
ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – GNSO Council Priorities and Prep Session
Monday, October 25, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 PDT

JULIE HEDLUND: Hello and welcome to the GNSO Council Priorities and Prep Session ICANN 72 on Monday, 25 October, 2021. My name is Julie Hedlund and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your 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. With that, I will hand the floor over to Philippe Fouquart. Philippe, you may please begin.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Julie. Hi, everyone. I put the camera on. Hopefully the bandwidth will be just enough for this. So welcome to our Priorities and Prep Session to all councilors and guests. We will have, as you can see on the screen, two items on our agenda. The first is the preparation for our bilateral sessions with the GAC later today and the Board. That's planned for tomorrow. That's for 30 minutes. And the following hour will be devoted a discussion on our priorities for the year ahead.

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.

So let's start with the first part. You will have noticed a document that was shared earlier today to the Council list for both these items, where the three questions that have been raised by the GAC for the first one and considered for the Board dialog that we will have tomorrow. That's three questions for each meeting.

So let's start with the meeting with the GAC. So just in terms of timing, as I said, we have 30 minutes for those two preps. So that's three items each. So it's just about five minutes per topic. And Nathalie, if you would keep an eye on the clock, just to make sure that we keep somewhat in time. That's fine if we spend five minutes more than intended but just to make sure we have enough time for the priorities part.

So with this, let's start with our session with the GAC. There were three questions that our GAC colleagues and we considered after discussion between the leaderships and the liaison. Thanks, Jeff, for helping putting this together. So we'll go through them quickly.

Again, these are referred to as talking points. At this point, these are essentially fit for thought and inputs to this discussion. Feel free to interject, add new elements, or even consider leading the discussions if you would like to. Thanks, Jeff. We just want to make sure that for those of you who might have not noticed the questions, you're aware of the topics that we'll be discussing in a few hours and also consider the elements that can be discussed as response with our GAC colleagues.

So let's start with the first one. That's regarding the next steps on the EPDP Phase 2A report. The GAC notes that, as you all know, there are

several minority statements that have been filed in the report regarding the balance of views that it reflects and that the GAC would welcome some insights as to whether—and you can see the question on the screen—whether that might lead to a reflection on the current PDP to ensure that it would reflect better, in their views, various “ICANN constituents and the public interest.” And they would ask for our insights on this.

So to this ... And I appreciate that, while speaking personally, the question is either too much or not enough, if you see what I mean, given that there’s no [element ability] to the suggestions—what those changes might entail anyway.

This being said, we went through several elements where we recount what the PDP considers in terms of how you can express a minority view within a final report, how this is part of the result of the working group, the fact that it is put forward to Council for consideration, the fact that for Phase 2A the set of recommendations are the best result—according to the chair—the best result that could possibly be agreed on.

And notwithstanding the fact that there are parties that would consider that this wouldn’t go far enough and others that would consider it going too far, precisely. So that would seem to be a good balance. And also mindful of the recommendation that Council monitors the future legislative developments. So that’s essentially, I think, a possible reminder—a recap of what the PDP considers to document, record the various views that would not be part of the consensus in a final report.

And that doesn't mean that ... And that's precisely consistent with the PDP.

So these are the elements that we'd like to put forward to our GAC colleagues and to the very first question. Pam, Tatiana, feel free to interject if I miss something. So with this, I've been talking too much already. I'd like to hear views as to whether that would align with the thinking of councilors in particular or whether you would like to add anything to those elements of response. Any views on this? I see Kurt first and then Greg. Kurt, hi.

KURT PRITZ:

Hi. I hope this comes across as coherent. Thanks for the thoughtful work on these talking points. To me they come across a little bit defensive. When we say things like, "This is the best outcome that we could have done," that doesn't necessarily mean it's a good outcome. I know some councilors don't think it's a good outcome. But I think we could say it is.

I think that the number of minority statements is really a feature and not a bug. In past reports, staff has interpreted the viewpoints of the different parties and sometimes that's a little bit off. So the opportunity for the parties to each say exactly what they are thinking in their own voice lends some credence to the report. So I think the number of minority statements should not reflect detrimentally on that.

And finally, when it comes to it being a good outcome, all the sides describe their issues. And on one side, there was a sense that it should

be easier to display whether an entity was a legal or natural person and what data could be described. But for others, there was a financial and legal risk and are wondering if there was real benefit to taking this risk. Part of that cost-benefit came across in the discussions. Your choice is not Kurt. I might interject with one of these comments from the cheap seats.

But anyway, I think we could put this up a little more positively than these words are—that this is a good outcome of the policy development process, and we’re working on other ways to combat abuse, and those sorts of things. Thanks for letting me speak here.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Kurt. Maybe that’s my mistake. I haven’t got the exact words off the top of my head, Keith’s words. But I used the word “best” and that’s not what we’ve got on the notes. I appreciate that it may not actually ... It certainly doesn’t reflect what some people think of what this is. I think the note says that it goes as far as it could go. But your point is well-taken. Maybe we’ll rephrase that somehow.

It shouldn’t be misconstrued as saying that there’s nothing to be learned from this, certainly. As you say, minority statements are a feature, not a bug. And that’s a totally consistent with a PDP. We’ll try to amend that in that spirit. I’m not sure we will have to or we would normally share notes with the GAC. But again, point taken. Thanks, Kurt. Assuming that’s an old hand. Greg, you’re next.

GREG DIBIASE:

Yeah. Thanks. Overall, I think these are good comments. I think that the GAC question seems to imply that if a constituency files a minority statement, they do not support the outcome of the work and I don't think that's necessarily true. You can support the work, file a minority statement, and simply be explaining a nuance of your opinion. So I'm wondering if there's something short that we could add in, saying, "Note that filing of a minority report does not mean that a constituency does not support the final recommendations. It may mean that they are just explaining a nuance of their position."

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Greg, and also a good point. Not something that we captured here and that we should have done. Yes. And you could go as far as it's not because you filed a minority statement. That is not only a nuance but a significant reservation on the output of our working group that you would not support the adoption of the final report. Those are two separate things. But yes, indeed. Very good point. Thanks, Greg. Anything else on this? Kurt, you still have your hand up. Is that an old one? It is. Okay.

So let's move on to the next topic. And that's the Scoping Team on Accuracy. Since you'll be leading this, Pam, would you mind helping us going through this?

PAM LITTLE:

Hi. Yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Pam.

PAM LITTLE: No problem. Hi, Philippe. Hi, everyone. I hope you are well. So given that we don't really have much new developments, this is just some of the input GAC has provided, as you can see here on the screen. So we are really just talking a little bit about logistics at this point.

We intend to share with the GAC that the team has started its work early this month. And given the GAC asked about timeline, we would just indicate that will be their first assignment, to develop a detailed work plan for the Council to consider. Usually, we don't even approve that. We just note it on a non-objection basis.

There's a point we made there or proposed to suggest. It's really how fast the team can progress its work. Really, it very much depends on the participants and members of that team. And we obviously welcome all those community members who have signed up and now joined that scoping team effort, including the GAC representatives.

Also, we're just going to promote a session there that will be held during later this week and welcome everyone to join the session. There's an open mic segment that everyone can chime in or provide comment or feedback to the Scoping Team, given it's a very early stage of its work.

I may also just mention about our AOB during the Council meeting, where the Council is going to consider whether to actually appoint a Council liaison to the Accuracy Scoping Team. I personally think that is a good move, to have someone there to actually be on hand, be

available to provide clarification on the charge to the Scoping Team, if needed, and closely follow the work and keep the Council informed of the progress of the Scoping Team’s work.

That’s all we have at the moment. Is there anything anyone thinks we should mention or we have missed? Please feel free to speak up. If none, I think I will hand that back to ... Oh. Will there be anyone who would be willing to talk to this topic or lead this topic? If not, I happily volunteer to do so. No? Okay. So I’ll hand that back to Philippe—hand it back to you. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, Pam. So let’s now move on to the third question. And mindful of time, I think we need to. I’m being told that we need to speed up things if we want to go through the items with the Board. So with this, I’ll turn it over to Tatiana to grow through the DNS abuse question and we’ll move on quickly to the Board. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA:

Yeah. Thank you, Philippe. Hi, everyone. I do understand that the DNS abuse topic is probably the topic where possibly any of us can say something. So we always try to compose the Council responses and interventions coming from the Council the most neutral manner that will not raise questions among you and us all about these positions we are not able to bridge just yet.

So what we’re going to do, we’re going to update the GAC on what is going on, on the Council level. And of course, I am going ... For now, it’s

the item which I'm going to cover but whoever wants to take this burden off my shoulders, please feel free to. Let me know—this exciting task—who wants to take it?

I'm going to say that the Council did maintain and is still maintaining an assigned item in the work portfolio which relates to the DNS abuse for the several months. But we are still exploring the appropriate next steps.

We do recognize that this topic is very important for Governmental Advisory Committee but also very important for our stakeholder groups and constituencies. But at this stage, we do not still have a common understanding of what is the meaning of the DNS abuse or what specific gaps need to be filled. So this is what I'm going to say and I'm also going to update them on our conversation with the Contracted Parties House DNS abuse and Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Last but not least, I want to reiterate what we already said many times, that we want to ensure that on the Council level, whatever efforts we are going to take are consistent with our remit—with our mandate or our policymaking in relation to the gTLDs.

Oh, yeah. One more point. I will also mention the substantive workload and that we are indeed ... And this is something that we're going to cover later in this session. We have to make considerations how we deal with the topic and what the timeline is. Thank you. Any questions, happy to answer. And I agree with Jeff that it would be good topic to cover for anybody from the Contracted Parties House.

So, Philippe, if you don't mind, I will also manage the queue. John, you have your hand up.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I see John has his hand up. I'm sorry, John. Go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Yeah. Just really quickly, I think that I agree with Jeff with respect to having a CPH member take this up because that's really where all this work is going on.

I think it might be overstating it a little bit to say that we're exploring appropriate next steps because it really is kind of sitting on our list of things to do. I don't want to overstate the efforts going on currently unless it's at y'all's level up there in leadership. We're essentially not really seeing much here as to the next appropriate steps. I think we're all willing to do it but there's still a lot of internal discussions at a lower level—i.e. the SO and AC levels—as to what the next steps ought to be. So that's the only thing. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Philippe, if I may address what John just said about appropriate next steps, I do believe that there was some sort of—and I know that this is a contentious topic—but I do believe that there is some sort of agreement that at least we have to talk to the CPH DNS abuse group. We have to talk to the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and get a briefing from them.

So yeah. I understand that perhaps doesn't match your vision of appropriate next steps. But I would say that we are taking steps. Sometimes it's baby steps. But also, please do not forget that we are all overloaded a bit with what we have now in terms of—or at least what we had so far in terms of PDPs, scoping teams, and so on and so forth. Just my comment. If anybody from the leadership has something to add, welcome. If not, Mark, you're the next in the queue. John, I think that's an old hand, right?

JOHN MCELWAINE: Yes.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you, John. Thank you, Tatiana. I don't know how many of you were able to make it to the session that was prior to this one, where the CPH was discussing DNS abuse. They have come forward with a very interesting and something that we definitely were missing in the community, which is a framework for trusted notifiers, which is one of the avenues forward we have on this topic. They also discuss some very interesting findings.

What I feel is that they are bringing forward a lot of a material. There is a lot of new things being brought to the table. And I would like to see the GNSO Council up-to-speed on that. I would like us to be able to keep up with the speed that they are starting to deliver these goods because they have been talking about it for a while about delivering them. But

now they are here. They are arriving. And these are things that certainly carry policy implications.

So I would like to ask from the GNSO leadership, from the ICANN staff, if we could start to clarify our role as the GNSO Council within these matters because there are certainly policy implications being brought forward. And for us to understand where we fit would be incredibly desirable moving forward, seeing the speed that things are starting to pick up. Thank you.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Mark. As an outgoing leadership, I perhaps can comment in my individual capacity here. First of all, indeed, I believe that the new Council leadership can consider this suggestion. I do believe that framework for the role, the borders for the role, are defined by our capacity and remit as the policy manager.

So here, I think that this is our starting point. I do not believe that we can jump outside of these borders. But this is my personal opinion and I'm sure that the new leadership can address this topic further with the start of the new cycle. Philippe, Pam, do you want to add anything?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

No. Not much. I think what Pam's put in the chat is an accurate reflection of where we are today. I just want to stick to what we're here for, i.e. trying to come up with elements to share with our GAC colleagues, notwithstanding the fact that, to Mark's observation, we may follow up from the CPH's initiative to consider policy work on that

basis. But that's next steps for Council, possibly—probably not relevant here.

But your point is taken, Mark. I think it's broader than what we're here for but I appreciate what you said. We'll come onto that, possibly, during the SPS, the Strategic Planning Session. Thanks, Mark. Mindful of time, Maxim, you're next on this.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I think we shouldn't conflate the marketing ideas of speed and things like that with the reality. The abuse item is not easy because I remind you all that also, it depends on the legislation of the country where the particular registry or registrar is situated. Broad ideas might not work now. Ideas and legislation vary a lot. And the DNS Abuse Framework, it's the work in progress. We shouldn't expect to build something solid on not-yet-finished ideas, just because we saw a presentation.

I think, definitely, it's something for the new leadership to take on but not necessarily right now or right away. For example, if you want a proper presentation of those ideas, it's a good idea to invite the persons involved in the DNS abuse group. I do participate in it but I am not the best speaker. Without it, we will just have another conversation. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Maxim. And in due time, they have been invited. And we'll repeat that, should we consider policy work on this. But your point is taken. Pam, to this, before we get to the questions with the board.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Philippe. Very quickly, on DNS abuse topic, I noted Jeff's suggestion to have a CPH rep or councilors to talk on this topic. I believe some of the work that the CPH DNS abuse group has been working on or is still working on is really also in collaboration with some of our GAC members—in particular, the PSWG within the GAC. So I am not sure whether the GAC really needs another inventory of what the CPH has been doing. I'm pretty sure they're pretty familiar with what the efforts are to date.

And the idea of having a more neutral person like Tatiana to lead this topic, really just for that inclusive purpose to make sure this is coming from someone more neutral, rather than CPH blowing their own trumpet about their effort.

I think as a Council, even a new Council, to deal with this topic, it needs to be really inclusive to make sure different perspectives and voices are heard. That's the idea of having Tatiana. But I have no issue of CPH councilors will want to chime in and add more details to the CPH ongoing efforts. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Pam. So just to close this and make sure the—double negative—that anyone from the CPH would like to volunteer. If not, then we'll move on. Last call. Okay. Seeing no one, we'll stick to what was planned with the spirit that you just indicated. Thank you.

So with this, let's move on to the ... Is it the fourth question? Do I have a number four? I'm slightly lost. I see that there is the item on the IGO. No. We're on the Board questions. Yes. That's the first item that we will be discussing with the Board.

Before we do this, I'll say just a couple of sentences, just to get it out of the way because we have a third item that's mainly for information to the Board. That's on the SBS. So I want to make sure that we have enough time for number two and three. So I'll say a word about the SBS and get it out of the way and then we'll move on to the IGO curative protections that were led by Tatiana, again. So Tatiana, would you help us go through this? We're with the Board now.

TATIANA TROPINA:

No, Philippe. On the screen, we're still with the GAC. I'm sorry about that. I think what you actually meant is that the Board had a question for the GNSO. And because nobody's changing the screen right now, I'm just going to talk about from that I remember.

So yes. I'm going to be leading the topic about the Board-proposed question to us, where they asked us, as they asked many stakeholder groups to provide input—comments on how we could efficiently identify and work more closely with governments globally and educate, train, and track when it comes to the—

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Sorry to jump in, Tatiana. That's not what we've got on the screen. I just want to make sure that we're in sync. So there's an IGO question with

the GAC that we just kept. That’s because I don’t think we have time. That’s fine.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. But that’s fine. It’s 30 seconds of update for the GAC no more. And I don’t think that there is something that councilors don’t know.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Exactly. So let’s move on to the questions with the Board. The first item is what I just said. I’m just repeating myself but I want to make sure that people are not lost. This is for information. Let’s skip this. That’s going to take me two sentences, just for the benefit of time. So let’s move on to point three, which is what you started talking about Tatiana. I’m sorry. There we are, number two. So the floor is yours, Tatiana. Apologies for repeating myself but I think otherwise, people will be lost.

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry. I’m lost myself so I’m sorry everybody. I’m sorry, 72 participants on this all. As you might know—many of you know—the Board asked us a question about input or comments on how we can work efficiently and more closely with the governments—how we can educate and train them and avoid these geopolitical threats, in a nutshell.

So I am going to lead this topic and I hope that it is going to be more of a discussion which I am going to moderate. We’ll look at the queue and accept your interventions because I do hope that the councilors have something to say about it from the Council perspective.

So we came up with some of the points about this question. First of all, we wonder about the assumption of this “we.” What does it refer to? Is it ICANN community as a whole, not just including ICANN Board, ICANN Org? Or is it only ICANN Board, how they can work with the governments more efficiently? So we would like to ask the Board to advise us on that point.

Then we are going to make reference about geopolitical issues, being mindful to Göran’s recent blog post, and ask the Board for any specific examples like initiative proposals, in the short term, the long term, that they would like to address in a priority.

And then we’re also going to remind the Board. I’m going to recap the Board on the prior correspondence about this. Maybe you remember. We sent a letter in 2019 about these initiatives and where we are welcome to further insight into ICANN Org’s plan for consolidating, analyzing, and sharing inputs received from the community with regard to this legislative monitoring, tracking, and everything that comes across as potentially impacting ICANN missions and operations from around the globe, from the governments.

This is all from me. I hope that I was succinct—that I was short enough. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Tatiana. Any views on this? Any views on this? The idea is essentially to try and frame the discussion that we and others will have on this particular topic during the plenary session. The essence of this

is to try and clarify the questions, including with examples of possibly targets where those inputs from the community would be useful and in what way. So that’s the spirit of this—very much along the lines of, at least what I have seen, from our SGs and Cs. Any comments on this? Things we should add? Okay. Seeing no hand.

Well then, let’s move on to point number two. That’s going to be an update on the status of Phase 1, Rec 12 and Rec 7 on the first item. You would have seen the recent response from the Board and a number of questions or assumptions that they would like to have our feedback on, on this. Pam, on the next slide, maybe you could help us go through this.

PAM LITTLE:

Sure. Thanks, Philippe. These are our Council counter-proposed topics. Basically, we were hoping to get an update from the Board on these two recommendations from Phase 1, on which the Council and the Board have had some exchange today.

And as Phillippe said, we just received a letter from ICANN Board on Recommendation 12. In that letter, the Board seemed to have made a number of assumptions or interpretations of how implementation of Recommendation 12, if adopted by the Board, would look like. And it goes into a lot of detail, surprisingly.

So given that we only just got the letter, we probably won’t have much to discuss with the Board. But suffice to say, the Council will probably have to look at this in very short order—probably an AOB in our October

meeting to see how we can address the letter. I'm also starting a conversation with my Registrars Stakeholder Group, given that this is something that really concerns how registrars implement these recommendations.

In terms of Recommendation 7, I'm not sure whether we shared with the Council list. It is my understanding that the Board is likely to adopt Recommendation 7 based on the supplemental recommendation or the last-exchanged letter from the Council to the Board. That was back in January. So maybe we could hear a little bit from the Board to see what they're thinking of with regard to Recommendation 7. I believe there's some e-mail on the IRT mailing list, which seemed to indicate that might be the way the Board is thinking, just to adopt Recommendation 7 as Council interpreted or clarified.

So I think that is on the topic of these two recommendations. Thanks, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Pam. Any comments or things that we should include? Obviously, it doesn't mean that you won't be able to jump in tomorrow. By all means, do. That's the purpose of having that exchange. But we want to make sure that you're both aware of the questions and the elements that we'll be discussing. Any inputs you'd like to make—provide to these?

Okay. Seeing no hands, I think we can move on and close, belatedly, the first part of this meeting—that was the prep session—and move on

swiftly to the priority discussion that we will have. The initial part of this session is intended to give you a brief outlook on what's ahead of us at Council for the next year using the project toolkit that you're now quite familiar with. I hope that the incoming councilors will catch up very quickly.

Based on this, we will go through a few questions for us to frame the discussion and possibly through a poll that we'll be taking, both from councilors and other participants. So with this, I'd like to hand over to either Steve or Berry. Who would like to take this and help us go through what's next for Council in terms of items that we'll be discussing in the next few months?

BERRY COBB:

Thank you. I'll be kicking off this part of the session. Then once I've gone through a quick review of the new planning tool for next year, then I'll turn it back over to Philippe to manage the rest of the call.

I think how we want to start off here is just a quick overview of what is the source of this new planning tool. For a while now, the Council should be familiar with what we call the portfolio management tool. We divide all of the different kinds of efforts, whether they're projects or ongoing work, by programs, either through RDDs, RPMs, operations, so on and so forth.

This is updated monthly and posted out onto the wiki that also provides details about the dependencies that lead up to the different phases of our particular projects. So for example, launching a PDP that then

needs adoption by the GNSO Council, that needs adoption by the ICANN Board, that then goes on to the Implementation Review Team or the consensus policies to be implemented.

All of our policy development is the same sort of structure but there are also a lot of projects in here that don't necessarily follow that same kind of model. In addition, there are some projects that the GNSO Council initiates or own, versus projects that exist out there by which the community contributes to—for example, reviews and those kinds of things. The thing about this particular tool here is that it's an eye chart for everybody to really understand what's going on except Gantt chart geeks like myself. I think Maxim qualifies in that department as well.

But what we're trying to really do is this whole portfolio tool is set up to try to have a picture over the five-year—to coincide or align with the Five-Year Strategic Plan, which kicked off, basically, the June or July of 2020. We're now in Fiscal Year 22, preparing to prepare for Fiscal Year 23, so on and so forth. And in particular, what we're interested in is what does it look like from one Council year to the next. Essentially, that starts Wednesday afternoon Seattle time when the new Council is set, leading up to next year's AGM.

This tool, though, does not do ... It's not helpful for the Council to understand, really, what's kind of in front of us. But what I want you to know is that this is the source or the foundational data by which the planning tool has been created.

So before I move to the tool, I feel that I need to constantly restate the disclaimers about how this tool is set up. It's really a planning and

forecasting tool. It's from precise. Nothing is ever perfect. Perfection is always striven for but never achieved. So with that in mind, it does not presuppose outcomes or decisions that will happen in the future but it does assume the greatest amount of possible activity.

So, for example, if we have a scoping team on a particular policy topic and the Council has initiated that work, as a default, I'm immediately going to load in, with the assumption that that scoping team will initiate or recommend that an issue report be created, once the issue report is created, that the Council would adopt to launch a PDP, that the PDP would occur, that it would go to the Council, to the Board and so on and so forth, so that we can try to better understand what the impact of that is going to look like over time.

Projected timelines, duration, completion dates. Most of these are educated guesses, based on prior experience and information that's available at the time. They shouldn't be considered commitments to specific delivery timeframes.

But I would say that for PDPs or policy work that is initiated from the GNSO—for example, our Transfers group, our IDNs group, or IGOs group, soon the Accuracy Team, and soon the Standing Committee and their work—all have specific project plans that are linked back into this. So we do have near-perfect visibility into when we can expect those things to be delivered. And why is that? It's because we own those particular projects, versus other areas that we may contribute to.

As I noted, this is generated on current available information. We update it monthly in preparation for the GNSO Council calls. And it

should be shared across the entire GNSO community and hopefully even further. But it really is a best effort on the information that is made or that I'm alerted to.

I will also state that it's not comprehensive. For example, the goal here is to really try to find anything that affects resources of the GNSO, whether that means that's staff or whether that means that's GNSO community members within your respective groups. But because I don't have visibility across everything, some of those things that may affect resources in the GNSO aren't loaded in here—things like SG and C specific type of related work, contract negotiations. Those things don't have the visibility like our policy work does. So not everything that goes on is in this tool.

The final thing I'll say, though, is this tool is like a bottle of wine. And hopefully, it will get better with age. As we continue to connect other projects into this, we get more clarity about how long certain things take, about how much resources, and so on and so forth. So again, this tool here ... I know you can't see what I'm really sharing on the screen but this is the source of the data.

So now, this takes us to what is a brand-new tool, which is essentially a filtered view of what I was having displayed up on the screen. This is the annual activity forecast. The filter on this is the date that is ... I believe it was December 31st, 2022. So anything that is going on now, all the way up to December, if any one of these rows down here fits within that filtered view, it's showing up here on this list. That's the idea of this orange-highlighted box here.

So you can see all of these projects that are listed on each row. At some point in time, in-flight activity may conclude or a new activity may start. The other thing that's important about this tool is the project owner. Who owns this? As I noted in some of my disclaimers, when the Council launches a PDP on a particular topic, they are the sponsor of this work. They own the work up until the point in time they resolve and approve any consensus recommendations coming out of it.

Once a particular project leaves the GNSO Council and goes to the Board or goes to implementation—those kinds of things—I consider us, or at least from this perspective, as contributors. Either staff or GNSO Community members will contribute to that effort, even though we may not necessarily own the project from when it's supposed to be initiated, and delivered, and so on and so forth. So this column over here is a very important indicator that I want you to be aware of.

Of course, project status, that has been in our project list for quite a while. We have planned things. We have status and health indicators of when they're on-schedule or if they're going to get into trouble. Sometimes they're on hold, so on and so forth.

Give me about seven more minutes and I'm going to run through this list at a high level. And then we'll open it up for questions and input. What I'm going to do here is start from the bottom, which is the easiest part of all of this. So you'll notice, at the bottom, is all strictly about what we call or have tagged "operations." I consider this work that we do, especially from the GNSO Council's perspective, of keeping the lights on.

We have several standing committees. We have monthly Council meetings. There's planning around those Council meetings. There's resources spent to do action items related to the Council meetings. Our Budget Committee, our Standing Selection Committee to look for new leadership and volunteers for leadership positions. We do our annual strategic planning sessions. And of course, we have three ICANN meetings within our Council year that requires planning, execution. And then an exit out of that is a key element about responding to GAC advice.

And then, of course, what is new to the operations program is the CCOICI. I'm still having trouble with how to come up with a short name for this but it's in a pilot program. They have two assignments as part of that pilot. But the intent, if the Council agrees with it, that that may itself become a standing committee as it relates to continuous improvements and some of the other things that are on the horizon.

The final thing I'll say about the operations—and I'm not even sure that I had this kind of view before—it's a considerable pie piece of our overall resource demands for dealing with operations-type stuff. If I were to put a number on it, 33% by just looking at this visually is consumed by just doing keeping-the-lights-on types of things.

Reviews. All of these, we're contributors. We don't own any of them. The only thing I'll say, ATRT3, the reason why it's here is we know that the Board is considering the recommendations. It's likely there's going to be work for the GNSO to do. We don't know what. We don't know exactly when. So you can pretty much think of this as a placeholder, just

like we have on our Action Decision Radar, that something could be coming our way. We just don't have exact visibility as to when.

Same for SSR2 or even the holistic pilot—the Holistic Review, which is supposed to be a pilot. We know it's out there. We don't know exactly when or exactly what it's going to look like. So as a placeholder, there's a possibility it could hit us in the next Council year, hence why it's showing up here on this particular page. And then, of course, we have the CSC Effectiveness Review that has just initiated.

The accountability program. The Work Stream 2 implementation. This is impacting the GNSO broadly. Most of the work, I believe, is more distributed amongst the SGs and Cs. But we know that the Council has a little bit of ownership for parts of implementing two or three of the recommendations. That is on our doorstep right now. And I believe, in the near future, the Council will be considering how to get that work done.

The Multistakeholder Model Evolution, as part of the Five-Year Strategic Plan, kind of like the reviews, it's out there. We know that it's out there. We don't know exactly when. We don't know exactly what. But it could be a part of a resource hit or require action and decisions from us here in the GNSO when that does appear for us.

The IGO program. The primary activity right now is the EPDP that just closed on public comment and is starting to review those comments in preparation for its final report. There's a lot of connectivity that goes on with everything IGOs here. Assuming that the EPDP does create

consensus recommendations and the Council adopts it, then it will go to the Board and then it goes into the IRT.

And just like we've had on the projects list for quite a while, the other IGO-related work is sitting at the Board. This is pretty much the primary critical path dependency to unstuck all of that other work that needs to be considered by the Board and/or implemented down the road. But the reason why these are here, we own this policy work. All of this other stuff, the GNSO is a contributor to. And obviously, there's an interest in the outcome whenever that work gets considered by the Board and implemented.

Transfers. It's an easy one. We're in-flight for a PDP right now. I believe the project date is approximately June 2023 to deliver its Phase 1 Final Report. But it's going to be consuming our time for the next Council year.

Expiration. This one's interesting. This is probably a perfect example about how the Council is attempting to prioritize work. You'll recall that back in November of last year, almost a year ago, the Council resolved to push out any kind of decision about requesting a policy status report on expiration. There didn't appear to be urgency. No one was aware of any issues. But at some point, the Council is on the hook to review that policy. We extended it out 18 months from that time last year.

Well, August of next year is when that decision is going to be coming up before us again. If you look at the Action Decision Radar, you'll see this item lurking at the very bottom, in the six- to nine-month range for us to eventually consider and make some sort of decision about what

should be done. The options, for example, would be to extend it again or the option is to request the PSR and see the results of the PSR before we were to make a decision about launching policy. And that should be considered in the greater context of everything else going on.

The gTLD program. There's really only ... Don't let the four rows here fool you. We know how much of a resource this is going to be. But SubPro, we know, based on the ICANN Board's latest decision that included some timeframes for when the ODP would occur. I believe it was a three-month spin-up, a 10-month ODP, and then three months for the Board to consider.

So based on those durations that were a part of the that decision to launch the ODP and plugging it into this tool, you might ask yourself, "Why don't I see the IRT for SubPro on here?" Based on the timing, that probably isn't going to be until January 2023 when the IRT may begin. That's what it's not listed here. So if we were to do this same exercise next year, of course we would see a row here for the IRT.

The IDNs Track 1, there was a letter just sent from the Board. I think right now, I had labeled this as on hold. But it looks like there is going to be some work ahead for the GNSO and the Council to respond to the Board. And of course, we have the IDNs working group going on.

And then, getting close to done here. RPMs. We know that the RPM Phase 1 Recommendations are sitting with the Board. We anticipate that they'll consider those before the end of the year. And then they need to go to implementation. Again, we don't own these two things.

But one way or another GNSO resources contribute to them to see them to their conclusion.

And also, RPMs Phase 2. What you don't see here is the policy status report that the Council is currently considering. I know that the presentation that was sent by staff does indicate some timeframes but I haven't included the PSR onto this yet until the Council understands exactly what the next steps are going to be, related to the PSR.

If that work is going to initiate, then a new row would show up here, noting that the PSR would take place based on the timeframes given. We would get the results of the PSR. The Council would consider the next steps, which would be the put together a charter drafting team to initiate the Phase 2 review of the UDRP.

And finally, the RDDDS program. There's so much going on here. This is certainly consuming a significant amount of resources, when we think about our pie piece of available resources. But we've got Phase 2 that's with the ODP, that the Board will need to consider once they get the ODA. And there's going to be an update about next steps, I believe, this week during ICANN 72. Eventually, it goes to IRT.

Phase 2A. The Council is considering it right now. Assuming that the Council adopts those recommendations, again to the Board, to the IRT. We still have the Phase 1 IRT that's still in flight.

The revision to the proposal for invoking the procedure on WHOIS privacy. That has been placed on hold based on the letter that we received from Theresa, I believe, recently. We've got two IRTs, PPSAI,

and TNT. The Council recently responded back to Org about restarting those efforts.

And of course, we've got the Accuracy Scoping team. You see here a possible staff issue report on registration data accuracy. As I noted in the disclaimer, I'm not presupposing an outcome. I think that there's a range of possible recommendations that the Scoping Team could do. But I'm choosing to load in the path of most resource consumption, one of which could be that there is additional policy work on accuracy. And if that happens, the Council will need to decide. Do we request an issue report or is there enough information that it would pass muster to be an EPDP?

But assuming that there's policy work that goes on, if you were to look at this particular section for RDA, for data accuracy, it could go on for several years to go through the PDP, through the Board and through implementation.

The final thing I'll say here—and I'm sorry for how long this is—what don't you see on here? One of the things you don't see on here is DNS abuse. I can probably find a few areas that may touch on the particular topic. In particular, there is a recommendation from SSR2 that the Board is considering that could ... There's no decision made but it could mean that there will be policy work on the topic.

There is obviously a lot of attention being devoted to this particular topic but I don't have anything tangible to call it out as a specific project here on this particular plan. It's still very vague or elusive, exactly what that kind of impact is going to be. So that's why you might not see DNS

abuse on here. But we know that the GSNO is burning a fair amount of resource on it.

So I'll stop there, turn it back to you, Philippe, and happy to answer any questions.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Berry. Before we get to the poll, I see that, Maxim, you have your hand up. Let's take your question and then we'll move on quickly to how we will approach the inputs from people in the room. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I think since we're talking about the project management, it's not just about the time, what we see now. It should have plans, persons, hours allocated, because without it, we don't see the picture. If we are speaking about prioritization, if you prioritize only time, you just lose the picture. You don't understand what's going on. So it will be a good thing to add, I'd say, some kind of crosslinks with the financial planning—at least rough—in, I'd say, hundreds of thousands of what was spent on this particular project, hours spent.

Also, since we effectively do not see the tool ... We see the snapshots of the current model of what's going on in the particular months with the projects. So the delta—I mean the difference in days, for example, for some particular project—is extremely important information. So we see that something is going to best date. Doing manual check here is just additional unneeded work. It can be done on tool level.

And third, in project management. If you see some project for which you see often changes of timeline, and each time days are increasing, it's a really bad sign. Something is going wrong there. And here, my personal opinion, that with ODP for SubPro, we see something like a pilot because ODP was ... We were told that it's kind of pilot idea. It looks like it's failing because how many months passed since the SubPro finished its work and it was approved by GSNO? It's almost 10 months.

So we need, for clarity, to add those times to the beginning of this project. If we see that, for the past 30 or 40 days, we saw few increases in timeline for OPD for SubPro, it's better. Maybe we need to say that, for this particular project, we do not need an ODP. We just use the previous model, which didn't require a couple of years in the beginning. If we see that something is failing, like a pilot, we need to be brave enough to say, "Maybe it's time to stop it." Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Maxim. I'm not sure we can address all the elements in your comments just now, including the [micromanagement] of having guesstimates of the resources that are available. We'll address that at a higher level in terms of what is the workload that is reasonably manageable by the community | the questions that we have.

Not sure how we can handle the other elements—the questions that you raised here. What I would suggest is that we go through the questions that we have here, collect the input, and see how the comments that you just made can be incorporated in the output of this meeting. I appreciate that's not quite the question answer that you

would expect from all the elements that you raised. But let's try and do that, if you would agree, Maxim.

So with this, mindful of time—we have 15 minutes left—what I would suggest is that we go through the questions that we have. Julie will help us go through this. Julie? Julie, you have your hand up. You're still muted. Do you hear me?

JULIE HEDLUND:

I'm so sorry. I did unmute and then I was muted. As you noted, since Susan Payne has entered a question into the chat in the appropriate format, I do need to read it out for the recording. It will just take a moment and then I can turn for Julie Bisland for the poll questions. Thank you.

And from, Susan Payne, question, "Why is it that the Council has raised no question with the Board about the RPMs Phase 1 Recommendations? These are "sitting with the board and we expect they will consider them by the end of the year," according to Berry. Why is the Council seemingly unconcerned that the Board is months overdue with considering and adopting these, in apparent breach of the Bylaws? What's the point of all these tracking tools if not to keep on top of what actually happens with the work that the GNSO has initiated?" End of question. Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, Susan for this. Again, I'll probably have to take that offline, the first question, simply because it was wasn't raised as a

possibility of having RPMs under our agenda for the questions with the Board. However, that’s probably something that we can discuss. I see, Pam, you have your hand up.

On the second question, that’s probably something that we can take on board as to whether those are elements that we can monitor through this tool. It also comes back to the paper that was circulated to Council on how what is delivered by Council can be monitored moving forward, including the discussions with the Board and the IRTs. So that’s totally timely. Pam, you have your hand up to this point.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Philippe. And thank you, Susan, for the question. I just want to say that, indeed, we share your concern. That is also something the Council is struggling. And we hope, in the conversation we’re going to have with the GAC later on, this will come up.

Earlier on, I touched upon two particular topics—Recommendation 7 and 12 out of the EPDP Phase 1 and other PDP outputs, as you mentioned—RPM Phase 1, SubPro, SSAD, even EPDP Phase 1. These are all just PDP implementation work piling up.

The Council does share the concern and of some community members’ frustration on this. When the timeline—once the work leaves the Council, it’s really very hard to predict. And I can understand the community want predictability and certainty but that is something we hope to have a conversation with the Board later on. So watch the space. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Pam. And thanks, Susan, for the question. With this, I think Julie Bisland, this time, can help us go through the question and the poll that we can have on the screen and that you have with the agenda as well. So there are, essentially four questions—four items that we would like you to provide your input on, given what we just discussed and with the comprehensive overview that Berry provided.

The questions are, as you could see in the agenda, is there anything missing from the list that we went through the Council should be working on? So you should see a question popping up under Zoom. So let's go through them and maybe we could—just to make sure that we collect the inputs. And we'll come back to the results and your comments once we're done with this.

Second question is, is it feasible to work on all these projects in the coming year, given the resources that you're aware of, both at Council and at SG/C level?

Third question, should Council take a more active oversight role in relation to the implementation of adopted GNSO policy recommendations? And if yes, how?

And the fourth question is, community fatigue is apparent in several projects, even those that have been identified as high-priority by some. Is this the result of Zoom COVID fatigue or are there other factors at play?

I think the last question is—and you can see them with the agenda—what can be done to counter this fatigue and make sure that the work gets done in a timely manner with active participation from all? I think that’s the last question. Do I have a poll question for this, Julie, on the what can be done? Or is it all included in the previous question? I’m looking for guidance here. It was just a yes or no. Okay. So we’ll take the inputs to discuss the how on this.

So I think now ... Is there a way that we can have the results? And maybe for the last few minutes, we could have a discussion of the data—a short one. And clearly, this is the introduction of the session that we will be taking during our strategic planning session on prioritization. We’ll take this as inputs to our discussion there and with the SG/C leaders as well.

So anything missing from the forecast? I guess it’s a split between “no” and “not sure.” Very few of us actually spotted missing elements. Any comment on this, including those who said, “I’m not sure about that?” What is any reason for this—why you responded “not sure?” Anyone? Okay. Possibly due to the sheer number of projects, which makes it difficult to say whether that’s yes or no. Okay.

Moving on, the results for question two. Is it feasible to take all this? Again, a split between “no” and “not sure.” And very few of us would say that we can definitely take those. So that’s very much in line with what we’ve heard so far, although I have to say that I wasn’t expecting that one third of us are not sure. On this, any comments. I see Kurt. You have your hand up.

KURT PRITZ:

Yep. Thanks. I don't know if this is helpful or not. To try to decide if this work can be done, it's not really a burden on the Council. We pretty much don't discuss things and just vote. But what would be helpful, if feasible, would be what's the load on the community?

So here's this effort. This is going to require two people from each stakeholder group for one year or two years. We're going to require this many leaders of these groups. Every time we have an effort, we have a call for a leader volunteer. And hopefully, one person volunteers. But how many capable leaders are in the pool, and how many are we going to need over a period of time, and how many volunteers is each stakeholder group expected to cough up for each one of these?

I wonder if the efforts can be—if there can be person power estimate for each one of these efforts laid over so people like Sam Demetriou in the RySG can say, "Boy. We're going to need to come up with 20 people over the next year," or something like that. So I don't know if there is any person power planning that can be done so we can assess, "Boy. We need 100 people. That isn't going to happen," or, "Oh, yeah. We need 25. We can probably do that." I wonder if there's some sort of either back-of-the-envelope or spreadsheet-calculated sort of manpower calculation we could do. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Kurt. I think it goes back to Maxim's observation on how we assess both the available resources and what each and every item would actually require. I think the difficulty here is obviously to guess

what's needed here. I think that, for what it's worth, it's a discussion that we need to have during the SBS.

If we were to do this for each and every item on this list, it's going to be a tremendous amount of work, just to do this. But it's certainly something that we may want to do on the major items, just to highlight to the SG and C leaders at least, how much work that would take and make sure that people have in mind the consequences of working on all of this. I think that's a point well-taken. We'll take that on board.

I don't know if staff could at least do this for part of the elements—a subset of the elements that we have on this list. That's something that we might have done already, to some extent. But that would certainly be useful, just to have the figures, even if it's just guesstimates. Any other comments on this question?

So let's move on to the third one. Should Council take a more active oversight role. The answer is "yes" for two thirds of the answers. Any one of those who said "yes" would like to elaborate on how we could do this? This is clearly a conversation we'll be having in the context of the document that I just shared that was sent by Theresa earlier, over the weekend, I think. That's the draft document developed by staff to the board, essentially. That's by and large on this particular topic. So that's something that we will take on board within the next few weeks.

Any follow-up on this, especially on how we could do this. That's one avenue that we can use to do just that. And that's also Susan's question as to how we can monitor the follow-ups of the work that we do. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here, it's just basic question because implementation is not for GNSO. It's for ICANN. ICANN means ICANN staff, and ICANN Board, and CEO. And since staff is responsible and CEO, and potentially, via CEO, to the Board, the oversight is for the Board, I think. And for us, it's spiritual oversight. That's it. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Maxim. Yes. Maybe the word “oversight” is a bit extreme. It's not strictly speaking but it's a way to follow it from, especially, the policies that we approved but the reports that went through and handed over to Board.

I think the question is really about to determine how those are not only being implemented through the IRTs but making sure that we monitor—I guess that's the right word—be it through the liaison, be the changes that we have with the ODPs, and make sure that we have all of those under the radar, and make sure the community is aware of where those items are going. I think it's also a question of transparency, to a large extent. But “oversight” is maybe too strong a word.

Mindful of time, we'll go through the results of the last question, although I think we all might know the answer. Yes. Overwhelming yes to this, unsurprisingly. As to how we can counter this, not sure that's ... Well, that's certainly a positive note to end this meeting.

But the way we work remotely and how we can improve this over time, it will be one of the two major topics of the SBS. Whether that's for the

form, whether that's for how, including leadership, we interact within Council and beyond Council in those virtual meeting times of ours, it's something that we'll be discussing during the SBS. But it's good that impression that we had is supported or confirmed by the responses that we've had here.

So mindful of time—we're already two minutes over—I think we will need to conclude our session here. We could have gone for longer than this but it's already quite late and the day is not over for a number of us, if not all, because we've got our meeting with the GAC later on. Just want to thank you for this. Again, that was just pretty much the intro of our prioritization exercise that we'll be doing during the SBS. But I think we'll need to adjourn.

So thanks again, everyone. That was much useful, I think, to every one of us. And we'll continue this at the SBS. Speak to you in a moment with our meeting with the GAC. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's session. Have a good rest of your days and evenings. Good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]