
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum - Joint Session: ICANN Board and GNSO Council
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 - 09:00 to 10:00 AST

WENDY PROFIT: Being as we're at the top of the hour I would like to hand to over to colleague Franco Carrasco to do the welcome, housekeeping items. Franco.

[Recording in progress]

FRANCO CARRASCO: Thank you, Wendy.

Hello. My name is Franco Carrasco from the ICANN org staff. Welcome to the joint session between the ICANN Board and the Generic Names Supporting Organization Council.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, first name and last name or surname.

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.

To rename your sign-in name for this webinar you will need to first exit the Zoom session. You may be removed from this session if you do not sign in using your full name.

Interpretation for this session will include the six U.N. languages, which are Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, and English. Click on the "Interpretation" icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session.

For our panelists, please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Also, please ensure to mute all audible notifications and speak clearly and slowly for our interpreters.

This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the GNSO councilmembers only. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience today. However, all participants may make comments in the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat box and select "Respond to all panelists and attendees." This will allow everyone to view your comments.

To view the real-time transcription, click on the "Closed Caption" button in the Zoom toolbar.

Having said that, I will now hand it over to the ICANN Board Chair, Mr. Maarten Botterman.

Maarten, the floor is yours.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Franco. Thank you, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council and all those attending this session to listen to the discussion we will have together, the dialogue we will have together today.

Today is International Women's Day. And please allow me to share a call for action. We mention gender equal worlds, a world free of bias, stereotypes and discrimination. A world that's diverse, equitable, and inclusive. A world where difference is valued and celebrated. Together we can forge women's equality. Collective, we can all break the bias.

This call I encountered when opening my telephone this morning, and I really want to share that call for action with you today. I think you will find and agree with me that promotion of diversity, equity and inclusion is something that's high in the values of ICANN as well. We have a high awareness on the Board, the organization, and the community, and there's always more to do.

So specifically today, I ask you to consider what you can do to break the bias.

ICANN73 is an opportunity for the Board to interact directly with the community in an open dialogue, and these dialogues are prepared beforehand by an exchange of questions. And our habit has become to first go into the questions of the community -- in this case, the GNSO Council -- and after that ask for reflection on the questions the Board sent prior to ICANN73.

We really appreciate the opportunity for direct interaction and look forward to our conversations today, starting now with the GNSO Council.

We're actively looking into ways the Board can facilitate the community even better by being more proactive, seeking open dialogue, always with deep respect for the role of the community and our value to work in the bottom-up, multistakeholder way.

Most recently, that led to an informal dialogue full of uplift in -- with the GNSO Council on the SSAD ODP and the SSAD ODA and the offer to facilitate a dialogue between GAC and GNSO on closed generics, which is part of the SubPro.

Another example is our aim to progress the global public interest framework as a useful tool for more explicit exploration of global public interest aspects in everything we do. Something that has implicitly always been there, but we believe making it explicit will help more transparent and possibly faster processes across the board. So over time you may see a board or maybe more often making proactive suggestions for the community to benefit from it as it feels to be right.

So with that, for today, the focus, no surprise, will be on also continuing this dialogue on the SSAD ODP, and more.

Philippe, welcome, and very good to see you again. As always, we share same time zone, so I recognize sunshine on your face. You must be sitting next to a window, too.

Please, floor is yours.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten, and, indeed, from sunny Normandy, western France here. So that's good afternoon. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening to board members. Thanks again for welcoming us in this session. Well, first, I'd like to second what you said initially in your presentation. Thank you for raising this.

And second, and for those observers who may not be familiar with the exchanges that we've had over the last few months, I just want to thank you and the board members who engaged in that dialogue, not on the (indiscernible) a while ago but also, as you said, on the SSAD ODA, and how we can discuss the specifics of the -- that (indiscernible) and also next steps on SubPro. And I'd like to also thank you in the help you provide us with our continuing review of the PDP. Several board members, Becky (indiscernible), have agreed to engage in the discussion with us.

So again, we're very grateful in the help you provide, and I think we're all looking forward to the pilot. Thank you, Maarten. Over to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, unmuted.

So thank you for raising the topics for this case, which are very much in point of what we're doing here and today. The first question that the Council asked was to the Board to provide a status update in relation to the expected next steps and timing of the ODA. So would you want to speak to that, or would we engage in our initial response? What is your preference?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten. Philippe speaking here. Maybe it would be timely for us just to give you a brief update on what we've put in place to address some of the questions and where we are, and then we can go to your inputs if that's okay.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: That works very well for me. Yeah, thank you. Please do.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: So with this, I'll turn to Sebastien, if that's okay. We don't have a word for the chair of a small team. We call that convener. I hope that's fine. And --

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sherpa, I decided last night.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, exactly. Over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. My name is Sebastien Ducos, and, indeed, I am trying to lead this small team on the ODA.

So the small team basically was tasked with both answering the letter sent shortly before the ODA was published and also looking at the ODA and trying to ensure that it correctly interprets the intent of the SSAD; that no key aspects are overlooked. And then as I said to look and answer -- and provide answers to your letter. And finally, possibly bring any other topic that we feel the ODA, or the letter are missing.

For this, and given the complexity of the topic, complexity of the mission, this is a small team that is not limited to the councilmembers. We went back to the community and asked every group to provide representation to ensure that we have people that have been intimately involved with the development of the recommendations knew exactly what we're talking about and not waste time second-guessing ourselves.

Now, this is early days. We've met so far only twice. And the main work so far has been up until Friday last week to ensure that we were able to gather all the clarifying questions that we had on the ODA and the first thoughts on the topic you brought in your letter. And so the first step, we had some clarifying questions that we gathered. Those were shared with staff and the ODA team -- the ODP team. Sorry. So last Friday for the last batch and earlier last week for our first batch of questions.

I will make it clear now on the record, yesterday I apparently may have left -- in front of the GAC, left open the fact that we were expecting answers this week. We're not expecting answers this week. From staff we understand that it takes a bit of time to procure this information. So we're all good. We can wait a few weeks, a few more days.

The small team has identified also a number of assumptions that might be inconsistent with the recommendation, and we'll share that in due time. I want to be careful here again because this exercise of information gathering was happening everybody individually. We didn't meet again since in order to discuss all that. I'd like to be able to do that before sharing more.

They have pointed to a number of issues that we believe weren't sufficiently or not covered at all in the ODA that we believe should.

And in relation to your letter, I think that most of the team seems to be of the view that whilst the ODP and the ODA were great efforts, it's probably -- it will be very difficult to determine the cost/benefit from it and we believe that more information is needed.

Some have noted that -- that determination is really the Board's task, not ours, should be left to the Board, which is agreed in

principle, but I think as a team, we do understand the complexity of this task and would like to be as helpful as possible in order to try to resolve this problem.

And then some views were expressed also on implementing a pilot. We haven't discussed at all what the pilot may or will need to look like, if it's on a voluntary basis or not or if -- The metrics around the pilot haven't been discussed. I really don't want to elaborate on it.

The possibility of a -- of a ticketing system or lightweight ticketing system has been also mentioned if not discussed as a means maybe to be able to have a better view of the demand market and have a better view of what the clientele of the system might be, particularly as there are vast ranges of opinion in terms of how many queries we're actually going to have between the study you conducted, the stuff that we are seeing, et cetera.

And that's it. I believe that last week we sent a formal reply to your letter essentially saying that we were working on it. This is what I'm trying to report today, but I'm open for any question.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, Sebastien.

I'd like to ask Becky to engage with you on this as our liaison to your work as well.

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you. Good morning. My name is Becky Burr for the record.

Thank you to the Council and Sebastien for that the update. We are extremely pleased that we're able to work together informally and constructively with the council on this. I think we are -- we're in a live experiment about better communication and better interaction. And I think I speak for the Board in saying that we feel like we're making good progress, which is a successful experiment just from the communication perspective but also, of course, we are dealing with a very important issue. The community has come up with a policy recommendation. And although the Board has not made a determination of how it would respond, whether it would accept or reject because it's not in the public interest or whatever, we are not there yet.

We are very much interested in getting as much input as we can and also understanding what possibilities there are for progressing the community's work on this PDP. I think the step-by-step nature of this, who goes first, whether the Board acts first,

all of those things are still things that we want to hear from you on.

But mostly what we want to do is take the time to explore the approaches that we might have, the options that we might have, and not close off anything before we've explored it with you.

I've been very pleased to engage with the small group that Sebastien is the convener for. And I know that other members of the Board, including the GDPR caucus, are open to engaging with the council in whatever way you all think makes sense.

We have been asked in the community about the timing, the length of the process. And I think we are very much open to hearing from you with that respect -- in that respect. I think we do not want to close off conversation and engagement prematurely, and we want to be engaged for as long as it is productive to be engaged in this way. We do not have a preconceived timeline with respect to this.

Obviously, the community is waiting for us, so I don't want to suggest that we don't feel a sense of the importance of a timely response and conclusion to this. But, again, we feel like we're in a very productive engagement at the moment. And the right thing

to do is to continue to be engaged with you and share ideas, brainstorm, and see if we can get to a good place.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Becky. This is Sebastien again. So, yeah, thank you very much. Thank you very much also for your offer to engage with the GDPR caucus. I think it will help our conversation.

I'd like to shortcut as much as possible the guessing game and having to send you back something that we think you might want to hear, or we think you might need. Let's discuss that, sit together, and figure out exactly what is needed from both parties and then go back to our own groups for validation. But let's try to cut the red tape as much as we can in order to come up with these recommendations -- ideas. Let's not call them recommendations. That's another meeting.

But apart from that --

GÖRAN MARBY: May I make a comment?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure, absolutely.

GÖRAN MARBY:

So I think that -- thank you very much. And I really appreciate the conversation. I think what would be very interesting from an Org sort of practical perspective is a little bit clarity on the problem definition. And I think we are all grasping with that, and I can understand that.

But to understand what is the problem or problems we are trying to solve. And that would help, I think, in many of the future discussions. We want to solve. We want to make it easy. We want to make it fast. We want to open up something. Maybe even a combination of all of them.

That I think -- it's very hard to build a computer system -- it's no criticism at all. Just a reflection. It's very hard to build any type of computer system if you don't know the purpose of it. So that would be something that I hope we can engage in the conversation, what is the problems or problem we're trying to solve.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Yeah, that makes sense.

I don't have the answer for you right now. But it will definitely be something that we will also try to respond to.

Just in closing, I don't want to take too much time but also answering your question, Becky -- and this is Sebastien Ducos again -- the small team right now, we're looking at a schedule that would have us coming up with a first draft back to the council in the course of March, the end of March, for the council to look at in April. That's the sort of timeline we're looking at. Obviously if it takes a bit more time, it's not the end of the world. But we're looking in that type of time frame. We're not talking about another three years on this. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much. Very clear. And we also recognize that these things need to go as fast as can but not faster. It needs to be good. And with this open dialogue, we also hope to in a way win time by connecting dots quicker than via a more formal dialogue would have -- may have been the case.

Philippe, please, sir.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten. This is Philippe here. I just wanted to -- from Göran's comment and just to highlight, if I understood it correctly, and just to reiterate, the primary goal of that small team is to address the Board's questions in the timeliest manner. But, also, as an exercise that consisted of addressing the cost-benefit issue

somehow. When you do this, it's always a question of trade-offs and whether the cost is worth the benefit and setting out priorities.

And I understand your comment, Göran, as just this. For example, if we're talking about a pilot, I don't know if that's where the small team is leading to. But when you say "pilot," it means that you do not do things that were originally planned. You set up priorities on a subset of those. And I think that's what the small team essentially is tasked with.

Again, I'm not saying that the pilot is a good idea. It's just an example.

I hope I understood your comment correctly, Göran. But that's typically something the small team is also tasked with.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you. Sorry. First of all, it's still a little bit of early for me, so if I am more incoherent than I usually am, blame a very early morning.

I appreciate very much the dialogue, and I appreciate we think from the Org perspective and my personal perspective the way to approach this is really good. We are in a good -- we are in a good

mood. Until the GNSO Council and the Board changes any decision that is on the table, from my perspective, it's the full PDP that we are thinking about.

Someone had -- for me, someone will to make a decision that we're not going to implement the full SSAD. That's not Org. That's the Board and the GNSO, however you do it.

I was just thinking, I would like to utilize the brain capacity and the knowledge that exists in the group that you set up in the GNSO Council together with my team. And we talked about how we can even work even closer in this one, so we don't end up exchanging letters.

And one of the questions we would really like to have a discussion of, which goals are we trying to achieve because that could lead to the cost-benefit analysis. And that could create a foundation for the next discussion.

It is hard to build a system that has a multipurpose and sometimes contradiction purpose. So I hope my comments didn't take me anywhere else than this is a very positive one.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: This is Sebastien Ducos again.

So, again, I want to be careful because we haven't had that discussion with the group and I do want to get the group the ability to share entirely their vision, not just mine.

But I think that, indeed, as Philippe said, I think the pilot, even though it hasn't been fairly thought or thought in detail at all and hasn't even been agreed as a good idea, but the pilot as has been referenced, and my understanding, would be exactly that. The capacity sort of piecemeals what needs to be done. It doesn't mean that it needs to be cut in one way or another. It might be, you know, limiting access to a certain population. I don't know. I don't want to -- but the idea would be that, indeed, we'd be able to test the validity of this system, the service it provides, and how it provides it before spending the millions for it and then be able to decide if, indeed, it makes sense. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Appreciate it. Also appreciate that you say this is not the full consensus of the group yet, but this is one of the aspects of this dialogue that makes it possible to exchange these views.

I mean, with the Board caucus, we also talked, like, what would make sense, a pilot in one country. Does that make sense? Or how would it look like best to serve the purpose, which is to get a good feel for what it could look like and could do. So look forward to further discussion on that, dialogue on that, and with the small group and our liaising to that via Becky and with the caucus group. I think we stand the best possible chance to progress well. We share the same goal, that's clear.

So maybe best, Philippe, to move on for time's sake to the next subject.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Certainly. Happy to, Maarten. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And if so, please, would you want to introduce that one, too. The question is about additional implementation details with regard to the ODP for SubPro.

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

Mindful of the fact that this was -- we came up with this before Friday last week and the letter you sent us and the GAC. Maybe

we will have to take it to sort of a different way than originally intended.

Just the background for this and stepping back from the conversation we just had, the purpose of this question was to seek your input on the general approach that we will be taking for this SubPro ODP and the delicate balance that we need to strike in terms of engaging in a dialogue during that ODP on specific topics, such as the one that you've sought our input on, on Friday on closed generics.

So having that dialogue, whilst still remaining robust in terms of the dealings to the PDP and the output of the working group, if you see what I mean, we want to make sure that we do not sort of relitigate and review decisions that were made by the working group and spend our time efficiently.

So we're trying to find that delicate balance between those two things. And we would certainly welcome at the initial stage of the SubPro ODP whether there are some initial thoughts within the Board on how we can approach this. Maybe taking the example of the topic that you raised on Friday and that we discussed informally before that. That's closed generics. And how much -- I wouldn't call that guidance but inputs the Board can offer.

And we appreciate that on this, Org will be providing a framing paper to sort of frame the discussions between the GAC and the GNSO.

So we would welcome this, this input if you -- if you would, even at this point, before we engage in that discussion with the GAC.

So with this introduction -- and I see Jeff, as liaison, you have your hand up, so feel free to add anything you'd like here.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, thank you, Philippe. And this is Jeff.

I want to also thank the Board for the letter on closed generics, but I also want to expand that a little bit.

When the working group was doing its work, there was no concept of an ODP yet. So when the work was -- when the recommendations were being developed by the working group, the assumption would be that, yes, the GNSO would approve the policies. It would go to the Board. The Board would take several months to approve it. They would approve it, and then implementation would immediately begin.

Now we have this Operational Design Phase, and it's going on and it will complete in about ten months, and the Board, I think, in the earliest would get the -- be in a position to make a decision in January of next year.

One of the unintended consequences of having this ODP formalized is that, because the Board is not making any decisions on any of the recommendations, that implementation ends up being delayed by about a year. Again, it's an unintended consequence, and it's not something that was foreseen by the SubPro PDP Working Group.

So with all that as a background, there are a number of distinct topics that the Sub Pro Working Group in its final report recognized that there be additional need for -- additional need for work on topics. So some of those topics include things like applicant support, which was recognized by the ODP team, the ICANN ODP team, and pre-evaluation program for registry service providers, appeals process, and other areas where the working group recognized that an implementation team may work on, but it's also been recognized that some of that work may not be pure implementation but may involve a little bit -- whether it's policy or something more than implementation.

So one of the things that the GNSO Council will be discussing is whether we would want to tackle some of these discrete -- sorry, distinct topics. And if so, would that be something that would be supported by the Board, even though the Board has not adopted formally the recommendations of the working group.

So I hope that makes sense. I'm just reading Göran's comment. Göran, that wasn't meant as any kind of insult or anything bad about the Board. I think it was just an assumption from past experience that normally the Board considers something within a few months and then makes a decision, and then implementation starts. But understand that, again, it was not intended to be something that was negative. That was just a reflection of how things were back in the time and the assumptions made by the working group.

Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Good. Thanks, Jeff. Actually, I would have said a similar thing, not so much fair/unfair, but I would have called it optimistic, because this is a complex decision and complex decision with, as you've seen in the ODP, has several elements. And you recognize those elements, even mentioned some of them explicitly.

So we do the ODA because we think it won't cost time. It will just help to be more transparent in the collecting and in the interaction. And I think the interaction, as I introduced already at the beginning, will be more proactive and exploring until we come to the point of formal points.

But with that, I would love to ask Avri whether you'd be willing to provide some more on the point, comments, than these general remarks from my side.

AVRI DORIA: Certainly.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Avri, please.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

And I think -- First of all, I want to say how, listening to the conversation that was before about sort of the new, you know, cooperative and working together style that's being developed post ODA in the SSAD is something I very much hope can evolve as we move ahead with the SubPro ODP and eventually ODA. And in fact it's not even certain that we necessarily have to wait as

long as we waited. And I think that feeds into sort of a very -- very much an openness to see some of the issues that we know are pending issues, that are issues that the SubPro Caucus and ODP are speaking of ourselves. You know, issues that Jeff outlined in terms of applicant support, appeals mechanisms, and a list of other issues that need further discussion.

So I think that certainly, you know, within the capabilities that the Council has to take on other work is a very -- is something that's very acceptable. And the Board is, you know, totally open to that in sort of a continuing of this evolving process. So can definitely see ways of working on that, you know, and hope that anything that you undertake is something that can sort of be brought, perhaps, to ICANN74 and that there'd be a progress between now and then on any of those issues that you do want to subject to further, you know, GNSO work. And both the SubPro Caucus and the ODP folks who are already talking with you are certainly available to participate in those processes to the extent that you would want it.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sorry. I hit mute.

Thank you for that, Avri, and I think that makes a lot of sense. And I just also want to state that the GNSO Council is going to be

discussing this on -- I think Wednesday is our meeting, but also that we had this discussion yesterday with the GAC and will likely have this discussion with the ALAC. So it's not the intention of the GNSO to work on this issue alone, recognizing that some of these issues, if not all of them, but certainly things like applicant support are high-interest topics to the GAC and ALAC and others. So we want to -- you know, we'll also be discussing how to be inclusive of the other communities as well so that any solution that we do come up with or any recommendations have wide acceptance and that we don't have to just, you know, keep doing it over again.

AVRI DORIA:

If I can respond to that. There's sort of an assumption I'm making that the GNSO processes I've seen that do an outreach and do work to be -- and that's why I sort of referenced to, you know, GNSO processes as they have been defined. You've got -- you've got processes for doing all these. You do take a look at it. It is part of what the various defined, you know, methodologies you've got do include.

So I very much assume that that's -- and I think that's a Board assumption when we look at the GNSO. We look at the PDP. We look at how the PDP evolves and such and its attempt to be inclusive, so -- and its attempt to strictly define the scope of what

they're working on, and knowing that in these things, the narrower the scope, the better chance you've got, and, you know, looking at that. But it's something that, yeah, you guys have been doing that, and, you know, could see that, so very much would put faith in you using the GNSO methodologies, and even some of the ones you never tried before, perhaps, but, you know, to do that and would count on that process.

Certainly it's something that, at the end of the day when the Board is making its evaluations and decisions, you know, it looks at what was the degree of inclusiveness, how was everything taken into account. But the SubPro recommendations do include a lot of that discussion. So it's something that's not new to you and something that I think we do count on.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Please let me call upon Göran to say a little bit of the work that is actually progressing while we're thinking about it.

Göran, please.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you very much. It's a good discussion. And I think that everybody wants to learn from the experience that -- from last

time. And the difference, of course, is people have a different experience from what happened the last time. But there was a couple of things that has been our guiding light, and this is one of them, it's tied with the openness, is transparency. But the third one is also who makes the decision and when.

And so Annebeth made a comment. The whole idea about doing this is to make it faster, to make it more clear who makes the decision, and also make it more transparent than last time.

It is true that last time we did a lot of the sort of ODP work after the Board made a decision. It took a year for the Board to make the decision about the next round last time, and then I -- I don't -- you probably know better, took four or five years, then we actually started doing something. And as you know, the round is not closed. We still have -- only last week, I think, we added .KIDS into the zone.

So I think many of the questions we can look at. We can actually look under the ODA -- sorry, in the ODP process. And the Board is willing and has been open to add more questions into it.

But I worry a little bit, just from -- not because of the intent but I worry a little bit about the sort of, if we sort of -- the Board sometime -- the Board has some time to make a decision about

when to proceed and how to proceed. That is sort of a -- And if we start certain types of work, could it be so that we force the Board to make a decision that they want to reverse. I'm not saying that's the case. I'm just saying that the Board has to have a fairly clear decision point in this one. Also taking into account that, for instance, the GAC has asked for a cost/benefit analysis of how to -- how to -- before the decision is made. They also set up their own discussions about -- you have the DNS abuse discussion as a prerequisite for going to the next round. So there are -- It's not a simple flow. And just for -- also for a sort of project management perspective, I think it's better to keep things inside the ODP.

On those discussions like how we're going to support new types of top-level domain operators, which is one of the questions that we all have, or how many names do we actually think or new operators we think will come into the root server, et cetera, et cetera.

That's why -- I think there are many good discussions to have, and you know I would like to have them with the community. I also want to make sure that the Board has the ability to make the right decisions at the right time. But continue this conversation and the way we do it I think is going to be essentially important going forward.

With the -- Just one more thing. The more things we add to the ODP work, the longer it's going to take. And then we have to think about which are the decisions that have to be made before the Board makes a decision and which will be part of implementation.

One thing we realize, which you know about, Jeff, as well, is that a part of the work we're doing now will lead directly to implementation, which means the time for implementation, if the Board makes the decision, will be shorter than last time.

I don't want to say the discussion is bad. I don't want to say that it's not a good idea. I just want to put some more obstacles to the -- on the table as well.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that, Göran. I see, Jeff, please share your reflections on that.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Göran. And certainly understand the concerns you raised. But I also do want to mention this topic actually was -- actually came out of the ODP, and it was a question that was asked of the Council where the ODP team had recognized that there are issues with applicant support, for

example, that may involve more than implementation and were expected areas of work by the community.

And so we're not in any way trying to interfere with the ODP in any way or trying to create more work for the ODP, but just taking distinct areas where we know more work is needed. And ICANN org has recognized that you all recognize that that work is needed by the community. So if we could take those areas, we can start working on those without actually impacting the -- or materially impacting the ODP.

So it's not trying to add things but, rather, work on areas where it's all -- where everyone recognizes that more community work is needed. Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. And with that, Philippe, if you would agree, I think we're well set for moving on to the next question on SubPro. It's really clear we're seeking the interaction and do things as fast as we can, and not faster, and with respect to the community process. So looking forward to next steps there together.

I think Avri said it also very well and very well expressed, seeking to solve all these issues and, where possible, start moving as soon as we can.

And so with that --

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Maarten, I was just going to say this -- this is Philippe here. I was just going to say whatever -- obviously whatever decision council takes on this, including on the specific topic of applicant support will be equally described and let you know and make sure the Board is engaged. You will be informed on this in due time. Thanks. Yes, we can move on to the next topic.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you. Good.
Next topic is the Board's open discussion questions, I think.

So question is: What are your key priorities for ICANN work in 2022? How would these priorities help our common objectives as expressed in the strategic plan? And how can we best move forward together taking into account what we're doing already, I would say. And if you see any suggestions to enhance ICANN's overall effectiveness and efficiency with regard to the best implementation, how would that look like?

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

Let me start and then certainly Sebastien can feel free, and councillors can feel free to jump in as you see fit.

And certainly there are a number of things that we've talked about already in terms of the two major topics that are on our table for this year, and that's the FSA (phonetic), the ODA, and SubPro ODP moving forward.

I cannot start without referring to our mission. That's the PDP stewardship, as you would guess, and not to forget the three in-flight PDPs that we have. It's not because -- we work very hard with you and with Org on post-final report decisions that we do not -- double negative, I'm sorry. But we make sure that we supervise as council, and that is our mission, the PDP and those that are in progress. And a number of them we'll be delivering in 2022.

This being said, we've talked about the FSA (phonetic), the ODA, that's the small team that's in place. We talked about SubPro PDP. We haven't talked about DNS abuse, at least today. Maybe I can start. As would you have heard, council initiated a small team on this to determine whether any policy-related work is necessary or it seemed useful by the community and in that spirit, the small team reached out to all interested parties to seek their feedback on this particular question. Trying to make sure not to

relitigate the effort that has been going on so far and focus on the actual policy-related work that council may undertake.

And I don't want to put anyone on the spot. But Mark, Paul, who are leading this effort, are co-conveners of this small team, feel free to chime in as you see fit. Just want to mention that's one of our goals for this year.

We will be -- including at the meeting tomorrow -- engaging with GDS on how we can -- through a dialogue also work with Org on the policy-related issues that were raised in the thought paper that was delivered a while ago and how policy -- council can engage with Org on specific items and can help with the implementation phase. And there's a number of suggestions that GDS has put forward and that council will be taking on, again, in the spirit of post-PDP-related work. And that's certainly one of our goals for 2022.

As to how those relate to the strategic goals, we see this as our contribution to the improvement of the multistakeholder model, making sure that not only on the items that we referred to earlier we make sure that we reach out to those that are interested in specific topics but also that we deliver moving forward. And I think it's a question of credibility for the model itself, especially this year.

It also relates to the strategic goals that are relative to competition as well as broadly speaking the evolution of the identifier system.

So this being said, I think it sort of summarizes the goals of the council this year. And I hope that it contributes to your goals, the goals you set out this year.

So over to you, Maarten. And certainly if councilors would like to chime in on this, feel free to.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you very much. Basically a lot of the talking we have done all touches upon the same, right? How do we get to -- from a PDP to implementation in a way that respects the PDP is doable and in its interpretation also reflecting on that very well the work of the council in the PDP 3.0 in a way that has been one of those things there. I think the ODP is one of the things that tries to do there.

The discussion we had also about maybe something to consider, a global public interest framework to assess that aspect of the work might also be one of those things that can be bridge. And the Board stands ready to interact more early, more informally to see whether that can help things move as well. So appreciate

your words and your thinking and all the work the GNSO is already doing in this perspective.

Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maarten. Edmon here.

Very encouraging to hear, at least from my side, the development on the DNS abuse and having a small team work on the topic because I think it's becoming a -- you know, not only a hot topic within ICANN community but beyond. And that puts a bit of a pressure on us to respond. And I really am encouraged with the direction that the GNSO Council is taking.

Just curious if there's a kind of timeline in how this, in some ways, prescoping almost -- sorry, trying to find the right word here -- work would be a little bit of the look on what might come next. Just curious if there are any indications on that at this point.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks for the question. Philippe, should I ask to go to Paul?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, certainly. Paul, feel free to chime in.

Just to say that this is a small team. It is not expected, to Edmon's question, to last forever.

[Laughter]

Hopefully -- especially on this sort of topic. So hopefully by the next ICANN meeting, we'll have something tangible to share from the feedback we all received.

But over to you, Paul, to be more --

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: We're not asking to a timeline to commit yourself so we can kill you if you if you don't make it. No worries.

[Laughter]

Paul.

PAUL McGRADY: Thank you. Hi, this is Paul McGrady. I'm so glad to hear that this small team won't be forever because Mark and I volunteered to lead it.

We're very early days, Edmon, is the answer. But the goal is what Philippe said, which is to have concrete take-aways from this process by the next ICANN meeting.

Part of what we're doing, it's -- I guess it's scoping to a certain extent, but it also really is harvesting. We have so many people in the community with so many good ideas, all working really hard to address this issue. And we think there could be an opportunity here to bring folks together and to work on things with council's help that we can get some early agreement on.

I like to say we're trying to quit talking past each other, and that's part of what this little kernel of the small team is going to do.

So I hope you feel sufficiently teased and are looking forward to what we come up with. And I'm very sorry that I can't give you a timeline today. Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Fully understood. We have until tomorrow because then we have a community-wide discussion about it.

[Laughter]

So you're blessed with that. And thanks for that.

I think one of the examples I saw recently where I thought, hey, that's a good approach and saw you help the community become better together is in the way you celebrated ten years new gTLDs where you came really in a positive and constructive way. For me that felt like pulling in people rather than making positions and coming from there.

So really looking forward to what comes out of there.

With that, we come to the end of our engagement for today in this informal hour but not the end of our engagement as Board and GNSO towards the rest of the year to come, no doubt.

Philippe, want to thank you very much. And councillors, want to thank you very much, and all those listening in for your interest. Thank you.

Philippe, last word is to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Well, I just want to equally thank you. And thank you for the next steps. I know that intersessionally we'll be engaging in more dialogue on the specific items that we reviewed. So we're all looking forward to that, including on the letter you sent Friday.

So thanks to the Board members and thanks to you, Maarten.
Over to you. And have a good 73 meeting.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Have a good 73 meeting. Thank you very much. And help break the bias.

See you later. Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]