anybody has any questions. I especially would welcome any intervention from Kurt who seconded this motion. But -- because he started the discussion on the list already.

So I don't see any hands up for now.

Ah, Kurt, please go ahead.

---

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Tania. I'm not going to turn my camera on at 3:30 in the morning to spare you all.

Thanks very much for this. And my amendment to this was merely to clarify that it would be the Council and not the committee that's formed that would decide whether or not the committee should stay in place.

You know, reading this, admittedly later in the game than I should have, I had -- I had some concerns that I discussed with my fellow councilors and my stakeholder group, and they are -- and sort of too late to really have a complete discussion here. So I didn't want to get in the way of starting the pilot. So I think the pilot in this limited form is fine. But for my stakeholder group in particular, you'll not be surprised to understand that the composition of the committee and the task force doesn't really mirror the composition of the Council the way it's formed. So we have a concern about that. And, you know, it's something that could be worked through in time.

And we also see that the -- you know, the definition of "consensus" that the task force has given is pretty much the same as the PDP, which is always a problem that, you know, what happens when you don't have full consensus. So we're



---

concerned about decisions being made that wouldn't be made in a -- in a traditional ICANN PDP. It might stray from that.

You know, looking at it, and this is something, you know, I hope we can discuss, but there's a committee formed, and that committee, you know, breaks all our work up into four task forces, considering seven assignments with four additional assignments for the committee. So all the work is still sitting there, but now we've created a committee that's doing some additional administrative work. So I'm not -- I'm not clear in my mind, I'm not certain that this is going to streamline things but, rather, put another administrative step in the way and suck up some volunteer time. So I'm not sure that it's not, you know, the Council itself that's supposed to be, you know, prioritizing our work. You know, I think that's our role as sort of a committee of the whole, as someone just said -- once said.

And for me, importantly, you know, while this -- while this -- while this example or pilot program is going on, you know, I want to attack some other things on that list. I'm sure everyone has something important to them. You know, for me it's probably labeled here as PDP 3.0, but, you know, I think it's vital that we look at the PDP and make some changes. And, you know, we've all read PDP 3.0 and there's some good stuff in there, there's some good stuff in the consensus playbook. You know, for -- my passion in joining the Council was to try to, and I'll just say repair the PDP

---

so we don't have five-year PDPs and the like. So I'd like us to dive into that as an existential issue, but I'm sure others have different issues they'd like to attack.

So, you know, the bottom line is I'm not convinced as to the efficacy of this. And while the pilot's going on, we can consider those issues and maybe attack something, you know, something that's not a small issue that's suitable for a pilot but a big issue that's important to us.

So that's my point of view on that. Thanks very much for -- for asking me to talk, Tania, and thanks very much, everyone, for your time.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Kurt.

And before I go to John, I want to address a couple of points. As I said already, this is just a pilot. I think Marie also clarified in the chat already that this is something that we can run for a couple of small tasks and then see. And if we want to switch to full consensus, let's switch to full consensus.

If we want to, I'm sorry, ditch this framework, let's do it but we have to see if it works or not. We have to start somehow,

---

somewhere. We have been discussing these issues about Action Decision Radar being full with these things' ad nauseam, and we really have to start somewhere.

So thank you, Kurt, for your support despite all the concerns you have.

And I believe in a few steps, these concerns are going to be addressed once we raise these issues.

Thanks again to Marie for answering the questions in the chat.

John, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

JOHN McELWAINE:

Thanks. John McElwaine for the record. I'm really just echoing a lot of what Kurt said.

Firstly, I'm not going to turn my camera on given the hour.

But, secondly, wanted to let the council know, and in particular council leadership, I think the council leadership was aware that IPC has been struggling with this issue. There's been some that believe that the framework for continuous improvement was -- at least parts of it were outside of the GNSO's remit and that there

---

were other processes already in place that would serve the same goal.

That being said, the IPC is certainly all in favor of any process improvements that gets the work of the GNSO done more rapidly, efficiently, and in the community's best interest.

With respect to this particular motion, however, since it was amended maybe just a little over 24 hours ago, and Flip and I need to take direction from our membership, we have not had sufficient time to see whether consensus was developed in voting.

So I don't know if the -- if leadership is seeking to get full votes here from every council member, but I don't know if others were put into the same bind in that we've not been able to really adequately get feedback on the amendment.

I don't know if that -- and certainly ironically don't want to ask for deferral. But if there is any thought of further input, we could take it up at next meeting. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, John.

---

Of course, by deferral, it will have to go to Philippe. I will continue this discussion for now.

Just a couple of points. Again, I'm speaking here for myself self only, as I understand this motion.

We identified the items on the council -- or the Action Decision Radar of the GNSO Council. So in a way, what we did is addressing the issues within the remit of the council. Of course, I understand that the concern here is whether procedure is within the remit of the council.

I do think that the pilot allows us without any drastic measures to actually see how it works.

I also think that we actually did have these ad hoc, small working groups, you know, forming here and there. But to me, it is apparent that in the last one and a half years of all these virtual meetings and Zoom fatigue, the notion of ownership -- in these small working groups, the notion of ownership of work is actually blurring. And a lot of work has been piling up. And we are looking at it in all, and we just don't know which one do we do first, which one do we do next. Shall we do this one? Shall we not?

---

And I do believe that in the way procedurally this is the way to start at least addressing what is within the remit of GNSO. Just because it is on our radar, it is on our agenda.

So I will pause for now. I see Olga's hand is up and then Kurt.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Tatiana. Good morning from Buenos Aires, Tatiana.

Thank you for the explanation. I think you already said something about it. I was just wondering, just the difference between this pilot -- proposed pilot stage and what could be a more definitive kind of work in this regard. I think you said something about it, but maybe you can elaborate a little bit more. Thank you very much.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Absolutely, Olga. Thank you very much for your question. I'm very happy to clarify.

So the difference between the pilot and more established structures is that with all the concerns we've heard from stakeholder groups and constituencies about resources, about composition, about everything else, about flexibility or

---

nonflexibility, whatever at all, so we want to see how it works on the two projects to see if something has to change.

So the sheer difference here, the clear line here is that after the pilot, as Kurt proposed, the GNSO Council will review how it went, listen to the comments, listen to feedback, and take a decision. A decision can be different. A decision can be whether we need this at all, whether it's working. I don't have a crystal ball. I hope it will work, but we don't know.

Or perhaps it should work in a very different form. For example, decisions taken by full consensus or removing some of the things.

So the difference between the framework and the pilot is that after the pilot, we will exactly know whether to continue with this framework and whether to amend it. I hope that is clearer now.

Kurt, you're the next.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks, Tania. I have two comments. One is to John and one is to you and the council generally.

So, John, my amendment -- it's always more complex than it needs to be. But essentially, it's this change, that in the

---

framework it says, "The pilot will include a decision on if and how to continue the framework approach after the pilot's over." And my amendment makes it clear that the council is making that decision and not the committee that's formed to form the pilot. So that's the only change. It really doesn't change any substance. And I think this pilot is sort of a baby step working on a small issue. So, you know, I think it would be better if we didn't defer for a month over that, but you can make your own judgment.

And to Tania and the group I'd say the one thing the pilot doesn't do is the prioritization, right? We prioritize for them. We're going to say, You're going to do this work first.

And probably the hardest thing this committee is going to do is -- or one of the primary things the committee is going to do is prioritization.

And I would instead, you know, urge -- while this pilot is going, urge the council to do that ourselves. I know we had an exercise when we were -- when us new councilors came on board to do that, but I'm not sure what came out of that.

And I hope, because, Tania, you talk so much about getting some work going, that we have some sort of session to prioritize our work and maybe knock some of the bigger chunks off or get those started. Thank you.



---

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Kurt.

And to wrap this up, because I don't see any hands up, exactly, so Kurt's proposed amendment just clarifies what was sort of already in the framework anyway but makes it clear that the decision whether to continue will be taken by the council. It doesn't change anything in the substance. So I easily accept as a very friendly amendment, very friendly clarifying amendment.

So I will pause here. Philippe, I will hand it back to you. So if there is any deferral, you can decide on this. You can decide whether we have a vote. If we do, I will read the result clause.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Certainly. Thank you. Thank you, Tania. Thanks, everyone, for the good inputs.

A couple of comments. Regarding the concern over the administrative burden, I think it's a recurring one. We've had that common dream I think pretty much in every call we had with the SG&C leaders. I think it's not only a valid comment, it's a concern even for me.

---

I think moving forward, one of the criteria that we will need to assess regarding the next steps will be, is this adding red tape, if that means anything to you, administrative burden, to the current process or is it actually addressing substance somehow and addressing the items that are upon us.

So I think we will need to use that as a criteria. I think everyone is aware of that, but it's good that we restate this during this meeting.

I'm hopeful that using the consensus-building decision process, we can alleviate some of the concerns of the distribution and the model that we apply, if it's not sufficient. And we might want to rethink that as well.

And, indeed, maybe the PDP itself, moving forward with the lessons learned from the pilot, that is something that should be - - must be our priority for the next steps that we may consider.

On the amendments and the deferral, well, I'll just note there was no formal request. But I will just respond to that. My understanding is that -- while the motion has been around for some time regarding the change, I think at least from the leadership perspective -- leadership's perspective this change is, indeed, useful. But it has been our understanding all along, and I

---

think from the discussions that we had with the SG&Cs, it is everyone's understanding. I'm hopeful it was. If it wasn't, then maybe something was lost along the line.

So to this point, I appreciate the principle of voting on something on which we have amendments. But I don't think they are really substantial. I don't think they are at all. I think that those are safeguards which actually we thought were there already.

So mindful of that, there was no formal request. I'm just -- I wouldn't like to defer this further. We have the opportunity to have the discussion at this meeting. It's good. We know that there are other things that are coming to our next meetings. If we can get this out of the way and start our pilot with the limited remit, I think that would be a good thing. I know it sounds like a month, but next month we will have other things on the table, and we know that by the radar.

So with this, I'll just -- but I appreciate the point of principle, leaving aside the nature of the amendments that were requested just yesterday.

So with this, I will just open up the floor for comments again on this. But we are at the point of voting at this meeting, just to make sure that there are no additional comments.

---

Flip, you have your hand up.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you, Philippe.

Just to add to what John has been mentioning, actually if we had been physically together, we might have been able at the IPC to discuss the amendment and to come back very quickly to council.

But, unfortunately, we are not in that position. And we've always liked to discuss matters within the IPC before taking a decision. And I just wanted to share that with you. It doesn't say yes. It doesn't say no. But it says that we like the dialogue in our constituency, and we didn't really have that opportunity on this topic. Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Flip. And this is Philippe again here.

I appreciate that, I really do. I think -- and speaking only from the ISPCP's perspective, the only reason why we're quite clear on the way forward on this is it so happens that we had a call quite close to this session. But I appreciate that. If we were face-to-face, it would have been a different situation.

---

Flip, I assume that's an old hand, so I will turn to Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: As well, I'll -- given the discussion and your explanation, Philippe, I will withdraw the amendment. We can vote on the motion the way it was originally written.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Kurt.

If that makes life easier and with that understanding, that it remains on the council's decision of pursuing this, procedurally, can we backtrack to the text, the original text? I am looking for guidance here from a purely procedural standpoint to make sure that we read the results, if that's even possible without the changes.

I think as was mentioned from both Flip and John, that would take the IPC's votes much easier. And we hope we would have your support.

John?

---

JOHN McELWAINE: So John McElwaine for the record. I don't know if that is necessary. We were in the midst of trying to come to consensus when the amendment was made, and that just threw a wrench into the process. So it's not going to change Flip and I's instructions right now, which we don't have any.

So, Kurt, I kind of liked where your amendment was headed. We unfortunately because of the -- we were about to get to consensus, then this happened and the meeting happened. And we were just unable to get the feedback that was necessary.

I never meant to -- with my mention of deferral to say that that was something that we were requesting. I was just saying that if leadership wanted us to be able to vote, we would need longer time. We would probably have been able to get a vote had we had more time, as Flip said, if we had an in-person meeting. But I wouldn't let that govern whether your amendment stays or is withdrawn. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, John.

Tania, you're next.

---

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, just a short note. The amendment changes nothing. If we are, indeed, going to vote, perhaps we -- Kurt, if he insists on the amendment or not. I would just go with what we have on the screen then. Maybe Kurt can make -- get his amendment back?

KURT PRITZ: I withdraw my withdrawal.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Kurt. That's what I was about to say. If withdrawing the amendment doesn't change anything, if for whatever reason there's not enough for some of the constituencies to make their mind on this, so be it. I'm hopeful that on substance, on the intent of it we have everyone on board.

From what we heard during the calls, the exchanges, appreciating there weren't not many other than the feedback that we discussed. But we had just about six months to discuss this, which I think is long enough at least to launch a pilot.

So with this and to your question, Tania, let's go with the amendments, the text that we have just to avoid confusion, the text that we have on the screen as was put to the agenda for this meeting and we'll go to our vote.

---

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Philippe.

So I will just read the Resolved clause as we see it on the screen.

Resolved, first, the GNSO Council initiates the GNSO Framework for Continuous Improvement pilot as outlined in Section 4 of this document where Step 4 of Section 4 is replaced with the third Resolved clause below.

Two, the GNSO Council requests the GNSO secretariat to circulate the call for volunteers to form the Council Committee for overseeing and implementing continuous improvement.

Three, once formed, the GNSO Council expects regular updates from the chair of the Council Committee to the council as well as SG/Cs in relation to progress made.

Four, once the pilot completes the council, in close collaboration with SG/Cs, as well as the council committee and pilot task force, will review the functions of the framework and decide whether to continue with the other assignments as outlined in the updated proposal, see Section 3, make modifications to the framework and continue with the other assignments or identify another path through which the assignments identified are to be addressed.



---

Five, for the time being, the items that are expected to be addressed as part of the framework, including WS2, Policy and Implementation, PDP 3.0, Empowered Community, ATRT3, GNSO review, will be moved to a section in the ADR with no time frame associated with them as the timing will be determined as a result of the pilot. However, this does not prevent the council from determining if one or more of these items need to be addressed in a different manner before the pilot concludes, for example, as a result of external factors or changes in the dependencies that were identified. See Section 5.

That's it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tania.

I think, Nathalie, we can go to our vote now.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Philippe. Would you like this to be a voice vote or a roll call vote?

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I think a voice vote would be -- hang on. Yes, I suppose a voice vote would be just good enough. And those who may have abstention, let's see. We'll phrase that explicitly as required.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Philippe. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye.

JOHN McELWAINE: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: I have an abstention from John. Would you care to comment on this John in addition to what you mentioned earlier?

JOHN McELWAINE: Nothing more to really add. Just the IPC was working toward consensus and the late amendment made it so we're unable to achieve consensus. There were some that -- in our constituency that felt that the framework and the pilot project were unnecessary and outside the scope but also that a number in the constituency that wanted to work on improving the process. We just weren't able to get voting instructions in time due to the late

---

nature of the amendment. But we appreciate all the efforts on this subject. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, John.  
Would anyone else like to abstain from this motion?

FLIP PETILLION: Flip here. Yes. Thank you. Add me to the list of abstaining.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Flip. Would you like to add anything else to what John has raised?

FLIP PETILLION: I concur with what John's views. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Flip.  
  
Would anyone like to vote against this motion, please say aye.

Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say aye.

---

[ Chorus of ayes ]

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much.

With two abstentions, no objection, the motion passes.

Back to you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. This is Philippe here. And thanks for the -- thanks for the vote and thanks for the input, including the -- those relative to the abstention. I think those will be taken on board as we go through the pilot and the lessons learned of that and the kind words of encouragement in that regard.

So moving on with our agenda, we're now on 5, and our discussion on the potential next steps for the IDN operational track, and v4 in particular.

As you would recall, those -- the guidelines are a part of the contractual requirements and identifiers liable to change. In that context, v4 was finalized in 2018. I think it's in the background section. We requested -- as Council, we requested deferral of the approval by the Board in 2019, and the reason was concerns

---

around the process and potential requirements of those guidelines. And just as soon as last May, you would recall that we had a discussion on this; notably, on the dependencies between the guidelines and the EPDP.

So the CPH suggested the way forward on this in June, and there's a draft letter that's associated -- to the Board that's associated with the background section here.

So with this, I'd like to turn to Kurt for this. And I understand you have a couple of slides for this.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks very much, Philippe.

So the contest today, if you don't want to pay attention to me, is to figure out what GNSO logo that is since it's not ours.

So the purpose of this -- and this is the last time you're going to hear me talk during this meeting. The purpose of this collaboration is to reconsider the Council approach, the Council-recommended approach for proceeding with the operational track that will lead to the adoption of the IDN Guidelines version 4.0, and then to also inform the ICANN Board of this proposed

---

plan so that the ICANN Board does not adopt those guidelines at this time.

So the current approach to implementing the guidelines is -- calls for the formation of an IDN operational track working group to review issues that have been raised with regard to its implementation and develop a plan forward. In the meantime, the Council, we just launched the IDN EPDP, and the charter has just been approved. And as the charter was developed, it became apparent that the IDN EPDP will consider some of the same issues addressed by the IDN Guidelines. So given that there's this overlap, there's a likelihood that the IDN EPDP and the operational track will approach these issues from a different perspective and develop what might be contradicting results. And in any case, both efforts will form the same set of players and so will result in redundant work if considered in both places. In other words, both efforts might compete for the same resources.

So I saw this as an opportunity for us, as managers of the policy process, to actually streamline and create some efficiencies in the policy process. So just to -- just to make a picture of it, the IDN Guidelines version 4.0 were developed, so -- and those guidelines are for ccTLDs and gTLDs, but as we know, they become part of the gTLD contract. And so, you know, it's the same -- the same issues arise as with our policy development processes. Policy

---

statements are made, and then implementing them is a whole other story. And you know, I myself was a co-author on some version of the IDN Guidelines, and it was a bunch of people in a bar writing -- writing what is essentially is policy. And so there were some hiccups, as Philippe described in the -- in the implementation, and some issues arose, and I think Dennis Tanaka is on the call, so if we want a description of those issues, we better rely on him and not me.

So with those implementation issues arising, we designed the operational track, which sort of, to me, an IRT for these guidelines. And then what's to come is this operational track will come up with an implementation model for the guidelines.

But what's happened in parallel is we created also the IDN charter, and now we're launching the IDN -- we have launched the IDN EPDP. So that's powered up.

So we've powered up this EPDP. We're going to power up this operational track. There's going to be a very real overlap between the issues discussed.

And so for a number of us, talking to Dennis Tanaka, who head led the authorship of the IDN charter and is heavily involved in this, it makes a lot of sense, you know, just common sense to pause the

---

operational track. As I said earlier, these issues aren't just implementation issues, but the issues have policy implementation, so they're better discussed in a policy forum, and the PDP is our traditional policy development forum, so I think that's the better place for them.

By undertaking one and not the other, we'll avoid conflicts. As a first step before recommending this to the Council, we said are there any stability and security issues being addressed in these IDN Guidelines version 4.0, because we don't want to pause those. But there are none. And I think -- I think this is a more respectful use of volunteer resources.

So I understand that, you know, this isn't a motion that we vote on. This is something that we sort of give a sense to the leadership that we think this is a good path. And as part of this effort, as you saw in the agenda, we authored a letter from the RySG as a platform from which these issues could be raised and a platform to whom these issues are important and the stakeholder group from which these resources will come. And wrote a letter to the Council that outlined all this, and then for the leadership's convenience, proposed a letter that the leadership could send on to the Board or edit liberally.



---

I'll say there's a couple other opportunities here, too, right? The ccNSO is spinning up a policy development process, and we -- you know, I personally think our IDN EPDP should collaborate with the ccNSO from time to time to make the IDN experience as uniform as possible. So to the extent these issues arise in the ccNSO policy development, they could be addressed, and also IDN issues were raised in sub pro. So there's some degree of collaboration there that can be taken advantage of. But they really -- really go to the core of those issues.

So I'm asking the Council to nod our collective heads and give the leadership the go-ahead to recommend that we pause the operational track in favor of the EPDP who will be naturally taking on these issues and advising the Board that we're doing this. So that's it.

And for those of you who don't know, the GNSO is the Greater Newburgh Symphony Orchestra, which is in upstate New York.

Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Kurt.

---

Any -- any questions or comments on the way forward here? Both on the issue and the way forward.

We've been discussing this for a couple months now. I heard people -- I know IDN is a dry subject sometimes, but I hope that people had the opportunity to get acquainted with the issue at hand here.

The proposal is -- and as Kurt just said we're not going to take a vote here but as leadership, we're seeking your guidance as to getting back to the Board and proposing, requesting that there is a pause to the operational track to favor the EPDP moving forward, noting the absence of security and stability issue. So we're seeking your guidance on this and see whether there's anyone opposed to this way forward.

Any questions or comments on this?

Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Philippe. I just have a question for -- for Kurt. And it's just a question whether if there are any other items within the operational track that would otherwise be urgent if -- to be done

---

if -- if the policy track were not to -- did introduce these concerns?  
And whether the -- it poses any risk to pause those as well.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. So I'll turn to Kurt.

My recollection of the discussion we had, even during the EPDP chartering exercise -- and that was essentially what was behind the security and stability issue question, as to the consistency between those items that -- that have an issue and the others, and whether there's any such risk.

But, Kurt, can you help us on this and help Tomslin?

KURT PRITZ: I can provide -- I can provide hearsay. So, Tomslin, that was my very first question to Dennis, who led the charter, when we pre-recognized this issue and proposed this solution; you know, especially whether there were any security and stability issues, but certainly whether there were any other urgent issues.

And one version of this paper that we could include, we could ask the EPDP as these things are discussed, as some things are settled, they might spin them off.

---

But in any event, it might be hard to take my word. I know Dennis Tanaka is on the call, so, Tomslin, if you would like to hear from him, I can ask him to speak and address your question, but I was fully convinced that there are no other urgent issues, because that was -- just as it's important for you, it was important for me.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Kurt. I'll be waiting to see if Dennis raises his hand, but I see, Karen, I see you have your hand up. Assuming that's on the same point, I'll go to the you first, and then-of-we'll get to Dennis after that.

Karen?

Oh, I see that the -- it's -- it's now Dennis's mic who is on.

So let's do the opposite, then. Dennis, you have the floor.  
Apologies for this.

DENNIS TANAKA: No worries, Philippe. Thank you. This is Dennis Tan for the record.

So to answer Tomslin's question about whether we're leaving out any issues pertaining to the operational track, so the short answer

---

is no. The operational track was envisioned to look at the issues raised by Registry Stakeholder Group pertaining to the implementation of the IDN Guidelines version 4. So all the issues are constrained within the IDN Guidelines version 4.

And so that answers your question, Tomslin. So there is no other items left there. The operational track was not going to look at any other items.

And also, just to briefly note on the security and stability concerns, the -- version 3 of the ICANN IDN Guidelines is in full force as we speak, and version 3 really, you know, holds the burden of security and stability concerns as far as commingling of the scripts and other items as well. So, yeah, there's that.

Back to you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Dennis. This is really useful background, and I'll hope that that addresses Tomslin's question.

So going back to the queue, John, you're next and I think we need to wrap this up. John.

---

JOHN McELWAINE: Thanks. This is John McElwaine for the record, and I'll be quick.

I was wondering if it might be possible, and Dennis or Kurt can maybe comment on this quickly, to get a -- just a list or a chart that compares the two, I guess, activities charters, for lack of a better word, so that we could understand, for instance, difference in timing of deliverables, resources, composition of the groups, just so that can make an informed decision. If that's not too much to ask, that would help. But from what I'm hearing it sounds like a -- this proposal sounds like a good idea. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, John. Obviously we cannot do this during this meeting, but I would rely on Kurt and Dennis to -- I think that would be useful for the full Council to have that. I would hope that we can -- we can have that chart reasonably -- reasonably soon for us to take action, as being leadership, with your guidance, to take action on this.

But on this, what I'm hearing is that there is support for the way -  
- for the way forward, mindful of the additional information that has just been requested. But I'm not hearing any -- any strong concern relative to the way forward that's suggested here.

---

So we'll take that on board with an action item that we'll spell out just after the session with the CPH to make sure that on the broader landscape we understand where we stand on this.

So thanks -- thanks for this. Thanks, Kurt. Thanks, Dennis.

And we'll move to our next item. That's our discussion on the progress of the accuracy scoping team. And I'll turn to Pam on this. It was convened in May and I think it's opportune for those who are not involved to be informed.

Pam?

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Philippe. Pam Little for the record.

This will be very brief. I just want to let the council know we convened a council small team to work on the set of instructions to be provided to the accuracy scoping team. We are still working on that document. We have every SG&C represented on the council small team but NCSG, I believe. And I just wanted to thank all the members of the SG/C council rep in that council small team effort.

---

This is a challenging topic, and we often have different views on this topic. But we have reached, I think, in principle agreement on the task or focus areas for this small team. Then we will enlist staff's help to help us update the document and for the next round of review and discussion.

Obviously, this week we can't meet because of ICANN71. We did meet last week. Hopefully, we might be able to schedule another call or two before the July meeting, before we -- before the document deadline to submit our final product or document or finalized version -- or proposed finalized version for the full council's consideration.

Happy to take any questions. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Pam.

Any questions on this? Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Philippe.

Not a question but a follow-on, if I may.



---

Because I am in Europe, I have got my camera on and I join Tania in the lucky corner because we're in Europe.

We have come an awfully long way on this. And I want to reiterate what Pam said, that we're really close.

At the last meeting, I would say pretty much Carlton, Greg, myself, and, of course, Jeff for the GAC, we're all working on the same road here.

So as the BC, we are -- I'm sorry, I didn't do the "My name is Marie Pattullo for the record." Sorry.

For the BC, we are very, very clean, as you know, for this to get started as soon as. We are very grateful in particular to the GAC for whatever comments they have made over the last couple of days about accuracy, with which we completely agree.

So as Pam said, staff is now helping us to put together the documents. We really do hope we can get this done at the next council and get the scoping team out as soon as possible, because to remind everybody, this isn't about us, this little team of people saying what the issue is. This is about us setting up a scoping team who will scope the issue. And we've really come down to some very good, I believe, instructions.

---

I'm sure I should have mentioned Kurt earlier when I did the name check.

So thanks very much. And let's get the show on the road. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Marie. This is Philippe here.

Thanks to the team for putting so much effort in this. This is, needless to say, an important task as you can tell with our discussion with the GAC just this morning European time. So thanks to all.

Pam, a follow-up on this?

PAM LITTLE: Sorry, Philippe. Pam Little.

I was just going to perhaps respond to Stephanie's question in the chat. Maybe, Jeff, you would like to respond to that yourself?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: My apologies, Pam. I thought that is on the same point.

So, Jeff, indeed, you were first.

---

So, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thank you. This is Jeff Neuman for the record. Yeah, that's why I raised my hand.

And I'm sure -- it's kind of a good sort of intro to the next topic anyway.

No, I'm not representing the GAC, and I'm not on their behalf. I am merely bringing their views into the discussion, so that's it. I don't make any decisions on this committee. You know, it's just something that -- to help improve our relations. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thank you, Jeff.

Duly noted.

This is Philippe here.

Indeed. Those elements are provided as in your role as liaison and, indeed, it's a nice transition.

---

Unless there are other comments, I will thank Pam and Marie for input on the accuracy scoping team. And hopefully we'll have that on the agenda for a vote at our next meeting, or consideration at least.

So moving on with our agenda -- so our discussion was, indeed, quite timely.

Item 7 is on the interaction with the GAC. And that should be put in the context of the renewal of the GNSO liaison to the GAC. Our current liaison, Jeff, was appointed in October last year following a recommendation from the SEC.

As usual, the role is reviewed, and the liaison is reconfirmed by the Council in its position every year. So that's the sprint of going through -- I won't call it relationship but the way we work with our GAC colleagues through the GAC -- the GAC liaison. So this is timely.

As you would see, the background section also refers to the annual report -- last year's annual report that refers to the need to evaluate the effectiveness of the recommendation and sort of change dynamic in the way we work or not for that matter. That's up for discussion.

---

So with this, maybe I'll turn, first, to Pam and Tania to see whether you have anything to add on this background?

And then we'll move on to the core of our discussion.

Pam.

PAM LITTLE:

Sorry. Thank you, Philippe. Pam Little for the record again. Excuse me.

As Philippe pointed out, this was a -- sort of a long overdue exercise. Our former council liaison, Julf, actually pointed out in his annual report last year before he left that role to ask the council to take a look at whether the -- particularly this role, given the way in which that our interactions between the two groups, the GNSO and GAC, seem to have changed quite a bit over the years.

One major obvious change is that the GAC has been participating in a number of PDPs. I can think of sub pro, the EPDP, and now the I- -- sorry, IGO curative rights work track, right?

---

So initially this was -- there were a number of mechanisms to sort of engage the GAC early during the PDP process or life cycle, including a so-called -- I can't remember that early something.

Jeff, help me out.

Quick-look mechanism, right? Upon receiving or confirming an issue report or something like that, the council then would draw the council liaison to the GAC, actually let the GAC take a quick look of what's in the issue report, whether they have any concerns and all that, and then feed back to the council.

That was one was of the mechanisms. And the other one was the council liaison role to the GAC. That was something that was piloted it on for a couple of years, and then it became a permanent role. It does envisage a review from time to time.

And I personally also feel -- this is my fourth year on the council -- excuse me. Throughout the year and during every ICANN meeting, we have interactions with the GAC. I feel maybe it is something we need to look at or things we didn't do ourselves or our homework well. Just didn't feel like we got a lot out of those interactions, especially the bilateral.

---

So we thought this is timely to sort of take a holistic look. Like, stock-taking, if you like, how we interact with the GAC or these different points of interactions or opportunities of interaction and how we can improve that and do better because it is time consuming, a lot of resources devoted to.

And it is a very important relationship. Don't get us wrong, right? We do value the GAC's participation and welcome their participation early on in the PDP process.

But I think council has also recognized that is something not envisaged originally under the ICANN multistakeholder model, where there are different roles and responsibility between different groups within the ICANN structure.

GAC, for example, was really, to me, intended to be an advisory role to issue GAC advice. But now they're also participating in the actual PDP. But at different points of the PDP process, they can, for example, provide minority statement and they can submit public comment as well.

All in all, I just feel that the dynamics and the environment have changed a lot. And we should take a look whether things still make sense or what worked, what didn't work, and that's why we're having this conversation.

---

I do encourage councilors to speak up based on your own observations or experience to see what can be improved or maybe certain things can be ditched. We don't do things just for the sake of doing it. Really, we should try to be more edgy -- agile, sorry.

Thank you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Pam. This is Philippe here.

So with this in mind, I'll turn to Jeff to help us go through our discussion. And you have a few slides on this.

So Jeff, as liaison to the GAC.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. This is Jeff Neuman. And I'll just -- if we can go to the next slide.

I will start with something actually Stephanie just said in the chat, which I agree wholeheartedly. Our relationship in general has changed with the GAC in the last several years and I would say for the better.



---

If many recall, when the GNSO passed a -- its policies on the new gTLDs, 2007, 2008, there were four years' worth of essentially the GAC dealing directly with the Board in a lot of cases without GNSO involvement at all. And many of us that were around back then said, you know what? Something has got to improve. We cannot be hearing the GAC's concerns after we spend years working on issues. We need to bring them into the process earlier.

And so when we -- Cheryl and I and Avri and I before that were on sub pro, we really wanted to make sure that the GAC was involved from the very beginning so that we could address any concerns.

Now, I think Tatiana this morning said something really important, which is that addressing the concerns doesn't necessarily mean adopting the recommendations or concerns of the GAC. It just means addressing them.

And so bringing them in early would not only help us develop better policy but also hopefully cut off the direct negotiations with the Board for policy activities that directly impact the GNSO, and which are in our exclusive jurisdiction in the bylaws.

And I'll address some of the things that Marika has in there, but let me just get through this here, because I don't necessarily agree with all of what Marika is putting in the chat.

---

So over the past several years, I believe our communication between the GAC and the GNSO have greatly improved. Now with open meetings and as Pam said, the GAC participating in PDPs, that started with sub pro. They're not in all of the PDPs by choice because some issues, either they can't get volunteers, or they just would rather play a hands-off role.

And, in fact, since we joined in the last couple years, certain PDP work chairs have been invited to present to the GAC. So Cheryl and I, I think, attended 13 GAC meetings in a row, 14, something like that, as sub pro chairs to help them understand and really get them involved in the process early.

So since I started -- and, again, I will very much admit that the role has become much more active than it has with past liaisons. And this is something I think is a good thing, and others have told me is a good thing. GAC has appreciated it and said it several times. But I understand it's definitely a different style than what you're used to.

So what we do, what we introduced this year was monthly meetings between the GNSO liaison to the GAC -- that's myself -- and the GAC point of contact, which is Jorge. We began having those meetings monthly starting in January. And we try to arrange those just to be the week after the GNSO Council meeting

---

so I could go through the resolutions and outcomes of those meetings.

Jorge also shares with me outcomes of any GAC intersessional meetings, GAC leadership meetings, and then we discuss involvement for GAC -- or where it's envisioned that GAC could engage, and then we set agendas for bilateral meetings.

You probably have noticed a lot more emails in the last couple months from me on providing much more specific GAC input prior to our bilaterals as opposed to just getting them in the bilaterals or only via communique.

In addition, the GAC leadership team and the GNSO Council leadership team meet a few weeks before ICANN. And that really is to modify or amend the agenda topics and discuss the current state of activities.

So the last thing that we introduced is that we -- the GNSO Council liaison works with the GAC point of contact to get the GAC discussion points and questions prior to our bilateral. So the council had all of the -- essentially everything that was put up on the slides this morning, the council had.

---

And for this meeting, I shared my thoughts with GNSO Council leadership, you know, personal thoughts on it. And they had asked me to forward that on to the council.

If we can go to the next slide. So the role of the -- yeah, there you go. Thanks.

The role of the council liaison is described in the position description. The link's on the Wiki. It's what I responded to in the -- in my application.

And the things on the left are the responsibilities. And the status, I have checkmarks for things that are being done and Xs for things that aren't being done.

For the first item -- I can let everybody go through this. But for the first time, the reason it's both a check and an X is that, yes, I'm at all of the GAC meetings held during ICANN but I've not been invited to any of the intersessional meetings up to this point.

I certainly represent and communicate the policy work of the GNSO in a neutral manner. For those of you that have been to any of the GAC sessions, I think you'll see in the chat I certainly bring up resolutions. I think that I certainly also -- where the GNSO is not of one position, I bring that out and I do citations, documents.

Just before this meeting, for example, I -- and I sent an email to the council list on this. There was a discussion on the CCT review team recommendations, and you'll see it in the GAC advice a concern that certain CCT recommendations have not been adopted, and they say addressed. But the reality is that sub pro has addressed almost all of them, with the exception of the DNS abuse ones which were referred back to the council.

And so I think a constant education during the GAC meetings has been incredibly important and I think is important on an ongoing basis.

One thing that's not going on at this point -- and it will deal with my recommendations in a minute -- is that for those of you that aren't aware, the GAC receives update briefings on GNSO activities prior to every ICANN meeting.

These updates are generally drafted by the support staff, the ICANN support staff for the GAC. Sometimes they have review from the GNSO policy staff; to my understanding, not always, but I believe that's getting better. But I've -- neither myself or anyone else from the GNSO actually sees these briefings before they go to the GAC. And I think that's a problem. And I'll explain why in the next slide.

---

And so -- why don't we just get to the next slide because I don't want to take up the whole time.

This describes the practical working methods. You'll see that, yes, I do attend all of the GAC open meetings, and I have been allowed to request the floor when I ask for it. Certainly when I put something in the chat, most of the time it's read out to the GAC. And so if you've gone to the GAC meetings, I think you'll see that.

But I've not been able to attend any GAC closed meetings. That's described in the -- or it's in the role description document. I have not been able to go to any conference calls that the GAC has outside of ICANN. I've followed -- the next item is that I followed all of the groups closely. The GNSO -- I'm sorry.

Next item is that the GAC working groups, I've not been invited to observe or get to see any of the activities that go on there, like the Public Safety Working Group or others. And I'm not on the GAC mailing list, although when I do have anything to send to the GAC from the GNSO, the ICANN staff is very good about making sure that that gets to the GAC mailing list and passed on.

If we go to the next slide, I do have a bunch of recommendations after doing this for a little less than a year. I have not yet decided whether I would like to do this for another year, so that -- but that

---

is -- you know, that's something that we can address a little bit later.

The first recommendation is I strongly believe that all GAC materials from ICANN staff should be reviewed by the GNSO for accuracy and avoid misunderstandings. I do not say here the GNSO Council liaison. I don't say that for a reason. I think it's up to the Council who should review those, whether that's working group chairs or Council leadership or the liaison. But I have noticed, about a year ago, there were briefing materials, and Cheryl will remember this well, there were briefing materials that were written by the GAC support staff who, you know, don't follow GNSO activities for their full time, and some of the things in the briefing note were not accurate, and some of those inaccuracies caused a whole kerfuffle during an ICANN meeting, and it almost became a much bigger issue. But Cheryl and I were able to correct that after we saw the briefing materials.

I should note that the briefing materials are made available after the ICANN meeting. But I've always found it a little bit puzzling to -- when the GNSO goes up before the GAC or when working group chairs go up before the GAC, that they are not privy to the information that is given to the GAC about their own activities prior to them going in. To me, that just seems a little bit -- not very balanced. So it's something we need to talk to ICANN org about if

---

you think this is a recommendation that should be followed through.

I do also think that we need to bring back prep sessions for bilaterals with the GAC. The last -- and perhaps this is because of the virtual environment, but for the last couple of GAC meetings that we've had bilaterals, it's really only the leadership talking, and it's -- we should be having potentially topic leads, which brings us to the third -- I'm merging the third one and the second one here, because I think the GAC should see additional people; topic leads present the materials and be prepared for any questions, those that are closest to the materials. I don't think we should give all that responsibility to the leadership team. You know, it really should be something that we prepare for in advance; otherwise, it becomes kind of -- you know, you all sit through it, right? It becomes kind of stale. It becomes them telling us their view; us just kind of, you know, waffling a little bit. And I think we can do a lot better, and I think it's just a function of more preparation.

I do think our communique responses should be a little bit more substantive as opposed to only factual. One thing the GAC does really well in their communiqués is they say it, they say it often and they repeat it, right? They don't just pass a resolution like we do and then let it stand on its own. If they have a point of view,



---

they express it, they follow-up on it, and they explain it. And I think our communique -- sorry, our response to their communiques can do a little bit more of that. Again, that's up to the Council to decide if it wants to do that. You know, and to be more honest with them and to not beat around the bush as much where there are conflicts. I think a lot of times we are trying to be politically correct because they are the governments, but we don't want to lead the GAC on if there are views of the Council or where there are views of the Council that are certainly in conflict. Because if there are views -- if there are conflicts, you know, there are always opportunities to try to work them out.

I think it would be helpful to have post-ICANN bilateral meetings amongst the leadership teams to discuss the communique and the response to the communique so that we're not just waiting until the next ICANN meeting. Certainly the Board has meetings with the GAC on the communique and their response. And so, you know, perhaps if there are questions and things, it may be useful to do that.

And then this is just, you know, a recognition of things that are in the responsibility's doc, which is the potential to attend GAC intersessional meetings. And I don't think there is -- I don't think this is the GAC saying no, we don't want the GAC -- the GNSO Council liaison there. I think it's just kind of an afterthought. I

---

think perhaps if the leadership team does request the presence of the liaison there, I think that is something that would be, you know, taken seriously. I can't say that they would say yes to having one or more of us attend these meetings, but I think it's helpful.

And so I think that's it. The last thing I would do is -- say is -- and I'm not sure why Marika put a couple things into the chat about a one-directional thing here. The roles and responsibilities document is what it is, it says what it says. It's been interpreted by staff in one way that may not be the same as some of us have interpreted it.

But sorry to take so long. I think it's a good discussion for us to have and I think it's the right time.

So thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. And, indeed, mindful of time, we'll take a couple of questions. There are many elements that would need further time, probably.

But, Pam, you're first.

---

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Philippe. I was just going to clarify this is not about Jeff. This is about reviewing the role of this Council liaison to the GAC, given that was something you've wanted us to do and was timely to do this.

And just in the course of preparing for this meeting item was the first time I looked at the job description for the Council role. And so we feel -- Jeff, I believe you agree that it's time to probably take a good look at that document to see whether it's still fit for purpose given the changed environment.

So with that, I was just hoping, given the time constraint, maybe we can just ask councilors to give it some thought, and maybe we can continue the discussion either on the Council list or during our wrap-up session, and maybe even beyond, in next meeting. We're just really being constrained by time.

And I'm sorry, Olga. I jumped the queue.

Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Did you? I don't think you did, Pam. Under my guidance, anyway.

---

Yes, indeed, time's running out, but I think it would be good if we had questions to consider. And this is work in progress. I don't think there's a rush here, but the points of improvement that Jeff highlighted -- and again, it's about the role -- are important to discuss.

So, Olga, you're next.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Philip. No, you didn't jump the queue. You were first in raising your hand up.

And this is Olga Cavalli for the record.

I want to commend Jeff for his great work as a liaison with the GAC.

Just a brief comment. The GAC briefing materials are very important for the GAC. They didn't exist before. It's something that's been happening for the last two or three years and they are very valued by all the members. So any input that the GNSO can do to these documents will be for sure very valued by the GAC and very good for the interaction between the GAC and the GNSO. So just to clarify some comments in the chat.

---

And I think that any other request of interaction, that can be coming down to the GAC leadership and they will consider. For me, being involved in this processes for many years, the closer interaction in between the GAC and the GNSO have always resulted in a very better outcome of any activities.

Thank you.

And commend Jeff for his great work. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Olga. This is Philippe here. Yes, indeed, thanks, Jeff, for putting this together.

I would, however, take exception with your characterization of our bilaterals. The feedback I've had is, and has always been for a few years now, quite positive, which is -- The difficulty we have is we have to reflect the diversity of views within the community, and it's sometimes a bit -- I wouldn't call uncomfortable, but it's factual. That's what we have to do.

This being said, I'll go to -- I assume that's an old hand, Pam. Is it an old hand?

Thank you.

---

And so I'll go to Stephanie, and we'll sort of wrap up, and we'll follow up tomorrow.

Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record, and I join in the many in the chat who commend Jeff on the great and active role he's been playing, and I particularly appreciate these recommendations to improve the relationship.

I just -- My feeling is we don't seem to have the openness and parity that one might have hoped for after this time. In other words, we are serving more than receiving.

I agree that the relationship is much improved, but it's time maybe to look at that job description and -- and give it a thorough review. So happy to work on that if we are going to strike a small committee.

Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Stephanie. And this is Philippe here. And we will. We'll follow-up tomorrow, as I said, mindful of time. But that's

---

work in progress and with a view to revising the remit of the role, further adapt it to those, the -- the new -- sort of new relationship that we have, inasmuch as it is new. We'll go on to that -- come on to that tomorrow.

Thanks again, Jeff. And looking forward to more discussion during our informal session.

With this, moving on to item 8. We're slightly late. This will just be a brief update on the status of Phase 2A. I'll just point to the community update that we have today at 4:30 CUT for questions and input. I will just note that the EPDP team published the initial report for public comment early June. It includes preliminary recommendations and a number of questions. This closes on July the 19th.

There has been tremendous effort into the last mile of this. I made a reference to 77. I made a mistake this morning. It is 79, came up with this item that the team had to deal with at the very last stage.

So a number of inputs are sought from the community, and there was also additional on this posted by Keith, the chair, on the public comment forum. I would encourage everyone to have a look at it.

---

So I'll -- This is a very quick, quick recap of where we are. I don't think I'm going to take questions at this point.

Please go to the community update. The other reason why we're not taking question is we're pretty much in pause at this point. This is the public comment period. And we'll come on to that, the same topic, once it closes and once the EPDP has -- team has reviewed the inputs.

So moving -- I think we can then move on with our -- with our agenda. And the EPDP Phase 1, Rec 7. You would remember that -- and we discussed this this morning with the GAC as well. The PPSAI and T&T have been both paused, and there was a first analysis of the Phase 1 report on the impact of Rec 27. And we agreed to reach out to the team through ICANN org for reconvening the IRT and the level of effort that would be required before we consider the next steps.

So I'll turn to -- I'll turn to staff now for this. I understand that the feedback has been received and collected. I'll turn to staff to give us some feedback on the elements that we have with this.

I saw Karen in the observers, but I'm -- who -- who would take this?



---

Okay. If we don't have anyone from -- from staff, rather than -- to go through this, rather than going through these -- these elements -- and again, mindful of time -- I think we can move on, then.

Last -- last call.

Okay. Okay. So we'll take that to the list or to tomorrow morning's update.

So we're back on schedule, then, with item 10 and our AOB section.

We wanted to have a look at the topics that we will put forward for our discussion with the Board. And -- yes, thank you.

So these are -- these are the elements that we thought would be worthwhile discussing with the Board during our -- during our meeting. Notably, the ODP timeline, if we have more information on this. The -- You would recall we had a small team working on comments to the SSAC report on sub pro, SAC114, and we thought that from purely practical standpoint, maybe rather than going through a correspondence, we could actually take the opportunity of our meeting with the Board to discuss those comments.

---

If -- or as we discussed this this afternoon, the second topic that would be interesting to discuss would be a potential -- I understand we have concurrence from the group -- correspondence relative to the IDN Guideline v4 as discussed earlier. So maybe we want to give them a heads up on this and maybe next steps on DNS abuse. Obviously we do not want to have an overly crowded agenda. My experience, we'd rather focus on a limited number of elements. But these are the things that our leadership thought would be worthwhile discussing.

Any views on this? Or anything else? Or you'd like to add or things you'd like to defer? Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, hi. Stephanie Perrin for the record.

I just thought we might as well throw accuracy on there because I'm pretty sure the GAC has views on it and the earlier the distant early warning, the better. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. I assume you're referring -- I'm sure GAC. And we know from this morning that GAC has a view on accuracy and so does the Board, I would think. So, indeed, that may be something at least as the state of our working progress.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, I didn't mean to conflate the GAC and the Board there, Philippe. But I think it is important that we get their views early.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Absolutely. Thank you. Thank you, Stephanie.

This is Philippe here for the record.

Any other comments on this? Okay. Okay. Seeing none, let's -- so we'll post this to the mailing list and if you have other inputs, please share them as quickly as possible, obviously. That would be excellent.

Moving on with our agenda, I just want to note and repeat that we will need a liaison to the EPDP on IDNs. I didn't see any volunteer coming forward at this point.

Steve, to this point?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Philippe. This is Steve Chan from staff.

Just to quickly note, we did have one councilor tentatively put his name forward. We are currently working with that person to

---

clarify the role and responsibilities as well as time commitment to determine whether or not that person is able to commit to the role.

So just wanted to note we might have a candidate for this. But we will let you all know once we confirm that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Steve.

I hope I didn't miss anything on the council list. I'm glad that we have a volunteer for this. This is a really important task, not only because it -- even I think there was a reference to the CCs earlier during our discussion on v4.

We do need to monitor this very closely. So it would be good if we had someone up to this task.

Thanks for the clarification, Steve.

So with this and moving on with our agenda, we have time for the open mic, which is a good thing.

---

Before we get there, I would just reiterate that we'll go on to the PPSAI and T&T as quickly as possible after this meeting. We left that aside for the moment, although that was on the agenda.

But with this, I will just turn to our observers, if there are any questions or comments, for that matter, that you would like to raise or anything that was put in the chat that would be worthwhile discussing.

Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. I'm wondering if Martin Sutton could be given the mic. He put an interesting comment in the chat. And so I'm just kind of hoping he -- yeah, his hand's raised. Cool.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Absolutely. Thank you, Jeff. And that's for putting Martin on the spot.

Your mic is on, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thank you. Martin Sutton from the Brand Registry Group.

---

I just wanted to pick up on the point of discussions with the Board related to sub pro and alert you to a session we held yesterday which unfortunately conflicted with the Board-GAC session. But it was extremely interesting to hear from future potential applicants and their clear frustrations of not only the time span that we've seen since the last round but also what appears to be some sort of slow progress since the completion of the subsequent procedures work which was delivered to the GNSO at the beginning of the year to the point there is only a scoping exercise being undertaken by ICANN staff for an ODP that may be requested.

So there's still strong levels of uncertainty in terms of how this will progress and when a Board decision will actually be made.

So I would include in your discussions with the Board how we can make sure that the sort of visibility, transparency of activity that may be going on is opened up to the community and to urge activities to move forward more efficiently. It does seem to be lacking efficiency and concerns, therefore, raised as to the time frames that the ODP will absorb.

And as part of the discussions yesterday, it was questionable whether an ODP was actually required given that this is not a new exercise. This is very much based on the last round with some modifications, some refinements, some additional elements. But

---

essentially the applicant guidebook stands pretty well as a strong base for undertaking future rounds.

So there are opportunities to certainly start communications and giving information out at an early stage that would be highly beneficial for new entrants, particularly in underserved regions.

So I would encourage councilors also to take the opportunity to look at the recording of the BRG session, and I would certainly be keen to provide you with a summary of that as well from the Brand Registry Group. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Martin. This is Philippe here.

And before I turn to our councilors, that's certainly something we can discuss or just raise their attention, just noting we have Board members in the observers for this meeting, just to ensure transparency and efficiency that you are referring to for the next steps, including the potential ODP on this. And if there are actions deemed necessary, that at least they are as transparent as possible and the need for them are known to the community.

We all know there are expectations on this, including on the timeline. It seems a long time for a lot of people.

---

Any reaction to Martin's comment on this? Noting support in the chat.

I'll turn to Karen now. Maybe it's the same point or a different one.  
Karen.

KAREN LENTZ:

Yes, hello, this is Karen Lentz from ICANN Org. Thank you.

I wanted to go back for a bit on Item 9 with Recommendation 27 item where, sorry, I wasn't quick enough to get into the queue there.

But just to remind everyone of the context, Recommendation 27 from the EPDP Phase 1 contemplated that some of the existing policies and procedures might need to be updated given the work in Phase 1.

And so both the Wave 1 and 1.5 identified some possible areas of impact for the council to consider in determining whether any updates are needed in this case to proxy/privacy or translation/transliteration recommendations.

And so in the April council discussion, one of the requests was for an estimated level of effort of the work and then also an



---

understanding from the former IRT members how much availability there was to potentially continue that work. So those are some data points into the discussion. And I understand that the council will continue to revisit this topic. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Karen. And we will come to that both on the list and possibly tomorrow if we can have that feedback. That would be excellent for us to further discuss the next steps. So turning back to the queue, Susan, your next.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Philippe. And thanks for the opportunity.

I just wanted to ask a question or perhaps it's raise a concern about transparency of some of council's activity. And really, I don't believe it's a deliberate desire to lack transparency. But I think the effect of the increasing use of small subgroups and working groups to try and advance the group, which I absolutely understand and wholeheartedly agree, it's absolutely necessary, but the effect of that is where the wider community can see what happens on the ICANN-GNSO Council mailing list, we cannot see what's happening on these subgroup mailing lists and, therefore, aren't necessarily being kept informed about what is going on,

---

what is being discussed, what decisions are being made in those smaller groups.

And so we're then inevitably reliant on whatever reporting goes back onto the full mailing list. Sometimes it seems to me that isn't happening.

And so a perfect example here is that you were talking about discussing with the Board the feedback of the council on SAC 114. But I don't believe I know what that is as a member of the community and a member of the GNSO.

I haven't seen it shared on the GNSO Council mailing list which I am subscribed to. Obviously, I may have missed it. But I haven't seen it shared that.

So what are the points are you going to make on SAC 114? And if I don't know, more concerningly, that means potentially all of the councilors don't know either. So I just -- I'd just like to urge you to consider how to increase the visibility of what is going on outside -- in groups outside of the full council mailing list and ensure that we are aware of what's going on.

---

Maxim is making a comment in the chat that SAC 114 is an SSAC document, not a GNSO one. I wasn't suggesting if anyone thought that was the case that I think that.

But as I understand it, there's been a GNSO group looking at what the response to SAC 114 should be, but I don't know what that is. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Susan.

This is Philippe, again.

Your general point on the need for transparency is well-taken. I think from a -- even from a statutory standpoint, we're trying to achieve a balance between making sure that we have that visibility but also keeping a sort of operational council. Operative, I should say -- not sure that's an English word -- in that respect.

And when I say this, maybe your example is not the right one for me to say that. But generally speaking, I would expect that the members -- members from the community within the GNSO should rely on their councilors to join in the small teams, as a rule, not specifically the sub pro report from SSAC and our comments on this.

---

But we don't want to turn council into, you know, a sort of -- and I appreciate what you request is transparency, not providing input.

But on both, I would hope that this can be provided as a rule -- again, it's not your particular example -- through the councilors.

The comments on SAC 114 is, indeed, a special beast in that regard because, as I said, rather than having a correspondence upon which the feedback from council would be sorts and then the community would -- could then weigh in through the SG&Cs, then will go through a direct discussion.

I understand your concern for this on this particular case.

If you've read 114, I'm sure you noted a couple of sort of radical statements that are made there which some of the members within the GNSO would take exception with. And I think we just want to at least flag those items to the Board.

But I'm sure you see where I'm coming from. This is a sort of -- it's not a "sort of." It's a representative model that we have, and we rely on the councilors to channel both ways the inputs to the small teams.

---

I appreciate that the sort of informal channels that we used to have during the face-to-face meetings are no longer there. So it means you rely, as you said, Susan, on the mailing list. You rely on the feedback that we provide. And it makes -- maybe it makes things much more difficult, and we probably want to improve the situation here.

Maxim, you have your hand up so I will turn to you for follow-up on this. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba for the record.

Actually it's a small group of councilors working on these. And the work in progress, we don't -- we can't effectively use emails as means of adding some articles here, some articles there because it's work on the text.

When it's ready, it goes to the councilors' list. There should be a reasonable level of transparency. We don't require, for example, open mailboxes of all councilors. So we don't go to that level of detail.

If you explain why should we, we may listen. But so far, it's not clear enough. Thanks.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maxim.

This is Philippe.

I think that's also a fair point. That's just as far as transparency goes.

But it's sometimes work in progress that is difficult to share.

But, John, you have your hand up, assuming that's on the same point, and then noting there are two hands from the audience. We'll go back to John.

JOHN McELWAINE: Thanks. John McElwaine, for the record.

To Susan's point, though, and I was just going back through my inbox, I don't think that the small team has reported back out to the GNSO Council any progress on their comments to SSAC 114, yet it's on the agenda to talk to the Board. So I don't know if that's something that can be circulated. Or are we saying this is going to be a topic for the individual councilors to discuss their views? I think that's the point that Susan was making.

---

Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, John.

And, yes, indeed, I think before we get to the Board on a number -- on elements related to SAC114, the point is well taken. I think this will have to be shared with the Council list and possibly discussed by email before we -- we get to any informal statement. We want efficiency without losing anything on transparency. Yes, I take your point, Susan, and that there's probably room -- room for improvement in that regard.

I'll -- So seeing two hands and mindful of time, Rob, you are first and then Rafik, if people would bear with us for a couple of minutes.

Rob. And we'll cut the line off with Rafik.

Can we have Rob's mic on?

If we -- If we can't, then we'll move to Rafik, then.

And we'll turn it on. Rafik? All right.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Philippe. This is Rafik speaking. So just to be brief, I just want to say that we need the Council -- councilor to be able to work on the different topics and issues, and so having the different subgroups to do that. So we need to trust our councilors, they are representing the different constituency and stakeholder groups, to do that. And so they can work, and when they have something, really, they can share it. And by -- usually by, how say, by what we are used to, that go through different review and discussion and conference call of the GNSO Council. And the councilor as representative to -- representative from constituency and stakeholder group, they report to their groups and share with them those documents.

So I think we need to have that flexibility to do a lot of the different task and work. And we should be -- to not have that feeling of missing out.

So that's what I want to say. Just let's trust our councilor to do the work.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thank you, Rafik. This is Philippe here. And that trust goes along with the -- indeed, with the representative model that



---

we have. I appreciate the need for information, though, whenever that is timely. I think that's also good. It's a balance anyway.

Last try with -- Point taken, Rafik.

Last try with Rob.

Rob's mic doesn't seem to turn on. So my apologies, Rob.

We'll bring this meeting to a close, then. I'll just draw your attention to, again, the PDP read-out later today, European time. And thanks, everyone, for their -- for their participation. And wish you a very -- Steve, last -- last point?

STEVE CHAN

Apologies for getting in the way of the meeting. I was just was alerted from Amr asked for his question raised earlier to be read. So I'm just trying to find that.

So his question was from earlier in the session and it is: Why is this being treated as a pilot program when there have been previous groups within GNSO that have done pretty much this exact type of work? I'm thinking of the SCI and the GNSO Review Working Group.

---

So it's back towards the pilot topic, so I think agenda item 4.  
Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. I think we, in the initial stages of -- and thanks for the question. In the initial stages of the framework, there was a comparison with the previous exercises and the structures that -- that's being referred to here. And the idea is not to replicate the - - those -- those -- those past initiatives.

I would just draw people's attention to the -- the framework paper where I, off the top of my head, seem to remember that we did that sort of exercise of comparing the two or three elements. We can probably dig that out. But that's not -- Actually, the pilot -- the remit is much more limited in scope, and so that's another difference.

And my apologies, that's pretty much all I can offer in 30 -- 30 seconds and mindful of the time. I -- if you just go back to us, maybe we can provide the pointers to those -- to those elements.

Thanks, Steve, for raising that.

So we're now five minutes over. So again, thank you for taking part. Hope you're all well. And thanks, all councilors, for their

---

participation. And we'll speak again tomorrow. Have a pleasant, inasmuch as it can be, ICANN71 meeting, or what remains of it, and we'll speak to you soon, then.

Bye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's GNSO Council meeting.

You may now stop the recordings. Good-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**