
ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO Council Working Session (2 of 2)
Sunday, September 18, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 KUL

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Council Working Session 2 of 2. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

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.

With that, I'll hand the floor over to Philippe Fouquart. Over to you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Welcome to Part 2 of our Working Session. We'll have three items for this Part 2. The first is a dialogue with our GDS colleagues from staff on the role of the PIR's programs and a number of items that are relevant to the GNSO, such as the implementation of GNSO recommendations that have been approved by Council and the Board.

The second item is on the PDP improvement tracker and the survey that was sent out a few weeks ago. I think we now have, thanks to the diligent work of staff, the initial results that we'd like to share with you.

And the third and final item is a dialogue with Rod and Julie from SSAC where we can review some of the items that have been dealt with at SSAC recently as they relate to the work within the GNSO.

So with this, I think we can start with the first item and our dialogue with GDS. Lars, I'm looking around the room. Oh, I'm sorry. Good morning, Lars. That's the thing with the facemasks. We don't recognize people. So you have the floor. Welcome.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thank you, Philippe. I could not agree more about the incognito aspect of the facemasks. First of all, I'd like to apologize. Unfortunately, Karen Lentz can't be here. She was last minute called into a session with the Board, and so she delegated this over to me. I hope I'll do her justice.

We have a couple of slides to introduce or to talk about our team. I'm not sure who's running the slides. Nathalie from far away? No, Ariel is. Hi, Ariel. I won't read this out. This is kind of the mission statement that we came up with.

Our team was formed, you may recall, a couple of years ago. Theresa Swinehart's multistakeholder and strategic initiatives team was merged with what was then GDD to become GDS. And Karen's team was part of that reorganization.

This is some of the overarching work that we do. We do policy implementation. And then Sarmad Hussain who I think is going to meet with you as well later or has already met with you this weekend on the universal acceptance team. And we also have a research team. I'll go into that in a little bit more detail in just a moment [inaudible] team.

And Karen is back already. Karen, do you want to step in, or do you want me to continue?

KAREN LENTZ: Please continue.

LARS HOFFMANN: All right. The next slide, please. So our team is divided essentially into four sections. I just gave a little bit of a preview there. The first one is the IDN team and universal acceptance that is led by Sarmad. It covers the execution of both programs and enables domain names in the languages and scripts of end users in a secure and stable manner.

The next team under Karen and the PRSP group is the Research, Strategy, and Data Programs team that's led by Jared Erwin who, unfortunately, couldn't travel here. I'm sure he's listening to the recording after this session. I think the timing is not perfect for him. That team provides a centralized source for high-quality, repeatable services, research, and data on a wide variety of subjects that are pertinent to GDS and ICANN as a whole. Also, as they come requested from the ICANN community, for example, as part of review teams or PDPs. Next slide, please.

We have two more teams. Policy Research led by Lars Hoffmann—I guess that's me—covering all areas of policy and implementation as far as GDS is concerned. I will talk about that in a minute. You see here a couple of areas we're focusing on. SubPro, I don't know if you've heard about that. And there's the

temp spec, EPDP Phases 1 and 2, RPM, etc. All those topics fall under that remit.

And then a fourth point here. A team yet to be fully coming off the ground. Some of you who follow ICANN’s recruitment pages will know that there’s an open position for a New gTLD Subsequent Procedures senior director. I think that recruitment process is ongoing at the moment.

So that’s a quick overview of our team. Next slide, please.

We have two topics that we’re going to—oh, no. First of all, this is essentially [inaudible]. I think Steve was kind enough to share this prior to the meeting with you already. We understand that you guys have Barry who is the master of all reporting. And while we’re not in a position to compete with him and his very impressive [SMART] and spreadsheets, we think there’s a gap to fill to maybe prepare the community a little bit better about the progress of policy implementation work from the GDS side.

So we started our first pre-ICANN briefing on the kind of work that we do. It was released before this meeting. If you had a chance to take a look at it and you have any thoughts how we can improve it further, please do not hesitate to share your opinion. I know that the GNSO is a lot of things, but not timid. So do be frank with us how we can make this better. Next slide, please.

These are two of the topics. One is the guidelines for GDS liaisons, specifically to GNSO PDP working groups. This is really a topic that is led by my colleague Jared who I said couldn't be here. The timing isn't perfect for him, so he asked me to cover that subject for him.

The PDP manual, many of you will know this, encourages working groups to establish communication in the early stages of the PDP with other departments—other than the policy department who obviously provides amazing support—within ICANN that may have an interest, expertise, or information regarding the implementability of the issues at hand.

And so as a result of that, the GDS tasks usually a liaison to develop an understanding of and expertise in the community discussions and, where appropriate, provides input to PDP working groups if and when requested. Obviously, [all liaisons bring] problems or questions from the working group to the Org and facilitates a dialogue, hopefully in a constructive manner.

And to kind of, formalize is maybe not the right word, but to provide expectations around that role, we have developed guidelines for the participation of these liaisons. Essentially, these follows similar guidelines that already exist for Board members serving as liaisons to ICANN community groups. And they describe in more detail the expectations, requirements, and

the procedures for GDS team members serving as liaisons to PDPs. Can we see the next slide, please?

The goal of these guidelines is, as I said, to set expectations and also provide the liaison with the foundational knowledge and tools that are required to carry out the liaison function and then also develop expertise and understanding of the subject matter area when it comes to implementation. We expect the liaisons to play a leading role when it comes to later implementation work of that subject matter area so that we have the right resources ready at the right time to lead on implementation work of PDP working group outputs.

Additionally, the liaison guidelines support the ongoing work related to improvement of the policy development and implementation processes. And in fact, for those of you who are engaged or working on or contributing to the transfer PDP or the EPDP on IDNs will know that we have two—I am slightly biased, but I think—very good and very active GDS liaisons working on these. They are both in the room, actually, Michael Karakash and Isabelle Colas, working respectively on those two PDPs.

Isabelle just facilitated quite substantive ICANN Org input on the initial report, I believe, of the transfer PDP. And all that, I think we are very conscious about that, and I think the PDP leadership appreciate that as well. It's helpful input from the Org for the

consideration of the group. If it's helpful and taken onboard, that's great. And if it's considered less helpful and it's not taken aboard, then that's perfectly fine as well. Obviously, this is a bottom-up process, and we're just there to provide additional information where needed or wanted.

If it's okay, I'm going to go to the next topic as well. It's just a couple more slides, and then I'll take any questions at the end. All right, you're already on Slide 11. Thank you.

So implementation of GNSO policy recommendations. The implementation of recommendations is coordinated—this won't come as a big surprise—within ICANN's GDS functions. And the process around that is documented in the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, the CPIF. It provides an overview of roles and responsibilities for the Org, for the implementation review team, and for the Board and other players or actors in the implementation process.

You will notice this is not the only area where this is the case, but resourcing has been an important factor when starting up implementation efforts. And you will know this as well, but I'll repeat it anyway. It's not so much just that there are GDS resources required for implementation work. We often draw also on colleagues from Compliance, from Legal. The policy support team obviously is a very helpful resource as well. And so all these

things need to come together in order to have the right support to conduct an efficient, effective implementation process.

Nevertheless, things can always be improved. And so at the moment, we have just the one IRT that is ongoing on the EPDP Phase 1. As you will know obviously, that is winding down I don't want to say, but at the very least there's a public comment out there which indicates that the end is maybe nearer than the beginning.

And with that in mind and with some additional resources that we were able to bring on board over the course of this year, we anticipate to launch one additional IRT this year. And then subject to the EPDP Phase 1 winding down and having the possibility to take out some of the resources that are supporting that work, maybe starting a second IRT next year.

And I'm noting here in bold this is in addition to any IRT that would be launched if and when the Board accepts the final recommendations of the SubPro PDP which obviously will be a significant amount of work both from the community and the Org to implement those recommendations.

And so the current planning is to have three active IRTs hopefully running at some point next year and to also maintain that kind of cadence, subject to expertise and availability obviously, so that

we can work maybe a little bit more efficiently through the policy and implementation lifecycle.

I've got two more slides here. Just talked about that a little bit, the anticipated launch of implementation work. We've been working internally to launch the RPM IRT later this year. I think the Board adopted those recommendations. I actually don't have the date. I want to say earlier this year in January or February. Is that right, Karen?

KAREN LENTZ:

Yes.

LARS HOFFMANN:

And so the goal is to work with that IRT to implement at the very least 22 out of the 35 recommendations. And those remaining 13 are essentially dependencies or are closely related to the SubPro work, and we expect them actually to be dealt with or absorbed by the SubPro IRT rather than being implemented through the RPM IRT. Hence, only 22. But obviously, the full set of recommendations will eventually be implemented.

The second aspect here is EPDP Phase 2A. I said once Phase 1 is wound down to a degree that resources can be reallocated, we anticipate the launch of that IRT. We didn't put a timing on here just because you never know what happens after the public

comment. I think we'll have a better idea once we see the kind of comments that come in on that policy language that's out at the moment. But I think early next year is certainly something that we have in mind for this.

And then I don't have to tell you this. There are a couple of other implementation works there. Then lined up after that SubPro IRT, separate animal. Resources will be made available for that, so that is work that will also spin up. I think that nobody will be surprised if I say most likely early next year.

And then obviously, EPDP Phase 2, the SSAD, the next step in terms of implementation obviously still has some dependencies on what will happen with the WHOIS disclosure system and design that is currently being discussed. But we know that is in the pipeline and coming our way as well, and the planning for that while not completed has at the very least started. And then the final slide.

Some of you—why is this not the final slide on my screen? Because I haven't moved forward. There are basically two PDPs that are paused at the moment: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation (PPSAI). There have been some communications, obviously, between the Council and the Org. The current thinking around this from the Org side is that the picking up or restarting

that implementation work which had actually progressed quite far when it was underway.

At this moment since we do not know what the ultimately SSAD system will look like and what the exact outcome of the implementation of EPDP Phase 1 will be, for us the thing here is that it makes most sense to bring those two other subjects to a close, assess where there are ways to integrate any of the PPSAI recommendations, and essentially make that a whole other implementation process as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Both RPM and 2A, which obviously came after PPSAI in the sequencing of things, have fewer dependencies, are more straightforward to implementation. So from our perspective it makes sense to move ahead with that work and then start planning for the restart of PPSAI once we have certainty around these two other aspects.

Similarly, the Translation and Transliteration PDP working group, that implementation is also on hold. There were some dependencies on the readiness of the RDAP. We've been in close contact with Karla from Russ' team who informed us that most likely we're going to be in a position in the first half of 2023 where the RDAP negotiations are in a stable position so that the T&T implementation can be picked up as well. And so at that moment, again, we will look the resources that we have available.

I'm going to be frank with you. I don't think early 2023 we're going to have the capacity to run four IRTs at the same time. We especially expect SubPro to take up more resources than maybe other IRTs have in the past. But it is something that we will add to the queue, and our goal is certainly that when one implementation process is finished the next one will start until hopefully the queue will become nonexistent.

And with that, I think I've come to the end of my slides and would be somewhat happy to take questions, depending on what they are. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Any questions for Lars or Karen? I think we have two questions in the chat. Susan's was centered I think on the IRTs in progress. And, Jeff, you had a question about the GDS liaison. Was it answered in the chat? I'm sorry. I should have followed. But whether that was public or is it documented. Right. Karen?

KAREN LENTZ: Yes, thank you. And hello, everyone. The guidelines that Lars was summarizing, we plan to circulate the actual document after this meeting for you all to review and provide any feedback. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Karen. So we can now go to the hands. Tomslin, you're first.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Philippe. I just wanted some clarity regarding the resourcing because you mentioned resourcing is a major factor in running the implementation work. So I wanted to understand whether you highlighted this because there could be potential challenges if perhaps more IRTs were approved than you anticipated or for some other reason.

LARS HOFFMANN: So the question is whether we update the staffing because of the anticipation of more IRT work?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No. Because you highlighted resourcing as one of the major factors, I wasn't sure why you highlighted that on the slide today. So that's what I was wanting clarity on.

LARS HOFFMANN: Just looking at the slide. Yeah, so resourcing is...do you mean what are some of the other factors other than resourcing?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, but also why you chose resourcing to be on the slide today.

LARS HOFFMANN: Well, because from our perspective you need to have the right people to conduct the kind of work that is required to lead an IRT and do implementation. It's very difficult. I mean, you will know this. You remember being new to ICANN at some point, whether that's community or staff. You can't just hire somebody completely new and ask them to lead an implementation review team or support what's essentially very complex policy work. And so for us, it's really important to build a pipeline through the liaison work to start with that we started and have the right people that are available at the right moment to pick up the work that has been approved or the recommendations that have been approved by Council and Board and then lead that implementation work. And so that's not something you can just build up overnight. It's a process that we've begun, that we're in the middle. We have made, I think, some good progress here and hopefully we'll continue to do that. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Lars. Next is Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. My question is really about the PPSAI. I was on that group, and it was certainly pre-GDPR and pre any analysis in terms of data protection requirements. And Steve Crocker brought up a very interesting problem related to privacy/proxy services in the discussion on the SSAD last night for me, yesterday for you guys. He'd like to see it divided into four. We didn't even divide it into two.

And in the light of the very tight resources and the fact that that IRT has been, well, getting some things done—and God bless them. I was on it, but I couldn't take it any longer and am now just monitoring it, but progress is slow. And in my humble opinion, it needs an entire new PDP because while the relationship between contracted parties and their privacy/proxy services was, shall we say, casual in the old days, it cannot remain so because there's residual liability that leads back. There have to be liability arrangements made between the contracted parties and their provider in proxy services.

I'm not for one minute suggesting that we should get rid of them. But things need to be provided in a much more rigorous way now that we are attempting to comply with GDPR. So really, we need to revisit the PDP. And I hesitate to say this because the first PDP was painful enough. But to go ahead with an IRT on material that needs to be rethought with the proper legal analysis strikes me as

a waste of time. I'd love to hear your comments on that. Thank you.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Stephanie. Do you mean our comment or the room's comment?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Both, really. Both.

LARS HOFFMANN: Well, so I think from an ICANN Org perspective, I don't feel it appropriate or empowered to comment on whether the GNSO Council believes more policy work is required. That is really up for you guys. What I will say is that you looked at the...I showed that there is no timeline here because there are too many dependencies. We don't want to say we can do this in August or September because it depends on what other work finishes when. And I think we all know that even if we put in our best efforts with community and Org, sometimes things can slip.

Having said that, we don't anticipate the PPSAI work to be picked up before the RPM implementation or the 2A implementation is at a moment where we can pull resources from that and reallocate them. So that would give certainly the Council ample

time to reflect on whether additional policy work is required or not.

If that is the case, we're happy to work with the Council as best we can to see how any future policy work can be integrated with the final results of the SSAD or the Phase 1 implementation. I think that's what I can offer at this moment. Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Stephanie. Thanks, Lars, for pulling an action point for Council next year. At least once the work on the WHOIS disclosure system has progressed. So next is John. Mindful of time, if you— I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thomas had [inaudible], I think.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thomas, is that on this point?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, I wanted to put myself in the queue, but I've been kicked out of the Zoom room. So maybe you can just add me to the queue.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay, certainly I can do that. Thank you. So, John, you're next.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks. Back to PPSAI. That was identified as a potential usage risk in the WHOIS disclosure system. And I'm wondering if it might be a good time to restart that work or at least find out how long it might take. The usage risk was that people will put in a request and then end up going through all that process just to get redacted information back from a privacy/proxy. I think if there's some way that we could at least get an update to Stephanie's point how much changes might need to be done and then secondly how long it would take to implement it, we could maybe start that up so that usage risk is removed from the WHOIS disclosure system. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Good feedback. Do you want to respond to that maybe, Karen?

KAREN LENTZ: Sure. Thank you, John. And this is really the point that Lars was making on noting the interaction of proxy/privacy with the other discussions that are happening now—with the WHOIS disclosure system, with the Phase 2 recommendations—and understanding the what path we’re taking because we don’t want to work in a silo where we’re coming up with things and not coordinating among these things. So that’s well noted. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Karen. Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Philippe. Joining the chorus here agreeing with Stephanie and also with John. The whole world around proxy/privacy, I mean, the PPSAI was agreed several years ago. We agreed several years ago that the dependencies weren’t there. I understand from Karen’s message—and thank you for that, Karen, it’s really helpful—that it’s more of an operational than a policy issue. However, if I read what’s on the slide that we’re going to pause it until completing the above dependencies, that really worries me.

Because they are interrelated, as John just explained, and it seems illogical to create something from scratch when we already have something to lose all of the work that we agreed on in the PPSAI and not to integrate the necessary functionalities

into whatever it is we're calling the WHOIS recording or WHOIS disclosure system or whatever terminology we go with. So, yes, I'd very much support my colleagues, both Stephanie and John, on that. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Marie. Lars?

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Marie. If I can just react to that. And you're quite right in pointing out what it says on the slide, so I might put a little qualifier on that and maybe update the slide as well. I think how we see it is that EPDP Phase 1 should be completed. So that's almost done, and I think the integration there, we need to know where that lands. And then we have the policy language that we can work with.

But once we know what the SSAD outcome is and how that system will look like based on the current discussion and once we're talking about how we then implement that, I think that is the moment to merge it with so what do we have on the PPSAI. So the sequencing is not how we have it in mind. Finish Phase 1, finish SSAD, and then look at PPSAI. That might have been the impression we have given.

I think what we're looking at it finish Phase 1, look at what is SSAD supposed to look like based on the final recommendation as adopted by the Board, and how can we then implement that together with what we have from PPSAI to make that a cohesive system that is integrated and works well together.

JOHN MCELWAINE: May I ask a follow-up question?

LARS HOFFMANN: Please do.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Does Phase 1 have to be finished though before the WHOIS disclosure system could be launched? I'm not understanding fully the integration of all that, if that makes sense.

KAREN LENTZ: I don't know if I would say it needs to be finished, but I think the Phase 1 work will be very relevant and helpful to the PPSAI for implementation. And we are, as we've noted, much farther along in that work than we were previously. So I think we at least wanted to have a sense that we were relatively stable in terms of understanding what that Phase 1 would look like in operation.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Karen. Next is...so we're already overtime for this item so we'll have to cut the queue after Thomas. John, is that a new hand?

JOHN MCELWAINE: No.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: No? Okay. So, Ariel, [inaudible] for the chat questions.

ARIEL LIANG: There are two questions in the chat. First is from Rafik Dammak regarding implementation and what the team is doing in terms of initiatives to improve the process, particularly to shorten the duration. And also the second question from Jeff Neuman. The WDS paper was silent on whether the implementation of that system would impact other projects like SubPro. Does that mean that there will be no impacts on other projects?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ariel? Lars?

LARS HOFFMANN: Yeah, thank you, Ariel. Thank you, Rafik. And hello, Rafik. Well, we're doing well. So we have been able to increase some of the

staffing. And as I said, we've been more formal about the liaison work and building up expertise doing the PDP that hopefully will lead to a more expedited and efficient implementation process.

We are also in the process of essentially building a pipeline, planning better, making sure the resources from the different departments can be available if and when a PDP is ready to be implemented. And hopefully building up the capacity, as I said, to maintain three different IRTs. One very substantive, the SubPro that is expected at the same time.

At the same time, we're working I think internally after the GDS integration very well with other teams, Russ' team and [Elisa's] specifically. Francisco's as well from a technical perspective. To make sure that the processes from our end work as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Something that I might as well float here I guess is, for example, I noted that the EPDP Phase 1 IRT doesn't have a leadership team, per se. And I would like to, when the RPM IRT is put into place, obviously there's a Council liaison role, but I'm wondering. All community groups have leadership and that system usually works very well and helps with efficiency and staff/community communications.

So maybe that is something also that we can talk about with the IRT when it comes into place whether that is a mechanism to

increase effectiveness and a better and more efficient workflow. Obviously, that needs to be mutually agreeable. It's not something that we can proscribe or anything, but something to maybe think about.

And I have to admit I need to hear the other question again.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. I think the second question was from Jeff on prioritization and the fact that the slides are silent on this. Maybe, Jeff, would you like to...?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. The question was the staff paper on WDS was silent on its impact on other projects that are ongoing. Unlike the previous SSAD design paper—the full one—which explicitly stated that other projects would be delayed by some period, this paper didn't say anything like that. So should we read that to mean that there will be no impact on any other projects that are ongoing if the Council decides to vote to approve the WDS? And if not, what will be the impact?

KAREN LENTZ: Hi, Jeff. I think it's a hard question to answer at this moment. I don't think we can ever say there will be no impact. But I think we're trying to be smart about looking at resources. Our

operational design phase work calls for how do we gradually staff up to be able to handle an IRT and all of the operationalization work. We don't really know the timing of that or what the next steps would be if there would be work on a WHOIS disclosure system. But that is part of the discussion I think internally, as we build out what the next steps look like how do we take that into account to make sure we don't end up with suddenly surprise on competing resources?

LARS HOFFMANN: Okay, I just note that Yuko is in the room and she may want to add to anything you said, Karen.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Quite quickly if you would. We're running out of time so if you would do that quickly. Thank you.

YUKO YOKOYAMA: The is Yuko from WDS project team. I would like to mention that design paper was strictly about system design, particularly because this is not a consensus policy like SSAD. So the implementation was not and is not decided yet. So the scope of the paper was very narrow and limited, therefore there was no mentioning of the impact assessment. But there will be some

impact, and that will be dependent on when the time of the implementation is. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, [inaudible]. Can we take that offline, Jeff, because we're running out of time. My apologies. But it's an important question. I think we'll have to take that forward.

THOMAS RICKERT: Philippe, sorry. I was kicked out of the Zoom room again.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you lowered your hand. So, Thomas, you are last.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, just briefly. Thank you so much for your presentation. I heard you talk about resources and that you're trying to find new staff and that you can't use everyone on the team for every type of project. But I think our issue is that, not only for the GNSO but for ICANN as such, that there is an expectation, and I think rightfully so, that whenever we produce policy that it should go into implementation instantly. And it looks like we are talking about competing resources or competing priorities and reallocating resources and all that. So is one addition hire

enough? Or what can we do as a Council to support you to be sufficiently resourced to plow forward with [all projects] as they mature enough to be implemented? I find it interesting that I'm asking for ICANN to potentially hire more staff, but I think that it's not good for the organization to be waiting for implementation for months and then see more surprises as new projects get onboarded and things being delayed. So what can we do in our discussions with the Board to maybe support you in being sufficiently resourced and staffed to do your work?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Karen and Lars, do you think you're in a position to answer that? I'll leave it to you. But it's a good question. Whether we can weigh in, I think it's a fair question.

KAREN LENTZ: Sure. Thank you, Thomas. I think the Board is in general interested in the effective working of the policy lifecycle. This is actually one of the goals for the CEO at the moment having to do with improvements throughout the policy lifecycle. Looking at how we're engaging during the policy development process to put up front some of the thinking about modeling for implementation, resource estimates, that kind of thing which I think will be a big help toward implementation.

Also, as we have mentioned, we are trying to staff up, or we have been adding to Lars' team, to give us the ability to support work as it comes out from the community. So I think just supporting those discussions, which is the next topic I think, in regard to improvements and for the Board to hear from the Council as to the importance of this work and how it contributes to the multistakeholder model I think would be weld by the Board. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: And thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Karen. And thanks, Lars, for the presentation. I'll think we'll take that forward, especially for the questions on the PPSAI and the impact of the WHOIS disclosure system proof of concept. I think at some point [at] the next Council we'll need to figure out how we can work out the policy implications of that once we know the exact remit of the proof of concept. Thanks again.

So we'll move on swiftly to...and now your hand is up, Thomas. So you've been kicked in. We'll move on to the next item. It's the review or the first step of the review of the survey on the PDP improvements. You would remember that we've identified over the last six months a number of improvements that could be made to the PDP generally speaking. And especially on those

actions that Council can take with the recommendations that have been approved already. And there have been a number of potential actions that Council can take.

There was a survey that was issued a few weeks ago as those potential actions relate to the dialogue that we can have with the Board. For example, what we do with some of the leftovers from PDP 3.0. The actions that can be taken with regard to scoping, for example, and the potential impacts on existing consensus policies. As well as the relationship with the implementation which we just have talked about.

So with this, I think we can go to the summary of the survey. And I think we've got a few slides for this. Marika, would you like to take us through this?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Not at all. Thank you, Philippe. We did circulate to you all yesterday late the survey report which has all the details of the responses. But what we tried to do here in the slide deck, which is posted on the wiki, is provide a high level overview of those results and also start looking at what does that potentially mean for the proposed improvement as well as the proposed next step? I realize we're already short on time for this session and of course there are quite a few improvements so I think, at least from our side, we don't anticipate we'll be able to get through all of this.

But we hope this is a helpful starting point of having this conversation and then seeing how to continue it. whether to schedule a dedicated follow-up session or as part of a future Council meeting to continue this conversation.

But first of all, of course, I want to thank everyone for participating in the survey, because we got quite a few responses. And I think what you see here, in general, this is first of all again just a snapshot of the responses in relation to the question of do you support this proposed improvement.

You see on the lefthand column basically that there's a high level of support for all the improvements. There were some where there was an indication of no support, but typically it was one or two response. In a number of cases [as well] an "other" response where it was maybe either a question or a suggestion for how things could be tweaked.

And I think also in some of the cases where no support was indicated in certain cases it was as well about not being clear about what the improvement meant or having specific suggestions on how it might be modified. So again, we've tried to factor that in to going into the details of each of those improvements and seeing how we can accommodate at least those comments that were made.

And again, also want to recognize that not everyone may have had a chance to participate in the survey, so please also feel free to speak up here if you have specific views about what you see or the suggestions that are made.

And I also want to reassure everyone that the next steps that are being proposed for each of these improvements are very incremental steps. So they're all about doing something that will then come back again to Council and the GNSO community for further review or a further decision on the next step on that. So kind of moving forward with some of these items doesn't set anything in stone or it doesn't prevent any further review of the details of those. We can go to the next slide.

This shows you then a similar slide but now focusing on the support for the proposed next steps. Here you can actually see that no one is not supporting what is being proposed as a next step. There are some areas where people had an "other" suggestion. Again, where people made a specific suggestion or had a concern about what was being proposed. And what we've tried to do in the next couple of slides is for each of those basically make a suggestion. And again, that's purely based on staff support team's assessment and review of the results as well as some course corrections or adjustments that hopefully address those that expressed concern.

So again, we hope that this is a helpful way of starting the conversation to be able to identify if and how to move forward with these items. And again, we'll need to see how far we get I think during today's discussion to determine when a decision can be taken and/or finalize the conversation on these. We can go to the next slide.

So basically we've done for each of the improvements just in the order as well as they were in the chart. We've listed here on the slide what is the specific improvement that was proposed, what was the proposed next step that was identified at a very high level, and identified what was the survey result and comments expressed. Then we've indicated as well our suggestion for how to move forward on this item.

So this on specifically relates to enabling a process during the PDP to share relevant information and analysis on the potential impacts to existing policy. And here the next step, and Lars has already been speaking about this, was about requesting, the development of the GDS liaison guidelines or as part of that be very specific about what the expectation is in relation to impact on existing policies.

So one commenter indicated as "other" support that they believed that this opportunity already exists but, again, didn't seem to vehemently oppose this moving forward. Our suggestion

is here as work on the guidelines is already underway and I believe they're going to be actually shared with Council after this meeting, the suggestion would be for Council then to review those guidelines and then determine whether anything further is needed to consider this improvement complete. So again, there's no specific work here foreseen as the guidelines are I think already complete. It's just a question when these are shared with Council. It's the next opportunity for Council to look at this and see if anything further is needed.

So I think I'll just pause here and see if there are any reactions or any concerns about this or whether this is one where everyone feels comfortable in moving ahead as suggested. I see Jeff has put his hand up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Let me just ask, is this open to anyone to respond to or just the Council?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Given the topic, I think it would be fair for this to be handled by councilors only given that that's the PDP now. I guess you were referring to your question in the chat. Since we're at it, I guess we can address that, Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, I'm just looking at Jeff's comment. I think that's well noted. I think we've—and I think in some of the responses to the comments it has also been marked as a concern that this doesn't add either more bureaucracy or more time. So I think that is definitely something to be aware of. But again, for example, on this specific item I think we've seen in Phase 1 that by not addressing that issue as part of the PDP, it actually added substantial time in the implementation phase.

So I think on some of these you also need to see where is it best dealt with. Because time needs to be spent on it anyway, is it better to do that at the outset or at the end? And I think this is really...these improvements, focusing on identifying the impact on existing consensus policies are really intended to avoid that at the IRT stage someone suddenly realizes this has a big impact on a consensus policy and we actually are not sure what the change or the impact or how it is intended to be reflected. Which then creates a whole cycle of going back, checking with Council, and potentially having another small group looking at it instead of dealing with that up front in the working group.

So I think many of these are actually intended to save time and create less bureaucracy. But I think fair point and that's definitely something Council and everyone needs to watch out for.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Paul, do you have a question?

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. I guess I'll drill down a bit on Jeff's question which is we've just heard from the GDS that they're super busy, right? And so when will they do this? This thing we want them to do. Is it a one-month wait for the working group to get started? It is a six-month wait for the working group to get started? Does the working group get started and then they put the input in midstream once we're six months into something? It's hard to be for this if we don't have any details about what the timeframes are for this to happen. Keeping in mind that we just heard from GDS that, woah, they're busy, right? So if we're going to give them yet something else to do, we need to know how they're going to do it and when they're going to do it. Thanks.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks, Paul. My understanding is that this is not a—and I see Jeff's comment as well—but this is not about adding a new phase but it's just spelling out that as part of the liaisons' input which they already provide throughout the PDP as well as during the initial report that as part of that they factor in thinking about impact on other consensus policy.

So I think this is more about specifically calling that out. And my assumption is, and of course I can't speak for my colleagues and

there may also be something you want to review as you see the guidelines to see if you indeed think that it's adding additional layers or whatever, it's indeed more specifically calling out that as part of your role you're also expected to do this. And this usually is something that presumably at the initial report phase when recommendations go out for public comment, you're able to see this is what the group is recommending. This is also linked to these other policies.

So if the group hasn't recognized that yet, it's an opportunity for the liaison then at that point to flag. Please take note that this may have an impact on these policies, so please spell out in your report what you would like us to do with those as part of implementation. That's, again, I think how I see it. I think Lars is still in the room so if he sees this completely differently—he's nodding no.

But as I said, I think this is something where when the guidelines are shared, have a look and see if that indeed raises concerns about adding another phase or additional time or whether you believe it is better done at a different stage of the PDP.

But again, I think this specifically comes as well from what happened in the Phase 1 where there was a clear impact. Some of those were recognized in the report, but there were also some that I think people realized there was an impact but it wasn't

specifically spelled out what the group expected to happen with that. Which then, indeed, created feedback loops and added dialogue for the Board and quite some time instead of maybe having if it would have been dealt with at the PDP working group level, it may not have needed to get to that. So I hope that's helpful.

Okay, going to the next one. This is a bit about advance planning and engagement with the Board. Here the proposed improvement is the Council should consider sharing with the ICANN Board. And the proposed next step here was that maybe in combination with when the Council shares its strategic planning session report which typically also focuses on forward looking, what are the priorities for the year, what's the work expected to be undertaken, it could also then at that point flag what are specific items the Council anticipates delivering to the Board. Which then hopefully also will help the Board in its planning of work and consideration it needs to do or is expected to do in that work.

This is also where there was general support. There was one commenter, however, who indicated no support as they were of the view that the Board should already be able to have that information by following GNSO meetings.

Our suggestion is here that although indeed that information is available, it may be helpful for the Board to have that more on a silver tray. And it's I think from our perspective something that's fairly easy to do because it's already information that is tracked through the project list as well as the ADR. So one other suggestion was, is it possible to do that in a yearly or in a six- to nine-month timeframe?

But I think the proposed next step here is maybe we can put something together based on what's currently in the ADR and the project list. And as part of the strategic planning session the Council can look at whether that is a helpful format and whether that's helpful to share with the Board. I think that's then also probably a follow-up conversation with the Board at some point. Does this help you? Because of course, if there's no value in it, no need to do it.

But again, I think it's something that's relatively easy to do and may add some value in helping as well the advance planning and conversation with the Board on items that are in the pipeline. And then of course, depending on how often that timing changes, you can consider how often you need to send an updated version to the Board on this.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Marika. Mark, a question on this?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. About this, this might betray my ignorance of the process, but just to be sure is this a one-way street? Do we send out the SPS report and not hear back from it? Is it taken and ingested as a document by the Board, or is there any process for this to be a two-way street in which we communicate and hear back from them any impressions? Or should that be only addressed in a bilateral meeting? How exactly do we go about making this as effective as possible. As in, here's our input, what do you think about it? Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Mark, for this. Mark, I think it's meant to be as lightweight as possible. But Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks. I think this is really about kind of a calendar almost. This is not about the kind of substantive input that's coming. I think that the next improvement talks a bit more about that. And again, there may be other areas, but this is purely—at least I think from the staff's perspective—a timeline that shows which recommendations are expected to be delivered over the course of a year or however far we can predict. That's it for now. Of course, if something needs to be added on, that can be

considered. But that's not at least what we had foreseen at this stage.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Marika. And obviously, if the Board should see fit that some feedback be provided during some of the bilateral meetings, they would do what they would decide to anyway.

So mindful of time. Let's say we have another nine meetings, and we'll run over by five to ten minutes just to make sure we have some time for the dialogue with our SSAC colleagues.

MARIKA KONINGS: I think they're actually already here, so I'm fine pausing here.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: So what we'll do now...yes. So as you said, Marika, then we want to have time to review all the improvements anyway. We went through the first two. I think we get the gist of the overall feedback that we've had through the survey. And again, thanks to those who responded. I think an action item for the next Council is to take that forward on the other improvements. May not be as

easy as this number two. And to review the next steps on this. Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, thanks, Philippe. Just maybe one final comment. What we'll do is share this slide deck, which I said kind of summarizes high-level survey results as well as our suggestions for moving forward. And of course, if any of this gives anyone any heartburn or triggers any specific suggestions, I think that's also a good conversation to start maybe on the Council list.

And as you said, then I think it's also a topic for Wednesday's Council meeting and to consider how to move forward. What's the best way to finalize the review of these and confirm whether people are happy to move forward as suggested or if other further tweaking is needed. But as I said, I think we have some time as well on Wednesday to discuss that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Exactly. Thank you, Marika. We'll do that. And I would add that as to the survey results it would be good to include those who responded if only for information in addition to councilors, thinking about the SGs and Cs leaders in particular. Thanks, Marika.

So with this, I welcome Rod and Julie for the third and final item of our Sunday working session. And that's our dialogue with SSAC. I think there will be some huge interest from Council to discuss some of the items that have been on the SSAC's table over the last few months. I'm thinking about the NCAP studies in particular and other items that would relate to SubPro, abuse, and other items. So I'll give you the floor, Rod and Julie, and let's [start this].

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Great. Thank you very much and the Council for the invite. It's been far too long since we've gotten together and definitely want to try and make a much more regular habit of getting together and sharing. I know we've done a lot in the background with the SO/AC chairs and sharing ideas [and what] everybody's going on. But there's so much information, it's hard to disseminate. It's nice to be here in-person to do that.

We could spend a couple of hours talking about what you just talked about. We have a few topics that we wanted to just talk about quickly that we're going to be talking with to the Board in response to the Board questions for this meeting. And I thought it would be good to share that with the GNSO because I think some of the topics we're bringing up here are really cross-community topics where we have some thoughts about that but want to

stimulate conversation to address some of the things that we see as ways to move things forward and make the whole community stronger and better and more aware of security issues and the like. So can we have the next slide, please?

Okay, so this is one of the topic areas that we've identified as a gap in the people at the table, so to speak, having conversations around policy and implications of technology, etc., in that there's not truly a home that represents security practitioners, as it were. That could be security companies, incident response, members of the first type folks that are CERTs around the world, things like that. And they're not participating in a lot of the work that goes on at ICANN.

Yet we have a lot of—as you know, we're all well aware—there are a lot of implications around disclosure of data, incident response, DNS abuse, etc., that directly are impacting those folks. The SSAC has a bit of a representative role in that, but we actually are a diverse set of folks. We're not here to represent a viewpoint. We're here to bring together expertise and provide as much as we can a conglomerated neutral opinion around security topics. So it's not an advocacy role for a particular point of view or the like.

And then you've got the group like the PSWG but that's very focused on law enforcement. So where do the literally millions of people working on these issues on the Internet have a seat at the

table? Good question. We want to stimulate the conversation there. There may be a home for them in the GNSO. I don't know. I don't know what the right solution is, but we wanted to bring up the topic as a gap.

The other area we see is more of an evolution in how the operations of the DNS have evolved over time. And when you look back when ICANN was first formed, most of the DNS operations were being handled by ISPs. And we have an ISP group here in the GNSO. But what's happened over time is you've seen the rise of the recursive resolvers, the open public resolvers that are huge players now. You have content delivery networks and cloud providers that are doing authoritative DNS.

There's been a lot of change, and those people aren't necessarily represented or showing up here to say, hey, we've got this cool idea of technology. It's going to have a big impact on you guys. Maybe you should think about this from a policy perspective. And so we've been in kind of a reactionary mode to things like DoH and DoT and other technologies that have risen up in other areas without having a policy side thinking about that here.

So those are areas where we were like what can we do to better bring in and engage folks like that, that have direct impacts or are being directly impacted by the policies with the ICANN community. So that's one area, as I said, we're going to bring this

up with the Board. We wanted to bring it up here and have people have this conversation, at least get it started.

I don't know if you wanted to react to that before I move on to the DNS abuse topic which is the next one I wanted to do or if there were any questions or thoughts about that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Rod. Maybe we could take the topics one-by-one. I think that would be easier. Any comment on one or the other items that you have on the screen? Obviously speaking, we haven't addressed that during any Council meetings, I don't think. And there cannot be any position on this anyway. But I'd be happy to offer personal views from an ISP's perspective. But first, any comments on this? Again, those on the individual comments. I'm sorry. I should be looking at the Zoom room now. First is Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. And again, this is not just the Council. This is just an individual comment.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Please do.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So thanks, Rod. I've been thinking about this for years since it dawned in me when I was at Neustar and Neustar had acquired UltraDNS—and that was 2006—that most people at ICANN didn't realize that 99% of DNS has nothing to do with ICANN. Or ICANN has nothing to do with 99% of DNS services, even though ICANN's mission is the security and stability of the DNS.

So I've always thought that there should be a place for them. Like you, I don't know if that's in the GNSO. I don't think it is because they're not bound by such policies. But it would be great to get them here because a lot of the mitigation of DNS abuse, for example, can be done by other players whether it's a Cloudflare. I know they're a registrar too, but cloud providers that may not also be a registrar or an ISP or something. So I've always thought that there should be a place for them here.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Here, speaking straight from the Business Constituency perspective, the BC does accommodate security actors. It doesn't mean that we had an extensive history of having them, but it is a viable place for them to be because our charter does allow for it. They would actually be very welcome were they interested to join the BC under those terms.

And speaking from experience as the co-chair of the DNS abuse team, this subject came up again and again. What is the role of the different security providers within ICANN? What is the way that we can best integrate them? And this emerged as a thing that...we didn't come up with an answer for that which I think speaks highly about how this is potentially an important topic for us moving forward.

Since a very engaged group of people who are very into this couldn't find the correct answer for this to make a recommendation on it, perhaps it is something that we need to look at more holistically. Perhaps it is something that should be raised by the Council and should be discussed, especially seeing as we are entering very soon a holistic review of ICANN.

So I would like to incentivize this topic to move on, and maybe as a Council we can take this discussion further because it is very valuable and it did come up within our working procedures during this year. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Mark. Any other comment? Just to echo what Mark has just said on both items, I think we all within the ISPCP constituency, we've also struggled with convening people that would not be familiar with this ecosystem. Whether that's the security people or also the alternative resolver operators. I think

for the latter, speaking personally, this is a drastic—and it's not just me—a drastic change in the landscape.

I think people here tend to forget that all we're dealing with directly or indirectly is authoritative servers and that if what you've got in front of that changes like what we've seen over the last couple of years with the introduction of encryption and not only the protocol side of things but those who operate those systems and are present here, then potentially what we'll do here becomes somewhat irrelevant. So I think it's not only a good question but something that will need to be addressed potentially in the course of how the ecosystem is represented here. Hence, the link with the holistic review which is certainly the good remit to address that.

I'm sorry. Thomas, you were before me, in fact.

THOMAS RICKERT:

No worries whatsoever. Thank you so much. I think this is a comment in a personal capacity because there is no ISPCP position on this. But I think when it comes to the DNS we need to make a distinction between authoritative and recursive. So I think the authoritative camp is likely in the contracted parties house because that's mostly done by registries and....

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

THOMAS RICKERT: Mostly, not necessarily. But the recursive part is very often done by access providers [as well]. So I'm not aware of any access provider that doesn't offer recursive DNS resolution. So I think that they are probably able to find their home in the ISPCP, but that I think should be further discussed. And I think that probably the ISPCP can also be a home for the security part of that because it's not only about providing connectivity services but it's also to provide them in a secure fashion. But the dialogue should be continued on that one. It's a good question.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Thomas. Next is John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks. A little bit outside my field but I'm wondering if one of the homes for folks falling into that DNS operators system is more naturally within the RIRs and whether coordinating with RIRs on some policy issues might make sense. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Rod, would you like to answer to that?

ROD RASMUSSEN: This is all about throwing ideas around and so, again, stimulating the conversation. I've already heard three or four different approaches to it right here, so I think.... But I am also hearing that people have been thinking about this for quite a bit, so we'll continue since we're going to discuss this with the Board and see if there's interest in putting some thoughts together. I like the idea of the holistic review as a potential way of addressing that because it does kind of naturally fit into that. Let's review what we're doing, how we're doing it, and who's missing. And we're bringing up who's missing, so this might be an input into that process. So thank you for the input there. I'd like to move on so we can...

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Sure.

ROD RASMUSSEN: ...talk about I think something even more near and dear to your hearts here. So one of the things we want to bring up with the Board on the topic of DNS abuse is putting together a roadmap for that. So we took a look and the thought about this is that there's a lot of different work going on all over ICANN. Everybody has their DNS abuse team working on stuff. And there's been a lot of work done by ICANN Org as far as data collection, provisioning, and things like that. So there's been a lot of processes and work

done. And in the strategic plan there's some specific items around dealing with DNS abuse. So that's that slide there. Could I have the next slide?

And that's just kind of background. Again, this is just directly from the strategic plan about where this shows up. Could I get to the next slide? This is kind of background information. It gets to the...what we're looking at is saying can we bring these things together and provide the bridge between what's in the strategic plan as high-level goals in the various projects that have been going on and create a roadmap, an outline, overview—whatever you want to come up with your favorite term—but bring these things together and get a planning process around how to do this and coordinate efforts.

And we've all been talking about cross-community coordination, so we're kind of looking at it from an engineering product creation perspective. Okay, well, let's put the plan together for what that looks like. And that also might be a forcing function for us to come to things like a common definition of DNS abuse or what we're going to call the abuse we're interested in, in the community. What the remit is for ICANN and the community that is part of the ICANN community and where it's not. And where it's not, try and identify entities that should be taking those things on and coordinate or at least say, hey, can you take a look at this.

Those kinds of things that putting something like this may stimulate.

So there's been, as I said, a lot of work going on. We're proposing let's get together, and we're kind of volunteering to the Board to help do this. I'm sure others would be too. And you have a team on abuse that I think is looking at some of these same issues. So that's a conversation we'd definitely like to have is how can we coordinate where you guys have been looking at, what we're thinking about, and others to do and create a strategic plan to mitigate DNS abuse across the ICANN community that we can look to. And can I have the next slide?

Some thoughts on what that strategic plan. That would be a whole bunch of aspects around what mitigating DNS abuse is. So it's everything from the prevention side to the mitigation side, goals and expectations, etc. But putting together those types of things which some of those would be discrete work products where you examine a particular set of issues or set of practices. Bringing things together, how people are actually tackling things, and looking at that. And then creating that consistent baseline for the market participants.

That's largely contracted parties, but there are other market participants as well which is actually the next bullet point. Which is for people who are wanting to mitigate abuse and report it what

are the standards that they should be thinking about using and how do we create mechanisms to cut through all the noise and confusion that still exists in the space and try and streamline that as much as possible.

And then the overall idea is create a workplan with a timeline and the participants, who's going to be doing these various aspects of things and goals and metrics to measure that against. Because we've all been talking about this for, I don't know, what? Four years it's the number one or two issue within ICANN. And we've all been doing hard work and good stuff, but I think from our perspective it's time to coordinate this and all get together and come to at least a consensus on how we're going to tackle the plan.

It may take a while. We may have some differences of opinion about how to do it. But let's try and put it together so we actually expose the gaps and the differences so that we can be effective as an organization in addressing the issues.

So that's what we're going to bring up to the Board. We've already done some pre-shadowing with some of the members. There's a lot of appetite. And we've talked about it with the SO/AC chairs, and there was a lot of enthusiasm for bringing that together. And I know you did mention that you've got the small team stuff that you've been working on. I think it would be a great time to talk

about what you guys are doing and transition over to you and any questions you had for us as well beyond this topic.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Rod. Any comment or questions on this? I think there is—well, speaking personally—there would be some value in providing one single across-the-board, no pun intended, view on the various DNS abuse related activities within the community. So, yes, indeed, we have, as you would be aware, the small team on DNS abuse working on how from a policy perspective some of the very specific abuse can be dealt with and whether more policy work needs to be undertaken as it relates to the enforcement of the measures that people may consider. And there's actions that have been identified by the small team, and I believe that the final recommendations should be produced within the next couple of weeks if I remember our discussion yesterday.

So maybe, Paul—I hate to put you on the spot—Paul or Mark, you'd like to say a few words about where we are within the small team at the moment and the final recommendations. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Paul, kindly referred to me. Thank you, buddy. So, yeah, just a quick recap of yesterday. We are as of yesterday ready for our draft report. The team will go over very minor potential revisions,

but the document as it stands is pretty much ready. We set a deadline for 6 October for it to be circulated, and it will be included in the next Council agenda. Therefore, anybody who is very interested in DNS abuse, I suggest get together with us during the next meeting.

And from that point onward it will be no longer our responsibility but the Council's responsibility to look into the recommendations that we are making. And that's when it becomes super important that all stakeholders actually have a look at this and that we manage to engage in a constructive discussion as each councilor from each stakeholder will be the ones making the final decision on whether our recommendations make sense and whether we got it right and how do we move forward.

So a heads up on that. Let's get this conversation started, and hopefully we can move ahead with this as fast as possible and actually get the ball rolling. That would be the one-minute summary of where we are.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Mark, for this. So once this is done and depending on the feedback from the Board, I think that it would be opportune for us to get together even informally to figure out how that can be taken forward. Rod, any follow-up to Mark's introduction?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. And thanks for the update, Mark. I'm looking forward to seeing where that all comes out. I think that jives or it melds together quite well with what we're proposing and what I know other various parts of the ICANN community are looking at. And I think that we could use this as a catalyst. [inaudible] the Board [inaudible] the release of this report. Say, okay, we've got a whole bunch of stuff here. Let's coordinate across the community and make sure we've got a plan that encompasses all the concerns and covers the gaps.

And that kind of gets to the Board level to have to probably do, but if we're all pushing in the same direction and coordinating with each other, I think we can be effective. And again, it's one of those things where we've all been working hard on this. It would be really nice to have a way of showing the outside world the progress and the plan for dealing with these things as pressures mount to do something. Great to show a combined view and vision on how to deal with it with actual metrics, etc.

MARK DATYSGELD:

If I may, that's exactly right. That's exactly where I think we are, and hopefully this concerted push will allow us to get in this direction in a firm manner and get away from this endless discussion and get to action which is where we are best at. So

thank you so much for being with us today. It's already very helpful in getting us steered in the right direction.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Mark. I will add to that, that was also the interest that I expressed is to avoid duplication. I know that coordination adds extra work to some extent but also avoids repeating the same debates. So as to the need to be transparent and convey to the outside world at this particular time when, as Göran mentioned yesterday, when there are references to takeovers, etc., it's all the more timely for us to do that on such an important topic for the Internet ecosystem as a whole.

So thanks again, Rod and Julie for being here. I think it was extremely useful. Action items to be taken forward.

So with this, it concludes our morning session. Would you like to say a final word, Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Just thank you for inviting us over and indulging. I think we're actually quite aligned on some of these issues and moving things forward across the spectrum of the community. And I know you had mentioned a few things up front that you may have questions for us, so let's make—even if it's...we have six months until the next ICANN meeting. Be very happy to schedule a time

where you have questions about whether it's NCAP or other things that we've been working on for us to do a briefing for the Council. I think it would be a really good use of time if you'd like to do that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Speaking personally since that can only be personal at this point, I think it would be good that within the next three to four months there be some virtual get together that could be focused on SubPro, for example, because I know NCAP is making progress and reaching conclusions. So it would be the right time for this.

So thanks again, Rod. Thanks, everyone, for turning up at this session. Our next meeting as far as Council is concerned is I think tomorrow for our bilateral. And all the best for the constituency meetings that you all have later today. And have a good rest of your day. Thank you. Meeting adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]