
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and GNSO Council
Wednesday, March 11, 2026 – 10:30 to 11:30 IST

LISA SAULINO

Hello, my name is Lisa Saulino. I'm the participation manager for this session. Welcome to the joint session between the ICANN Board and the Generic Name Supporting Organization. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and The Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. For our panelists today, we ask that you speak, we ask that you please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please also speak at a reasonable pace. This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the GNSO only. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience.

With that, I hand the floor over to ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Lisa. Welcome, everyone, to the joint meeting between the GNSO and the Board. Let's first start with introductions. I'm going to turn it over to Wes.

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.

WES HARDAKER I'm Wes Hardaker, the RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.

JAMES GALVIN James Galvin, ICANN Board.

OSVALDO NOVOA Osvaldo Novoa, GNSO council.

JENNIFER CHUNG Jennifer Chung, GNSO council vice chair.

SUSAN PAYNE Susan Payne, GNSO council chair.

TRIPTI SINHA Tripti Sinha, ICANN Board.

KURTIS LINDQVIST Kurtis Lindqvist, ICANN President and CEO.

SAJID RAHMAN Sajid Rahman, ICANN Board.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE Chris Buckridge, ICANN Board.

GREG DIBIASE

Greg DiBiase, ICANN Board.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, everyone, for being here. So, in an effort to have a candid discussion on various and sundry topics, both the Board and the GNSO have exchanged questions. The GNSO will go first with their questions of us. So, I'm going to turn it over to Susan. And by the way, Susan, this is Susan's first time as chair of this meeting. So, congratulations, and over to you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, Tripti. Yes, I hope you'll bear with me if I do this wrong. So I'm hoping that the slides will show our questions to you but in the meantime. Perfect, okay, yes.

So in fact, our first question to you related to the Review of Reviews, but the GNSO Council does plan to respond briefly to your question on that as well. And hoping we'll learn the views of the Board. But so maybe we'll take that when we get to the Review of Reviews and we'll move on to question two for now.

And this relates to prioritization. I think it's fair to say the GNSO Council has been struggling for some time in determining how best to prioritize a number of the different potential work efforts that we have on our plate. We're currently engaging in an exercise to try to develop a more formal process for how we prioritize.

And that will actually be part of our discussion in our council meeting later. But once we have that sort of formal process a bit more bedded down, we then have to actually do the prioritization effort itself. And so, our question is really, are there any internal or external factors that the Board is seeing and that you would like us to take into consideration? And say, for example, are there specific future risks that the Board has identified already that you feel requires more policy work that we should be bringing into the mix when we're doing this exercise?

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you very much, Susan, for the question. Greg DiBiase will be addressing this on behalf of the Board. Greg?

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Susan. So, I don't think we have a new specific risk that we can point to. So, we do appreciate the tools that are developed. I think that gives us great transparency to see what the council is working on and what's on the backlog. I think there's a general sense that the council is choosing the right topics to work on.

I haven't heard, I don't think the Board has been surprised by prioritization. It seems like what's in your backlog is what makes sense to work on. So, maybe the question, I don't think we can provide a specific risk right now, but I would highlight that we're excited about just an increased collaboration for when things do arise.

We can tackle it more efficiently, right? You're doing things like allowing Wes and I to come to your working session to talk through thorny issues. And we think that is really productive. So, maybe it's more of a matter of having these lines of communication and mechanisms open where we can come and engage as things arise and we can be more specific on working through specific knotty issues that we appreciate.

So, yeah, I wish I could give more specificity now other than we appreciate the tools. We think that's helpful to give transparency. We think that council is addressing the right topics generally, and let's keep these lines of collaboration open and maturing so when things do arise, we can get in there and help address risks.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, really quick addendum to something that was incredibly important that Greg just said, which is the communication pathways help make the whole policy process go faster. And that's one of the risks. So, in the last session with the ALAC, we actually had a discussion around the fact that policy takes so long sometimes that by the time you're done or by the time implementation of a policy is done, you end up needing to make changes or the world has altered in some way.

And as Greg said, by inviting more rapid communication, not just with the Board, but with all the constituencies and figuring out how

to get, you get that feedback sooner from an external perspective for the topics you guys were thinking about.

TRIPTI SINHA

Susan, was that helpful?

SUSAN PAYNE

Yes, thank you. We really appreciate that. And we really appreciate the, particularly the reference to the communication. I think we all will come onto this, our Board readiness efforts in a little bit, but we all have been spending quite a lot of time in the council, sort of working more collaboratively, I think with our colleagues on the Board and around the wider community and definitely feel that that's helped make the work more efficient and more productive. So, we really appreciate that. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Yes.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Susan. Jen Chung for the record. Really do appreciate that we do have, you know, increasing lines of communications, both like semi-formal, formal, and also informal. I think that really helps very much. I know GNSO Council previously wasn't quite sure how that we can relate to the Board without just, you know, throwing a letter over and that becomes quite formal. So, really do appreciate the Board caucus coming to one of our, you know,

talking to us through some matters in our working session. Do appreciate that. Okay.

SUSAN PAYNE

If we could move on to the, I hope the next slide, it should contain our next topic. Yes. This is regarding the ICANN Grant Program. Recipients of that were announced around the beginning of 2025, and many of those were two-year projects. I think some of them, a handful, were shorter duration than two years.

And our understanding is that all grant recipients are expected to complete interim reports throughout the duration of the grant to document their progress on the project and the use of the funds. And then there will be a final report from each of them when they get to the conclusion of their projects, and that should detail the achievements of the goals and objectives and so on.

Our question really is, when will we start seeing those reports particularly those interim reports being shared with the community?

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Susan. Alan Barrett, our colleague, will respond to this. And I believe he's online. Alan?

ALAN BARRETT

Thank you. Yes, this is Alan. I'm online. Thank you for the question. I have some good news, and that is that many of the grantees have

already submitted their interim reports, and some of them are already sharing detailed updates through their own website. And through their own channels.

A few publications made by a few of the grantees are linked from the Grant Program webpage. That's under ICANN.org, Grant Program. And these interim reports are being used internally by the Grant Program management to monitor their progress and to manage risk. However, I have some bad news as well, and that is that these reports are not intended to be published.

If they were going to be published, then the award recipients would have had to have been informed of that in advance, and perhaps they would have prepared their reports in a slightly different way for publication. But that has not been done. They were not informed that the reports would be published, and so we can't publish them. But perhaps in a future round, things could be done differently.

I do anticipate that there will be a Public Comment period in preparation for a future round of the Grant Program, and you will have the opportunity there to request that these interim reports be prepared for publication. Meanwhile, as the reports are provided to staff, they evaluate them. Even the Board doesn't see these reports.

But the Grant Program will continue to provide regular updates on the overall status, including things like the number of reports that have been received, any backlogs, aggregated information on

outcomes, impacts, lessons learned. But I think outcomes from individual projects are unlikely to be shared because of the, what I said before about the need to inform the grantees in advance.

The Grant Program, of course, will continue to provide updates on overall status. There was an update during the prep week session just before this ICANN 85 meeting. And just about a week ago on the 6th of March, Shayna Robinson, the Grant Program director, published a blog with program updates. So, yeah, I hope that that helps.

I do see some comments in the chat saying that the reports are supposed to be in the public interest. I do have some sympathy for that perspective, but at the moment we're unable to publish the reports. Thanks. Yeah, I see another comment in the chat saying we could tell them that the final reports must be published. I can't make any promises right now, but we can certainly take that as feedback.

And it will be considered by the staff managing the program. I can't make any promises about what the results will be, but I very much appreciate your perspective that the reports should be in the public interest. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you. Yeah, thanks for the detailed update, Alan. That's really helpful. Obviously, there's a great deal of interest, as some in the chat are expressing, in getting sort of sufficient information on

those particular grant projects and how they performed and whether they met the intents and so on.

And so, blog posts are good and they give a certain amount of information, but they tend to be quite high level. And so, I guess if it's a question of information being collated and presented rather than the actual reports being published, then certainly it would be preferable if they can be much more detailed than the kind of average blog post would be.

But I think I can channel some of the comments I'm seeing in the chat, that I feel like as a community, we probably were always expecting that these reports would be available to us. And so, I'm a bit disappointed and I'm seeing disappointment that that might not be the case.

And perhaps there is some mechanism to either go back to those recipients and ask them whether they have a problem with it being published. Perhaps if there's something in there that's truly confidential, it could be redacted. And perhaps if we aren't yet at the point where they've produced their final reports, perhaps those final reports could be produced on the understanding that they will get published to the community, because some of these grants were really substantial amounts of money and the Auction Proceed Fund in general is a huge fund.

And I think there's a real public interest in seeing that that Grant Program is delivering value. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT

Thank you very much, Susan. I'm very sympathetic to your viewpoint and I do hope that your comments can be taken into account during the remainder of the program.

TRIPTI SINHA

Yes, Susan, thank you for that feedback. We'll take that into consideration.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yes, thank you very much. Okay, and then I think it's time for our final question, which is relating to WSIS+20. And now that the process has moved on to the development of the implementation, does ICANN have any involvement in or visibility on that process? And do you envisage any impact on the current or future policy landscape that maybe we should need to know?

But I think it's in two parts, like firstly, what role does ICANN now plan to take? And then is there anything specific at this point that you feel we should be aware of and taking into consideration?

TRIPTI SINHA

So, I'd like to first, once again, thank the community for coming together and the outcome of recognizing the multi-stakeholder community and in particular, the technical community and making the IGF permanent was a very good outcome. Kurtis worked very closely with our colleagues in the ecosystem, as well as the

community to make this happen. I'm going to turn it over to him to address in more detail. Go ahead, Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you, Tripti. So, yeah, I just want to first stress that the WSIS outcomes are much broader than the ICANN mandate. So, just to scope this, we're not going to expand, we're not going to use this to expand ICANN scope.

So, one of the things that is an outcome that we are very happy about is the inclusion of Universal Acceptance, not even inside the Internet Governance part, but in the wider document. And I think that's something we have been championed and working very hard on for many years is including our own Strategic Plan. And I think we will continue to work on this and pushing that that's really something we care deeply about.

We will continue to fund the IGF and the work we do on the national IGFs. We will continue that work. Those who were here on the Monday session will have heard that there is a strategy session by the IGF Secretariat in April. So, when we talk about the implementation about this part, I think we'll have to wait and see the form and agreement and shape that comes out of that.

But we'll definitely committed to continue to support this and work with them on this and support the IGF Secretariat. And the part that comes out of the business outcomes that comes towards closer talks about Internet Governance and the multistakeholder

model, we will of course continue to strengthen and work with because that's core to ICANN.

We are very much dedicated to also continue the representing the technical community and bringing that input into the governments because that was one of the technical communities that was mentioned. It has a role in this and we'll continue to foster that and make sure we can pull input into the IGF as well.

So, we definitely have a role in the implementation. We continue to fulfill that role. I don't think we see any policy development. I think it might be a bit early because the form and shape haven't been defined yet. So, I don't think we can see anything. Obviously, the IGF is a non-binding forum. I mean, that's one of the things that make it so strong, I think, but will there be ideas and thoughts and processes coming out of there that we can build on? We don't know, but if it does, we will certainly do so.

We tend to have quite a deep representation and bring our own tracks to the IGF. And I think if we pick up on something, we will definitely bring it back and work with the GNSO on those topics, but it is too early to tell if there's any policy landscape changes.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, Kurtis. Really appreciate the update. Don't know if anyone wants to add anything. Peter? Apologies, I have just seen that Peter, who is our other vice chair and was unable to

travel, actually does have his hand up in the room and this was his question. So, I will ask Peter to speak. Thank you.

PETER AKINREMI

Thank you, Susan. My apologies that I'm unable to travel on site. Can you hear me?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Yes.

PETER AKINREMI

Awesome. Yeah, just wanted to follow up on the response. Thanks for acknowledging that some of the outcomes of those documents are actually outside the remit of ICANN. Just wanted to like get a feel whether those out of remit outcome creates a kind of indirect pressure that may affect any policy landscape is currently looking at that or discussing that. Thank you.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I think that's a very good question. I wish I knew the answer. No, but I mean, there are obviously, as you know, I mean, if we take ourselves back to December and the unanimous adoption of this in New York, for those of you who don't know, the WSIS outcome document covers a lot of aspects from access to digital broadband to AI to, a whole range of policy issues.

Various governments reserve themselves against various portions of this. Nothing really that affects us, but there's some of these

other aspects. Some of those topics, I believe, will continue to be discussed. I mean, AI governance is a very, very hot topic among governments.

That's completely outside ICANN's remit. We have no opinion on this. It has nothing to do with us. Will there be outcomes in a future policy discussion, if that even happens, that will put pressure on ICANN, possibly, but we don't even know what shape that discussion will take or data governance or any of these other topics. So, it's a little bit far out to have an opinion on this, but I think the answer to you is that we are continuously always screening the geopolitical and policy landscape for things that might affect ICANN.

I don't think that changes our attitude towards that screening and following those processes. We do tend to stress very much so that the technical layer of the internet, the foundational layer is unique. Well, it's not unique, but it's separate from the other topics or distinct from these other topics, and we should preserve a model that's worked very, very well and delivered phenomenal economic growth and stability over 20 years.

We shouldn't mix the Internet Governance topic up with the governance of AI or data locality or broadband access. I think there is a distinct policy area has to be distinct solutions. So, can I say that that will remain forever? No, and that's why we continue screening it.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks for the question, Peter, and Chris Buckridge speaking here. I just wanted to note, I think, as we look towards the post WSIS+20 landscape, and as we look at what Kurtis was talking about, the very sort of complicated governance landscape, technology landscape, technology governance landscape that we're seeing, we've spoken about how effective and important it was that ICANN worked with other organizations, ISOC and the RIRs, for instance.

I think it's also really worth highlighting that ICANN in an institutional sense, and so I'm talking about community members, Board members, staff members have been really deeply imbricated in the processes around this in the past years and also going forward. So, we've had Board members, staff members, community members on the IGF MAG being very active and productive there.

Board members, staff members, community members on the informal multi-stakeholder Sounding Board that was set up around the WSIS+20. As we go forward into this next phase, I'm sure we will have Board, staff, community members involved on the MAG and also a technical community MAG chair.

So, it's a really important period this next two years for the technical community to drive in a sense, at least have a very significant influence on how this progresses, how it develops. I think we should make sure we're taking full and best advantage of the very broad ICANN institutional ecosystem engagement in this,

make sure we're coordinating, make sure we're working together to identify priorities or issues that we want to have a very strong position on.

So, hopefully that's something we can improve and work together on as we go forward.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Kurtis, and thank you, Chris, for that comprehensive answer. I think for council, we are of course most concerned with our policymaking in the ICANN context, but Peter of course identified a really important part. There are pressures that look at the ICANN version of the Multi-Stakeholder Model and we have to be very clear if we are going to be successful in the way that we do bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy here, that we really do, do it in an effective, efficient manner.

I think going back a little bit, the pressures building up before the outcomes document came about in mid-December of last year, I think that was a big question on everyone's mind. Can we really guard and protect and strengthen the way that we do a lot of the policy here?

The answer right now with that outcome document is yes, but that's not the end of the story. Specifically, when you're looking at the outcomes document, there is one particular paragraph that calls out to the technical community. I know that of course ICANN as an institution is part of the technical community and that

particularly is strengthening existing initiatives that build digital policy and technical capacity, particularly for innovation, digital governance, civil service, and the judiciary.

So, I know a lot of it is the interplay between multilateral and multi-stakeholder, but I think hopefully the ICANN community, the ICANN Org Board as well, and of course GNSO Council continue to be able to do that. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Jennifer. The best way we uphold our model is to deliver on it effectively. And there's no other response to this, but we will ensure that that happens. And it's a collective effort by the organization, the Board, and the community. So, thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, thanks, Tripti. Yes, so we then, the Board asked us, and I think most of the community asked a couple of questions and suggested that we could consider answering one or both of them. We did decide that we would do our best to answer both. So, your first question relates to the FY26 to 30 Strategic Plan, and I won't read all of that out, but from our perspective, what are emerging trends and so on that the ICANN Board may consider?

In saying that we've answered that, I'm not sure that we've entirely answered it, but it's part of this, almost a continuation of the discussion we were just having. One of the really important areas we think relates to that strategic objective, one, about evolving and

promoting ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder Model to sustain its inclusive approach to Internet Governance, and specifically, I think, for the GNSO, it's that evolving element that we've been very focused on and grappling on in terms of how to enhance the agility and effectiveness of the policy development in detail.

It's been a kind of recurring topic, I think, in some of our GNSO and Board recent discussions, and we've, I would say, just kind of listening around the room in various of the sessions here at ICANN85, that sort of call for increased effectiveness and efficiency has been coming across quite strongly in various sessions.

So, in particular, we've been hearing about it in relation to the newly commenced DNS Abuse PDP. So, recently, the GNSO Council tasked a Small Team to review the concept of Board readiness to better ensure that recommendations that come out of GNSO policy processes are able to be approved by the Board and so that they are sort of fit for purpose, if you like, and something that can be operationalized and implemented and fits within the ICANN bylaws and mission and so on.

And this involved, in particular, an exercise of identifying lessons we could learn from some of our more recent past PDPs where some of the recommendations had not been adopted by the Board and by means of conducting a number of interviews of those involved in those efforts, including PDP chairs, Working Group members, and indeed some Board members themselves also very

kindly gave up their time to be interviewed by our small team that were working on this.

And we greatly appreciate both the Board involvement on that effort and the wider involvement from the Small Team members who conducted that work and from those who gave up their time to be interviewed. We thought it was, when we came to look at the recommendations coming out of that group, we felt as a council we needed to also have a bit of a kind of comprehensive review and understanding of what improvements might have been made over time anyway to sort of establish a baseline of what now exists compared to perhaps what existed at the time of the efforts that were the subject of the interviews.

And really what we did find, and we spent quite a bit of time during our Strategic Planning session in Barcelona earlier this year, was that many of the important lessons learned, when we looked at the changes that we've made over recent times, we have adopted a number of measures, we think that goes hopefully some way at least to meeting some of those recommendations and adding some improvements to the process.

And so, I'm thinking in particular about efforts to try to shorten the PDP timelines, which we know is very sensitive for many members of the community, and to kind of improve the outputs from the Working Groups. So, for example, the addition of Board, ICANN Board and ICANN Org liaisons to GNSO PDP Working Groups, we think has been incredibly valuable and has given an opportunity for

sort of concerns to be raised earlier, and ideally, and some slightly more collaborative efforts.

I don't know at the moment if there's been a PDP, working PDP, DNS Abuse PDP liaison identified yet by the Board, but certainly we would very much appreciate if you are able to appoint a liaison to that group, given the kind of cross-community importance of the work. We feel it would be incredibly valuable for that to be the case.

And other improvements that we've been making are things like improvements to our chartering to try to make them more narrowly focused, and particularly having a kind of key set of charter questions rather than what some past PDP charters sometimes seem to look like, which was like a dump of everyone's wish list. So, we've definitely been working on that. We also give active consideration now to what the appropriate Working Group model is for a particular PDP.

So, we definitely are trying to move away from the huge open models as the default effort, but that doesn't mean that that model will never be used. It's not the case that we've moved on to representative models as a default instead, but certainly we are trying to use a representative model where it seems more appropriate to make the work more efficient and to get things done better.

Having said all of this, I think there's always space for continuing improvement and evolution on our side. And again, we've been hearing this in the context of the abuse PDP. And there's one thing

that has been coming up from that group quite early on is the desire for kind of newer asynchronous models of tools rather to allow the Working Group members to collaborate more effectively so that more can get done between the calls, thereby hopefully reducing the work time of that effort and reducing the number of calls people need to be on if they really can collaboratively work together.

So, I know that that's an ask that's been made and hopefully it's something that some thought can be given to making that available for that PDP at a minimum at least.

So, I think to summarize, we feel a number of improvements on what we can do were definitely surfaced during the Board readiness work. We feel that a number of them actually have been started to be adopted already and have been incorporated into the two that we currently have going, the Latin Diacritics PDP and the DNS Abuse PDP. But it's obviously a continued area of importance and as we're hearing really clearly this week, there's things like efficiency of working and timelines is firmly on in people's minds.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Susan. So, your input to the Strategic Plan focuses most on the effectiveness of the model and how do we get things done rapidly. So, I do appreciate the fact that you've been very proactive actually looking at scoping the PDPs very tightly,

shortening the timeline and putting together the smaller group to look at how we can improve that.

And as Jennifer, as you mentioned, on the heels of WSIS+20, we've got to put a lot of effort into ensuring that our model is viewed as one that is effective and we get things done on time, in a timely manner. And in particular, I think our big test right now is the DNS PDP.

So, that's going to be very telling and I hope we get it right. And this is going to be a collective effort by all, by the organization, by the community and of course the Board as well. I'm going to open it up for my colleagues. Do you have any input? Yes, go ahead, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN

So, I'll just comment briefly on the DNS Abuse PDP. But add in frontier that certainly the Board, it is a priority of the Board to be dealing with effectiveness and efficiency issues and Tripti kind of addressed that. And I just want to emphasize that. We're all concerned about trying to figure out where we can improve in low-hanging fruit in particular so that we can be effective and be efficient.

The PDP abuse, it's interesting. We know, we are aware that the group is already meeting this week. It's good that it's moving along and it looks like it can actually finish rather efficiently.

Although there's a proposed schedule for a longer timeframe. I guess it depends on your point of view with successes. But the

Board is aware of the request for a liaison to this group. And that process is now active and so that will happen. And hopefully we'll have an answer to that relatively soon. Certainly, sometime before Seville or Manchester. I'll get it right. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA Jim, quick question. You said a longer timeline. What was that?

JAMES GALVIN Somewhere there's discussions in the group about a 270-day timeline for the DNS Abuse PDP.

TRIPTI SINHA The current?

JAMES GALVIN Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA That's not doing things in a timely fashion.

JAMES GALVIN No, it's not. But that's a whole different discussion.

TRIPTI SINHA All right, okay. Thank you for putting that on my radar. Greg, go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, sorry. I don't know this because I'm new. Did the council send specific recommendations back to the Board based on the Board readiness work?

SUSAN PAYNE

Not so far. We had a good discussion during our SPS. And I think indeed we may be having a further discussion possibly during today's meeting or subsequently. I mean, there were some of those recommendations from that group did talk about the kind of relationship with the Board and so on.

I think some were probably a little aspirational in terms of having more sight of documentation and things like that. But I think a lot of the key ones, I think are for us to still work out if there's anything we specifically need to send to the Board.

And actually, I should comment that some of the things that we talked about and identified also again do seem to be in train. And notice the recent announcement from Russ Weinstein about the chairing program. And that sort of identification of this sort of huge set of skills we're now expecting our PDP chairs to have is hopefully going to be met by that program. So, I think this is very iterative. But we will, if we do identify anything that we need to refer specifically to the Board, we will do so.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Tripti, can I follow up? Yeah, I think at least it would be helpful to make sure the broad themes are communicated back to the Board. I think it's been clear, like the idea that we need to be in the process, ICANN Org and the Board should be giving feedback earlier in the process to make sure we don't get to this point where there's surprises after the PDP is fully developed. I think that is well understood. But I guess just an open statement that thematic feedback like that is always helpful.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yes, apologies, I misunderstood you. Yes, that is something we will do. I thought you were asking if we had any specific recommendations we were asking of the Board. And to date, no, but yes, you're absolutely right. There will be a readout of that effort.

TRIPTI SINHA

Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Tripti, and thanks, Jim, for honing in on one of the high-interest policy development processes that we are currently or we just started.

We had four very good, very effective sessions of the Associated Domain Checks PDP. I know that we have our chair-elect in the room, but I happen to be the council liaison to this process. And I just do want to emphasize, the Work Plan that was shown is a draft

Work Plan. It is something that the Working Group will have to take a look at and finalize as well, considering through a lot of the implications and, of course, the importance of doing this work effectively too.

So, I guess speed is not the only indicator of efficiency, not efficiency, effectiveness. I think there's also a lot of willingness that I've heard during the PDP sessions and, of course, around the community, that there is a lot of willingness to come to the table to work well. And there's been straw people texts already circulated in the list.

So, I think that this PDP and all the participants in there, members, participants, observers, alternates, all of them, are really willing to work together constructively. So, I think, as said by our chair-elect, we will actively try to beat the timeline. So, I don't think there's too much cause for alarm. We're trying to count the days and prejudge what that really means for this. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN

So, I just want to amplify a bit a point that Jennifer made about the timeline being a proposal to the Working Group that they have to take on Board and evaluate and decide how they want to handle it. I'm being told in the background that the important distinction there is that was provided as input to the PDP from staff as a

proposed sort of a standard kind of way in which we look at these things.

So, I also appreciate the second comment that you made that a critical part of the participants in the group is they would like to beat the timeline that's been proposed. Maybe they'll put something different together, I don't know. But it is an open topic of discussion and just important to put that on the record. I didn't want to make it sound earlier, Tripti, that that was the defined timeline. So, I appreciate the clarification from Jennifer. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Jim. Yeah.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah. I think I would also add there, the PDP process does have a certain number of steps that kind of have to happen. There has to be a Public Comment and that kind of thing. And really, we can't shave time out of that. And so, there are a certain number of days for some of the required processes that we just, without us doing more work and seeing where we can change that. I mean, they currently, that is what stands at the moment.

But I think there are places where we can encourage everyone. It's kind of, you mentioned it being a kind of collective responsibility for us to get this done and get it right. And I think that's definitely the case. We can all, as a kind of community, if we can commit to,

we won't come back and ask for an extension on a Public Comment period.

If Paul, assuming he is appointed later today as the chair, if Paul gives a seven-day timeline table to put input in on something, well, turn it around in two. We all have a kind of collective power to move this along faster and really hoping that the Working Group will be able to do that without skimping on doing the job properly.

TRIPTI SINHA

Agree, agree, thank you. Oh, go ahead, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Susan. Yeah, I just wanted to add one more comment on the DNS Abuse PDP. We're talking about efficiencies and making it more efficient process-wise, but I guess I just don't want to skip over the fact that we also want careful consideration of these issues, right? Like, we're talking about process and we're talking about ways to improve, but I don't want people to leave this conversation thinking that these issues shouldn't be carefully considered.

So, just want to make sure that that isn't lost in our efforts, which I agree with, to make things more efficient. And then I also think that one thing we haven't said is appreciation for the volunteers that have been working on an expedited timeline. You know, we're asking things of the community, and I just wanted to note that too, that that's like a really important part.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Greg, absolutely. We will not take cut corners and make sure we do right by the PDP. I don't see any other heads around the table. Our colleague Amitabh Singhal is the chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, so I want to call out to him and say, do you have any questions, Amitabh? Do you have the right feedback that you were looking for? I mean, we're all looking for it, but he's facilitating it.

SAJID RAHMAN

Thank you, Tripti, and thank you for calling me out. And I think I was in the hall listening to this very interesting conversation around some of the strategic planning and objectives that we have in terms of improving upon our deliverables on the plans, which includes being agile.

Now, I'm very glad to hear from the GNSO that one of the big issues that has been hanging over the communities and the constituencies is about speeding up the PDP process. And I've heard some very good feedback that there is an effort towards speeding up and meeting certain deadlines and timelines.

And I think there's a lot of scope to improve that, because that is where I think the community needs to see how ICANN is not a slow-moving elephant, but it's a quicker horse. Because in a way, throughout these sessions, we have been hearing about AI and how it squeezes timelines and the work processes have become very

quick and faster. And in comparison, other processes seem so slow.

So, that contrast is actually now working on the minds of the stakeholders as to how ICANN can further improve, given the technology, the way it is moving forward. So, I just wanted to juxtapose both these two developments. On one hand, we are seen as slow. On the other hand, the technology is moving at a rapid pace. So, we need to somehow bridge that gap in terms of perception as to how we are planning to move faster and forward.

So, that is one risk I would say that we need to overcome going forward. It's not an easy task. It will take a lot of working within the constituencies, a lot of changes of thought processes as to how we approach our PDB processes. And that's something I would be willing to discuss, engage going further. But that's a good start today that I've heard from the GNSO. Thank you very much for that.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Amitabh. Thank you, everyone. So, should we just move on to the last question? We both had more or less the same question for each other.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yes, thank you. The second question was regarding the Review of Reviews. And I'm going to hand this over to Osvaldo, my colleague, who is one of the ISP GNSO councilors and actually is one of the two GNSO representatives on the Review of Reviews.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Okay, Osvaldo Novoa for the record. I am the GNSO counsel designated two persons for members of the Working Group. That would be Sophie Hay and myself. But we act in our personal opinion and capacity. We don't voice to the council our position is personal. We don't represent neither the council nor the constituencies we are part of.

Though we submit periodical updates to the council regarding the work of the group. This said, it's very difficult to answer the question because due to the way the council is formed, there is not a unified answer to your questions. We have our personal, but during the CCG meeting here, some of the councilors provided their inputs to the feedback to the group. But it's just individual opinions. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. So, from the Board, we have two members and Jim Galvin and Leon Sanchez. I don't know if he's in the room. He is here. So, actually, Jim, would you like to weigh in on this?

JAMES GALVIN

So, I think that one of the important things to bring out here in all of this is that the Board is participating in this particular CCG as an equal member of others. So, we're taking the approach that we have some principles that we're looking for, and then it's up to

Leon and myself to simply express those and move that forward as the group decides with its own consensus where we're going to go.

And we will raise any issues or concerns as any other member of the group would be. So, we don't really have a Board position, per se. We, I would say that in general, we're very supportive of what's going on with the CCG, the process, the Multi-Stakeholder Model. We're all here as a group working together. And we're satisfied with all of that.

Our principles that Leon and I are most engaged with is to ensure, as you would probably fully expect, accountability and transparency and sustainability. And those are sort of the three things that we're trying to make sure are covered in whatever the community comes up with for how to handle reviews going forward.

We're certainly not looking to be prescriptive about the solution. And I will say more personally, with respect to all of the bilaterals we've been having, we presented this question to all and very happy that the community is engaged. People are there. Happy that Susan, Osvaldo, that you guys are there contributing, participating and engaged and keeping the counts, keeping the GNSO itself up to date and getting those opinions and bringing them into the group.

That's the way we're supposed to be working and we're very happy about all of that. So, I don't know that that was a specific answer to any question, but in the larger space you're doing the right thing.

And hopefully the community agrees that we're doing a good thing, too. And if you think your Board is not representing yourself, please do let us know. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

So, I do have a couple of questions. Let's go with the first one. You said you were representing yourself. I got that's a little, I found that a little odd because each constituency sends membership to the Working Group.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Now, according to the charter, all the members of the group participate in the personal capacity. We can, and sometimes we do, transmit comments or feedback from our constituency or some stakeholder groups or the council to the group, but we don't represent the constituency.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thanks for the clarification. So, you're taking the feedback back. There is a back and forth. Okay, yes.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yes, I would say we mentioned we've got two representatives for the whole of the GNSO. So unfortunately, it's not the case that each sort of S, G, and C has their own person. But I would say Sophie Hay is one and Osvaldo is the other, and they've been doing a very good job of trying to circulate information and pushing each visiting each

of the individual groups as requested to keep them updated and get their feedback or encourage them to submit their own feedback and indeed giving sort of not quite monthly but pretty regular updates to council as well.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. So, a question for you. Do you have any, how's it going? Do you have a sense? I heard something in a prior meeting that perhaps we're not looking at the past data and how to improve reviews and so forth. What's your sense of that?

OSVALDO NOVOA

That would be my personal opinion. No, I think we are doing a good work. We are on schedule. Of course, there are differences, difference of opinions. There are some doubts. But I think that's part of the Working Group and the way the group is working, I think we will reach a result that's good for the community. There is a lot of work to do. But I'm hopeful that we can reach a draft proposal by Seville.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. Leon and Jim, do you have any questions? No. Any of my colleagues are on the table? All right.

SUSAN PAYNE

Oh, you do. Not a question, but before we wrapped up, I think we did have another thing we wanted to just mention to the Board if there's time.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Susan.

JENNIFER CHUNG

This is Jen again. Just a brief update really to the Board and I guess generally for the community as well. So, this is the update on our PDP and GGP. So, the policy development process and GNSO guidance process. I need to remember to do the long form of the acronyms as well.

The manual red lines for un-Adopting GNSO recommendations. So, we had a Public Comment. So, just a little bit of background for where this came from. So, during the council's 2025, so last year's SPS, the Strategic Planning Session, we came to a general agreement on an approach for ICANN Board, how they can reverse its adoption of a GNSO recommendation.

And during that discussion, which included the GNSO appointed Board members at that time, council agreed that the next step was to identify the proper place to document this process. So, Org and ICANN staff coordinated internally, determined the recommended location was to the updates to the ePDP, PDP and GGP manuals. And these edits seek to balance and set expectations for both the

council and the Board, but of course not seek to limit the board's fiduciary duties.

So, we discussed this approach during the last bilateral at ICANN84 and the Board was in agreement. So, following this Board agreement in November of last year, the council published these red lines in the PDP and GGP manuals to capture a proposed process to enable the Board to consider a previously adopted policy recommendation from the GNSO for Public Comment.

We received quite a lot of comments there. A lot of it, the council will be looking at it in detail during our meeting in the afternoon, but just common themes that we've identified in the comments were that this is of an exceptional nature. And it's not just about implementation delays. And there were comments about community involvement in the reversal process.

There is a lot of comments about what reporting might look like. And of course, again, the placement of the mechanism. So, once we discuss these proposed updates to the process based on these comments received, we will share it to the Board before officially approving the changes to these GNSO procedures.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. Thank you for that. Greg, go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE

So, first of all, thanks for that. I just wanted to say one AOB is that an update on the IDN and transfer policies that are pending before

the Board staff has completed their analysis. It's now going to the Board to review. But I thought that was, we want to be, work on being more transparent about where those recommendations are when they come from council and as well as things in implementation. So, wanted to note that and maybe have that as an action item going forward.

TRIPTI SINHA

All right. Any other comments, questions, input? Yes, Wes.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you very much for the status update on where the discussions lie. I appreciate that. Can I ask for one point of clarification?

It was unclear to me if you were waiting for that process to complete before you gave the Board advice about recommendation 18 and what you thought the best path forward were, or is this being worked on in parallel to solving that issue? I'm thinking of timeliness, of course.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for the difficult question there, Wes. No, we're not waiting on that effort to be completed before we have an answer on what we think is the correct path forward on REC 18. But it's, I suppose for at least some of us, it's certainly in our minds that if we were to

choose one of those three options, the process isn't in existence yet.

No, I think we're hoping to be able to come back to you within the next sort of month or so. Perhaps something that we will, if we cannot reach agreement here, and I suspect we can't because people need to sort of surface the views of their groups, but hoping we would be able to do so by the next meeting.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, thank you very much.

SUSAN PAYNE

I don't mean Seville, I mean before that.

WES HARDAKER

No, thank you very much. I think my theme for this week has been we learn from things, and we make changes accordingly and part of the process of solving that particular issue will then, of course, provide feedback to the documents that you're working on. And I agree a hundred percent it needs to be codified somewhere.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Wes. Oh, another one. Amitabh, go ahead.

SAJID RAHMAN

Thank you. So, I just wanted to also highlight the fact that the Strategic Planning Committee has undertaken the process of the

annual reviews as has been discussed before, and we are actively seeking inputs from the various constituencies and stakeholders. And we would love to hear from this GNSO Council about any inputs that they have if they identify any risks to the plan that any assumptions that they think we need to look at, and if we need to modify or update our plans. So, the inputs from the Council and the stakeholders will be very welcome while we do this exercise. Thank you so much.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, Amitabh. I've made a note that we must put that on the agenda. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

All right. We are at time. I don't see any hands, no comments. So, thank you very much. This was a good discussion. Susan, you did really fabulous. All right.

SUSAN PAYNE

Just thank you very much as well. We really appreciate these, these opportunities to meet with the Board. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]