
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO Work Session (2 of 3)
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

TERRI AGNEW

Hello and welcome to the GNSO Working Session 2 of 3. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards to Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning Statements of Interest. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in the session, and I will also post them in the chat for your reference.

Only questions posted in chat identified as a question will be read aloud during the session as time permits and when directed by the chair of the session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor back over to our GNSO chair, Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks very much, Terri. Thanks, everyone. I hope you had a good tea or coffee break. I must say I'm really starting to love this tea from our hosts here. We are in our second working session on Sunday, and we're going to kick off, first of all, with an update and conversation about the Review of Reviews. And we have with us Avri and Chris Disspain, who are two of the three co-chairs of the

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.

Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group, CCG. And I'm going to turn it over to them.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Susan. Good morning, everybody. This is Chris and this is Avri. We're going to give you a sort of update on where we're at with the Review of Reviews. We have a plenary session on Thursday morning at which we will go through a whole bunch of slides and hopefully have an open, vibrant discussion with everybody in the room. But this session is equally as important and should be as open and vibrant as possible.

We're not going to go through the slides because we think it's probably better to look at the table that we've produced. The slides refer to the table, but I think for this smaller group, we should probably stick with the table. And it's up on the screen and it's in the Zoom room. Hopefully everyone can read it. It shows where we're at, and this is a first iteration, a draft proposal for the way forward with reviews.

We're very, very much open to and keen to get as much feedback as possible from everybody in the community. Once we've done that at this meeting in Mumbai, we're going to take this away and we're going to adjust it if necessary, add to it, take things away from it, et cetera, et cetera, based on the feedback that we've got. And then we'll end up putting something out for public comment and so on. There are currently five buckets.

There may not be five buckets by the time we finish this, but there are currently five. And we're going to go through this table horizontally, so deal with the focus and the methodology and so on for each of the reviews. I think, Avri, if I just introduce each of the reviews and you take the focus that would be useful.

AVRI DORIA

Can I?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes, you go ahead. Sorry.

AVRI DORIA

Thanks. So, it's important for us to go through this and such. What I want to point out is you're not looking at the moment at a set of reviews. What you're looking at is a set of review types and the attributes that those would have. In the next phase, having talked about all these, having listened to everything that everybody has said, then we can figure out, oh, okay, we're going to do one of these kinds of reviews and we're going to do one of those kinds of reviews.

So, when we say it may not be all the buckets, that may not correspond necessarily to review in the end. And the other thing I want to say is I'm a lot more interested in hearing what you all think of it than in hearing us tell you what we think it is yet again. So, please give us your view.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

We will be quick and get out of the way of the conversation. So, to start and very briefly, there are currently five. There is an accountability and transparency bucket. There is a CIP assessment bucket, a structural review bucket, a review of reviews, and an ad hoc or on-demand review bucket.

And across all of those, the purpose is to assess whether ICANN is fulfilling its mission and its commitments and its core values, et cetera, et cetera. So, each one of these reviews has a series of boxes underneath it that deal with various different aspects. So, Avri, do you want to take us through the focus one?

AVRI DORIA

So, you'll notice, and one of the things that I've sort of enjoyed doing is looking across the rows so we're not sort of stuck in the silo of talking about one particular view, but looking at the focus that we have in the different reviews and sort of seeing them in comparison to each other so that, A, you're not doing the same thing in two, and you can see that in the row, or you're not missing something, you don't find a gap.

So, by going through it row-wise, going through it by focus, we look. So, in the focus for A, we've got commitment to the articles of incorporation, bylaws, strategic plan, financial and operational. So, the mission and core values is really what roots the A and what

is talked about, what is reviewed, what is the issue of that particular review.

Then we have also the focus of the CIP assessment is, and first of all, pointing out that with CIP, we are in a pilot. We're not really quite sure whether it's a pilot that works or not. We've seen lots of different implementations, lots of different views of whether it's working or not. So, CIP is going to probably need something special at the end of a pilot that you do have their pilot and sort of say, is this something that's going to become real? But basically, there's got to be a CIP assessment of some sort at some point.

The structural review, this is one a lot of people, and this is very GNSO, not centered, not oriented, but sort of it rises out of things we've heard within and about the GNSO that we need a structure. But it also comes from other people that said, you know, we've been the same SO/ACs, the same three of these and four of those forever.

We really should look at it and say, do we have the right structure that works for us? So, it's a thing that contains both the overall structure and perhaps some of the more particular structures, et cetera. Then there's the review of reviews, which is what we're doing now. This is something that used to be part of the ATRT, used to as one of its things. Also look at all the other reviews and do a little bit of review of review with each ATRT.

Now at the moment, we've sort of taken that away from the Bucket A review and look at it as a focus thing in its own. That basically

that we had to do it now after, what, 20 years again? Is it necessary to do it more often or not? It's one of the ones we're not really sure. Does it really merit a bucket of its own, or does it belong perhaps somewhere else? And then we have what had originally been called ad hoc reviews, which I think was one of those sad original names that you get stuck with and says the wrong thing.

We've seen that happen so many times. The cool idea at the beginning has a funny name that traps you. It's really an on-demand, it's really a situational review, and in fact, it's the bucket that we sort of say the CCT, the SSR, all these other reviews that are in the bylaws that need to happen from time to time, but they're not necessarily a must happen every three to five, seven years type of thing. They need to happen when they need to happen.

So, basically, looking at that and also looking at, are there other issues that come up and all of a sudden, we really need to do a review on the implication of cyber coin or AI or quantum or things that aren't a problem at the moment that we certainly wouldn't define a review for at the moment, but in 30 years we might need to. So, that's going across the focus review. I made him smile.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I was just smiling because I thought that's planting some seeds for future reviews there, quantum.

AVRI DORIA

I said 30 years. You'd definitely be gone by then.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Let's go through the methodology, and then we'll stop and ask for comments and questions. So, if we look at the methodology for each of the reviews, you start with the accountability and transparency one. Basically, the methodology is to evaluate the extent to which ICANN is delivering on its mission, its commitments, et cetera. And each of those reviews would be prioritized during a scoping exercise, and the review would be done by examining procedures and processes and so on.

In essence, the fundamental difference between this and what is currently ATR is that we're suggesting that the scoping be done prior to the review so that the review team can then be assembled based on what the scope is, and the scope is guardrailed, if you will, by the documentation, the mission, the bylaws, the articles, the standards of behavior, all of the other things that ICANN has as its documentation.

There's more detail as to how that would be described. Thank you, Susan. I'm here to amuse. And that would then, as I say, that would then go away and do its review. In respect to the CIP, the principle with the CIP, as Avri has said, clearly, it's currently a pilot. It's already clear that it's being dealt with in different ways, as we always knew it would, different ways by each of the different SOs and Acs, and that at some point that is going to need to be assessed.

So, there will need to be a CIP pilot review. But if you look at how you would actually just assess the work of the CIPs, then it would be a lightweight ongoing effort to confirm that each of the SOs and ACs has completed the work in accordance with the framework to test their outputs to make sure that their conclusions are supported, they make sense, and then to compare across SO and AC, to compare to make sure that they fit together, and then on an ongoing basis, to make sure that the actions that need to be taken or each CIP recommends are actually taken.

And the example that I've used for that on numerous occasions now is to say, look, if the ccNSO produces its continuous improvement report and it says, we're wonderful, we're the best SO on the planet, everyone thinks we're marvelous. And the GAC's continuing improvement report says, one of the things we'd like to know more about is the ccNSO and they never come and talk to us.

Clearly, there's a kind of mismatch there between the ccNSO's output and the GAC's output, and that's the sort of thing that you'd expect an assessment process to look at and say, maybe you guys should talk to each other a little bit more. You're not as good as you think you are. So, that's that one. Then the structural review, and here we have a couple of options and this is really important.

So, option one is that the structural review will be focused on the structure of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model as a system to recommend changes as needed to improve effectiveness or address a specific gap or need. For example, is there a need for a

new structure? It does not cover internal structures of existing SOs and ACs unless specifically requested to do so. Don't worry about by whom for the moment, but unless specifically requested to do so.

It would discuss structural issues at the request of an SO or AC and where SO and AC leaders determine the issue meets the threshold for doing so. That's one possibility. The other possibility is all of the first stuff, the focused on the ICANN structure, multi-stakeholder model, et cetera, et cetera. But it also includes a mandatory review that examines the structures themselves in terms of dynamics and placement, composition, representation.

There's a significant difference between those two things. One is if the GNSO thinks that it should be structurally reviewed because it's tried to do it itself and has failed or whatever, it can request a structural review to do so. The other is that the structural review will automatically look at each of the structures and say, you need to do some work on them. Yeah? Questions in a minute. I'll just finish up.

The review of reviews is very simple. It's an audit of the review system. And then the ad hoc reviews or the on-demand reviews are intended to address narrowly scoped topics that qualify for review. And we can talk a bit more about that when we go through. But I sense there may be some questions. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Not so much a question, it was just a sort of, oh, moment that I just had where I didn't get the kind of option two was additive to option one.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It is because if you think about it for a second, so one of the inputs we've had already is here we've had a written input and unspoken input from the ICPC, and they've said that they think that the review of the individual structures, the SOs and ACs should be mandatory. In other words, a structural review should be mandated to look at each of the structures and to make recommendations in respect to those structures.

Equally, we were with the RSSAC yesterday, and they were very clear that their view is that it shouldn't, that it should review their structure if they ask it to, but that they don't think it's appropriate that their structure should be open to a full-blown community review. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

And the one thing that I would add about them being additive is that it's really difficult to do the option two without having done option one. Because once you start changing the internal structure, there are all sorts of implications. What does it mean for NomCom? What does it mean for Board seats? What does it mean for various things are done when you start looking at that internal?

The internal structures are not atomic in that they aren't connected to all the other structures. They have an effect. We've seen the effect in various structures of reorganized stakeholder groups where all of a sudden, they didn't match the NomCom impedance or how things work. So, you cannot do the internal without doing it within the larger scale because you'll just be missing implications.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Exactly. We've got some hands up. So, Vivek and then Osvaldo. Vivek, go ahead.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah, I have read option one and option two maybe four times now, I still don't get them. Maybe that's my problem. English is not my first language. Here's a scenario, and if you can help me understand which option will help that. At the BC, we have repeatedly said that there needs to be a review of the ICANN Board as to which seats are allocated and filled in what manner. Now, if you want that review to be done, does that fit in option one or option two?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's a really good question. And it's nothing to do with your language. Our job is for us to be understood. Thank you for not understanding. It means a lot. I think the best way for me to answer that question is in a sort of slightly roundabout way. But if

you think about it this way, the structure of the GNSO as it currently exists, it's always been in the remit of the GNSO to change.

The GNSO can, if it wants to, say, we would like to look at our own structure and we would like to change it. Now, I don't know what the thresholds are within the GNSO by which that could happen, but I assume that if more than 50 of the GNSO said it wanted to do that, it could happen. It's entirely possible that you can never reach a point where you have consensus that the structure needs to be looked at and you're stuck with a structure that some of you don't think works.

So, how do you solve that problem? One way of solving that problem is a forcing function that says through the Continuous Improvement Program that when you do an assessment of that, which would be done by a cross-community working group, rather than just by the GNSO itself, says, look, it's clear that you have got some problems here with your structure. We strongly recommend you go away and you fix it. But that still puts the ball back in your court to go away and fix it.

And so, therefore, there has to be a willingness on behalf of presumably pretty much the whole of the GNSO to do that. So, what's the other alternative? And the other alternative is that there is a, in a structural review, the structure of the GNSO is looked at. And what option one says is that can only happen if there is a request for it to be done. And what option two says is it will

automatically happen in the sense that the review will look at all of the structures. Am I making sense?

AVRI DORIA

You are, but I think I want to add something that'll probably confuse it. When you get to the question of how is the Board structured, does that one require an option two? And the decision could be, having a Board composed of people elected by the SO's and AC's really doesn't make any sense anymore. Let's just have instead of NomCom selecting half the seats, behave like the IETF behaves, and have NomCom select them all. Get us out of this fighting over a new stakeholder, a new this, a new that, we need to change the Board.

So, in that case, you could do an option one restructure of the Board that did not involve looking any deeper than boards should be executive, boards should not be elected by SOs and Acs, they should come from an NomCom. That kind of option, that kind of decision could be done by an option review one only. So, that's why there's going to remain some ambiguity on who decides whether you need an option one or an option two.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's correct. And the alternative and where and where the direction I was heading in was to say that consequent upon the restructuring of the GNSO, there would obviously be consequential

changes that may very well involve changes of the Board level.
Does that make sense, Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL

I was with you till you were explaining when Avri added to point, I lost it again. So, here's my question. If we want the way the Board is currently, seats are filled to be reviewed, do we vote for option one or option two? Simple question.

AVRI DORIA

It can go either way. In other words, if we're pushing for a board that is not elected by SOs and ACs, then option one is sufficient.

VIVEK GOYAL

I don't want to present and say how it should be done. I'm saying it should be reviewed.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I understand what you're saying. I understand your question. So, I don't think it matters. I think option one and option two, both would cover Board structure. What option two mandates is that the structure of the GNSO gets looked at. What option one says is that the structure of the GNSO only gets looked at if the GNSO asks for it to be.

The structure of the Board can be looked at either as a discrete piece of work that is looking only at the structure of the Board, or the structure of the Board must get looked at if the structure of the

SOs and ACs changes. So, clearly, for example, if we introduced a new supporting organization for, oh, I don't know, hosting companies, just say, that would then have consequential requirements of probable change to the Board structure, right?

So, there are two ways of looking at the Board structure. There's three ways, actually. One is new stuff comes in or old stuff goes. The second is there's restructuring of the existing stuff, which means that the Board structure needs to change. And the third is you look at the Board structure anyway because you should and decide what changes.

So, I don't think it matters from the point of view of the Board structure, I think it matters from the point of view of the individual SO and AC structures, whether you go for one or two. But let's let others have a question, and then we'll circle back.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. I'll come back again.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Osvaldo, Susan, and Volker.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Yes, Osvaldo for the record. No, I just wanted to make a clarification. The structural review, the ISPCP is supporting or recommending. It's basically what's included in the holistic review

that the ATRT3 recommended. It's basically that part of the holistic review. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thank you. So, again, I suppose because of the GNSO and it's got a fairly complicated structure, we're probably all quite heavily focused on that one, and indeed, I am. And I can see some further conversation needed about, let's go back to the SSAC first of all, that kind of like the SSAC focused, say, on option one, no, you only review us if we ask you to.

But what happens if everyone else thinks there's a problem with the SSAC? You know, the SSAC think they're great, but we don't think they're great. I'm not saying that, that's not on the record. But do you know what I mean? And this doesn't address that. So, that's my first concern.

And then my second one is, is again, going back to the GNSO and its particularly complicated structure. There could be quite a significant part of the GNSO that thinks the GNSO needs to be reviewed, but it doesn't rise to the level that they're going to ever get a vote in Council to have that.

And so, it's kind of the same point, what do you do about the people who feel like they don't have the ability to influence the decision. And so, mandatory is maybe too onerous, but is there a mechanism so that we can kick in when we don't hit the need to request one?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Those are both exceptionally good points and can be answered I think by some small changes. And again, I just want to say I'm talking for myself here. But if you look at option one at the moment, at the bottom it says, does not cover internal structures of existing SOs/ACs unless specifically requested, discuss structural issues at the request of SO or AC and where SO/AC leaders determine the issue meets a threshold.

What you could say is you could say at the request of the SO or AC or in circumstances where there is sufficient pull from the community generally to say you should look at it. So, for example, then you could have a situation where the SSAC or it was actually the RSSAC that we were at. But you could have a situation where, as you quite rightly say, all the SOs and ACs say the RSSAC is useless.

We've got a total waste of time, we should review them. That's one thing. And then the other thing would be for the portion of the GNSO that has the issue to go to At-Large and to go to others and say, would you support a request for a review of the structure of the GNSO? Now, I don't know how that would work, but that is an alternative way of doing it, which is what you asked.

AVRI DORIA

And we have a separate row where we've talked about what is the threshold? What is it that kicks off a review? So, it's not all bound up just in this one little box.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

And the only other point I would make, and I do acknowledge that this is easy for me to say, is that we cannot create an ICANN-wide review system simply to solve a problem in the GNSO. It needs to get as close as it possibly can be to help solve that problem, but it may be that the actual system itself can put some levers in place that can be used to do it, but we can't make it happen because it really is a matter for the GNSO.

And I think if you were sitting in the ccNSO right now, they would say it's up to us, and it's not up to you. So, there is the rest of the community to take into account as well, I think. But I'm not pushing one or the other, I'm just saying I think those are the realities.

AVRI DORIA

And you do have a historical. I mean, at the moment, the structure of the GNSO, just to look at it historically, is just a pilot that was being tried for a couple of years and decide whether it would work or not. Nobody's ever gone back and said, gee, we need to review that, nor is there a mechanism that allows that to happen.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Perhaps we'll take some more questions, and I'll circle back because I want to give everyone their turn. I've got Volker, and then I don't know. I apologize for not being able to pronounce your name. Gaurav, Gaurav. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN

Yes, thank you. Volker Greimann, a freshman councilor from the RRSg. I have two questions. The first question being, what is the balance being sought between internal review and external review? I'm aware that if you only have an internal review, then you might face the situation of the group of blind men trying to discard the elephant because they only see the part that they know and they can feel, whereas the external reviewer might not have the in-depth knowledge and would be hard-pressed to see all the intricacies.

So, there's a balance to be achieved there. That's the first question. The second question is, proposing that now we have review, the results are in, what is the further process? Could the ICANN Board just sit on it and say, no, we're not going to do it? Actually, we don't think that's the right idea, that's not the way forward. Or is there some mechanism that actually will cause change based on the review?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think on your first point, point on experts, I think if further on in the table, and we can discuss this if we get to it but otherwise we'll talk about it in the plenary is it's open to any of these reviews to say we want expert input, and frankly I think I would recommend personally say to everybody if you haven't got an independent

expert in, fish can't see water, so you need someone else who can see the water.

But then, of course, you've got the disadvantage of the fact that they don't necessarily understand. But that's okay because the education process of teaching them is what works to make it a valuable exercise. In respect to the status of recommendations, again, it's covered to some extent in the table. Recommendations will go to the Board, obviously, but we need to build in some factors to make sure that these things get dealt with properly and in a timely manner. Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, I think there's two things. One is to have an expert doesn't mean you only have an expert. So, you can have an expert that's also working with the internal review, and probably that would probably be the best balancing act that you can have is not to rely on either one completely.

And, yeah, we already have some notion of the board's decisions being mitigated by the EC. This doesn't necessarily call that out, but it could. So, the Board saying, sorry, we reject the review is indeed a decision that would be EC reviewed that then does have a backstop to it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Valker. Gaurav.

GAURAV VEDI

Hi, Gaurav VEDI, NomCom appointee for the Contracted Party House. Can you please explain what is the subtle difference between CIP assessment and structural review? Because the way I read it, and again, it's a lack of understanding maybe on my end, but I see that there's a bit of overlap between both of CIP assessment and structural review. So, does that entail, let's say based on the results of CIP assessment, the output of that, if identifies any structural challenges with supporting organizations or advising committees, does that automatically entail or triggers the structural review consideration?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Really good question. So, I think that if you follow the sort of process, the CIP review or assessment is looking at all sorts of things. Structure is only one of them, and it may not even come up. But is the process been done properly? Do the results make sense? Have the right conclusions been reached?

If it becomes clear in the CIP assessment that there may be a structural issue, then what we think is that that assessment would go back to the SO/AC and say, we think you have a structural problem, you should go away and sort that out. The point about the structural review is if they can't sort it out, then how do you fix the problem?

And the answer is you fix the problem in a structural review. But where we're struggling is how do you get the problem into the structural review? Do you say it is mandatory to look at it or do you wait to be requested? That's the fundamental difference. Does that make sense? Cool. Thank you. Jen

JENNIFER CHUNG

Hi. Jen Chung for the record. A question I had as I'm going through this really lovely table is when I get to the row that says recipients of outputs, we kind of stop there, and there's no kind of row underneath that looks to who implements these things. And I guess maybe the answer is depends, but that is also prompted by the question and the comments we just had from Volker.

If there's going to be some kind of mechanism or backstop or come some “appeals” or if an SO and AC doesn't agree with a certain thing that was reviewed, they can be like, we're not going to implement it. Is there such a fear or a problem now we're back to catch-22?

AVRI DORIA

Something beyond the EC that we have now that reviews any Board decision. No, at the moment, there isn't.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No, there isn't. But I think, again, it's a really good question, but it's complicated. If the recommendations go to the Board, then there is a process. And what we could easily do, if we chose to do so, is

to lift recommendations from certain reviews to a level where the Board can only reject them. in certain circumstances, like the GAC advice, for example, you could do that. Where the recommendations go directly to an SO and AC, where is that going to come from? It's going to come from a CIP assessment, which is intended to be lightweight.

So, it isn't intended to force issues, it's more intended to be advisory. Or it's going to come from a structural review. And if it comes from a structural review, that's going to be a cross-community, full-blown, cross-community working group review. It's going to be pretty hard, given that the GNSO will have been a part of that. Those recommendations will get signed off if you personally don't agree.

Well, you don't personally agree, but the GNSO will have signed off, and then there's an implementation. So, I'm not sure. I mean, I get it, but it's really, really hard to build... If it's an ICANN structure, then it's ICANN that has to implement the change to that structure. And if you look at the way that the GNSO's current structure, and Avri, you were there, I think, the GNSO's current structure was put in place.

In essence, what happened was the GNSO couldn't reach consensus. The Organizational Review Committee of the Board, which is basically, at the time, was Ray Polzak, said, you will be structured in this way for now until you can figure out a way of changing it. And it just happened.

AVRI DORIA Not quite.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Not quite.

AVRI DORIA Just a bit for the history, yeah, I was there. The Board decided that there would be equal seating for all the groups and enough of all this. If you guys don't like it, we will take seven of you and put you in a room for a month virtually, and you have a chance to come out with something different.

And if you come out with consensus, with something different, which is this bicameral structure with the various divisions that you've got now, then we will go with that. And that's what, basically, there were seven people that came up with that one. It was only one that quibbled and had disagreements, but by and large, there was an acceptable consensus on it.

And it was put in as, here, let's try this for now. So, that's the situation you're in, is that you have a structure that was decided by seven people many years ago. I forget how many years ago, but many years ago. This was when I was still chair of the GNSO, I think. That you're still living with.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Benjamin, and then Anne.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE

Thank you, Benjamin, for the records, NCSG councilor. So, I wanted to ask that, taking from the experience that I witnessed in CIP process, how is it going to be possible for review of reviews to get everybody on board to agree on probably similar indicators or definitions to have all multiple structures or stakeholders assess or review the same way. That's my first question.

The second one would be, is there anything that is going to be in the review of reviews that is going to prevent weaponizing? Because there are some things you're mentioning, like if a group sees that this group is no longer relevant or the way they are structured, is there something in a mechanism in the review of reviews to prevent that from happening, to weaponize the process against another group?

AVRI DORIA

I think the first question, and I'll jump on in this one, and then you can correct me, is that one of the things that the Board was concerned about when they said, here, you guys come together, it's almost like it was the last time. You guys come together, come to a consensus on what you want to do, or we'll go back to the old stuff that we were using.

And that perhaps is enough of a forcing function for people that disliked the previous structure, the ATRT3 with its decisions and so

on and so forth. And that basically, we go forward as we had, that this was an escape path for us to try and get out of something that so many people were complaining about.

And here, come to consensus for a way to come out of it, or we go back to what we had. Is that enough of a forcing function? I don't know. My answer to your second one, and this is purely my personal view of the world, is there's nothing that can stop people from weaponizing anything.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE

Thank you, Avri.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

For the positive comment.

AVRI DORIA

You got to not want to weaponize, but if you want to weaponize, you can.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah. I mean, look, the vast majority of this stuff that we do in ICANN is built around good faith, and sometimes I don't think we give each other enough credit for the fact that we actually mostly do operate in good faith. What we tend to do is get stuck in the weeds in our own personal little silo and wish that it could be better

than it is. But actually, when you think about what we get done, it's not that bad. Anne, the floor is yours.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thanks so much, Chris. And thanks, Avri. This is Anne, a NomCom non-voting councilor, and probably can anticipate that I'd like to go back to Bucket A with accountability and transparency. Thank you for the revisions that have been done there. I would like to ask a question regarding methodology under Bucket A for accountability and transparency. I think I've, as an observer, communicated this question a little bit in the past, and maybe there's been more discussion on it, but my question is about scoping.

Okay, evaluate the extent to which ICANN's delivering on aspects of its mission, commitments, and core values as prioritized during scoping. So, have you had an opportunity to talk more about scoping procedures since, of course, commitments and core values, that's a very, very broad topic. And I think I previously suggested a systematic rolling look at different commitments and different core values over period of several years by looking at one at a time or two at a time.

But I think that what the group's been discussing is folks getting together to determine the scope before conducting the review. And I have some concerns that there could be significant levels of

disagreement and significant delays involved in the scoping exercise. So, has there been more discussion on that point?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes. I think what you're suggesting is that in essence, you create a list of the aspects, a complete list of the mission commitments, core values, et cetera, et cetera. And you divide those up and say over an X number of reviews, we will complete this whole list.

I think where we seem to be heading is to say, no, let the community say that in this review that starts in six months' time, say, we think that the priorities under the banner of the delivery of mission commitments, core values, and so on, to look at are these, rather than saying you must look at this, because I think we think that it's better that the community has the control over the review.

Now, I accept your point that it's possible that there could be disagreements and arguments about that, and I think that's something that we need to take away and think about, because we've been working on the principle that the community would be able through whatever mechanism we decide, and there has been some proposals it could be the leadership of the SOs and ACs across the Board, it could be all sorts of different things.

But I think your point's a valid point and I think it's something that we should go in and consider a little bit more, so thank you for raising it. If you want to respond you're welcome to do so.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

No, just thanks so much, Chris, I do think it's important for the group to consider. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

There's an interesting discussion in the chat or some comments in the chat about what I think we're talking about past reviews, are we, Susan, where we're talking about structure was specifically excluded? That's the GNSO review. I just wanted to make sure I was clear about that. But your hand is up, so go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE

And this is just a really personal comment, but it is based on some things I have sort of heard just as we've been going through some of the sessions in the last couple of days. Currently, we've got a sort of set of bylaws reviews, and I understand your job here is to review them and work out which ones need to stay, but we've got various ones that for years have been considered important enough that they're enshrined in the bylaws.

And most of them are now being consigned into the sort of bucket five or whatever Bucket E kind of ad hoc, kind of as and when if someone thinks we need one. And we seem to have gone from the extreme of they are so important, they have to be every five years, they're in the bylaws to kind of not quite in the bin, but hovering over it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So, that's a perfectly valid question, and it's been asked by other people. So, I think there are a couple of things to say. The first is, and again, I'm speaking personally, I think that I was in the room when those reviews were written down on the back of an envelope. I'm exaggerating slightly, there wasn't an envelope involved. But in essence, Larry Strickling and Paul Levens, who was at ICANN at the time, said these are the reviews that will be done.

So, they're in the bylaws. I'm not suggesting they're not important, but they were plucked out of thin air, really, in essence. Secondly, the recommendations in ATR3 contemplated that those reviews would, in essence, stop. What we're saying is, we think if we can create a mechanism that enables reviews to happen subject to a threshold, which we haven't got to yet, but obviously it needs to be a reasonably high threshold, but it doesn't need to be so high that we never get to it, that if those reviews needed to be run, they could be run.

And I think that is a better mechanism than forcing them to be run come what may, when there may or may not be a need for them. Also, the other challenge is, I think, if you go back and look at the bylaws, part of the challenge was the way that the scope of those reviews was structured. ATR has been okay because ATR basically was, get the people in a room, you can look at whatever you want to look at, but you should look at these as well. And we're sort of switching that around slightly.

But in the case of the other reviews, it was never been particularly clear what it was they were actually supposed to do in the case of security, stability, and review. That was kind of a weird construct of things. Not saying it's unimportant, it's just that I think it was badly defined.

So, I think it's better that we trust the community, we say, here's a thing, it should be reviewed, let's write a scope for it, and rather than sort of putting that in the bylaws and saying, you must do this every three or four or five or six years, do it as and when necessary. I think, again, speaking entirely personally, it's about growing up and trusting ourselves that if we need to do something, we're capable of doing it. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

And to add to that, that's one of the reasons I said at the beginning, it's an unfortunate first naming of the ad hoc. There was another problem that occurred with that is no matter what kind of timing you put on a fixed cycle, eventually they synchronize. Eventually you find yourself in a situation where they may all be in different stages, but all of a sudden, you've got all six of them. And at various times, we spent exercises, how can we do that?

Now, ATRT3 went through and came up with formulaic methods of saying, you can keep them and you can come up with a formula that may be sufficiently complicated, that can keep them from synchronizing. But the point is, one of the drivers of all this is how do we keep from doing six reviews at the same time? Maybe one or

two at the same time can work, but six reviews at the same time doesn't work.

And somehow anything we tried to get them to desynchronize, they always came to a point where you turned around and all of them were gone. They weren't all at the same phase, but they were all going on at the same time, and that's when it became impossibly too much for people to handle. And as I say, the ad hoc is really an unfortunate naming. It's a way of saying not on a regular schedule, but initiated when needed.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Maybe it's community-initiated review. But we've struggled with the name, so let's not.

AVRI DORIA

Exactly.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I mean, I tried to rename the buckets yesterday, and that was a total disaster. So, let's not do that.

AVRI DORIA

Just admit that ad hoc is an unfortunate first name. Always be careful of the first name you attach to this thing.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

On demand may be the go-to expression. We've got 10 minutes left. Anne, go ahead, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thanks so much, Chris and Avri, it's Anne again. And I do share Susan's concerns regarding what's been put into bucket five that had been emphasized in the bylaws or has been emphasized in the bylaws. And I know that talking about it as something that's written on the back of an envelope makes it sound kind of casual, but I honestly, I doubt it was casual in nature.

And I think that we need to be concerned as well with respect to how good the community is at reviewing itself and just “trusting the community to review itself.” We do have various accountability mechanisms like empowered community and request for reconsideration, and we have independent review process.

But as I think many already know, in a recent, well, not that recent, I guess, independent review process decision, it was determined that ICANN itself did not honor its transparency obligations. And so, I think the notion that, hey, let's just trust the community to review whatever the community thinks is important, especially when you're using a process that is actually, I believe Board triggered, it's Board triggered.

What we're doing here would require amendments to the bylaws. And so, I'm not quite as confident that it will be as objective as you suggest. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thanks. Jumping quickly. First of all, I think there was something intentional when in the transition, these were not made fundamental bylaws. And I have to say at the time, as one of the ones that was working on this, I had requested that they be fundamental, but there was a decision made that, no, they don't rise to the level of the fundamental bylaw.

So, that means that there are bylaws that can be changed, and that's really all that's being spoken of here. And there's absolutely no reason why any of these review types that we're saying are perhaps on demand and not on a regular schedule would not also be in the bylaws with the demand and the threshold that drives them being defined.

It's not that they go into a bucket and are forgotten about. It's not a forgotten bucket. It's a bucket that also represents a bylaw candidate to sort of say, CCT is important and after every round, there should be one, or after three rounds, there should be one, or when such and such happens and defining the thresholds that do one of those.

All we're saying here is that these reviews do not look like they are properly situated as reviews that are on a regular repeating schedule. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

And just one tiny point in addition to that, which is that in essence, this is what, not so much the on-demand review, but this is what ATR3 anticipated would occur. But anyway, we're running out of time. We've covered a huge amount of ground. I appreciate everyone's comments. And I know that there are very specific sections of this table that are very important to the GNSO. So, we've got a lot more discussion to have, and you guys have got a lot of things to sort of take away and think about.

And I know that Sophie is running a whole heap of sessions with the individual stakeholder groups of the GNSO spread throughout this week. And there are sessions with the GAC and At-Large and so on and so forth. And the plenary is on Thursday morning. Please come to the plenary and make us feel loved. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

I think I will just say an apologies in advance. Everyone else in the room, do please go. But I think that plenary clashes with our SSAD discussion with on the next steps, which is a bit unfortunate, which is why it's so good that we have this opportunity.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

We'll survive.

AVRI DORIA

And we can find other times to talk, even if it's in a phone call. We don't have to end any of these conversations. There's rows we didn't get to that might have important either solutions or new

problems that would affect the discussion. And I think we'll set up a phone call with any or all of you as necessary as we're moving forward.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Very happy to do that. Sophie's hand is up. Sophie.

SOPHIE HEY

I'd just like to do another pitch for you can also send input to the mailing list, infoonreviews@icann.org. I've got it memorized now. And you can also sign up as an observer so you can join calls and pitch your ideas to the group directly. Our co-chairs have a very flexible observer policy.

But also to reiterate, Osvaldo and I, we gave you an update in, I think it was your January meeting. So, if you want us in future meetings, please say. Sorry, Osvaldo, I hope I'm not promising things you don't want to do. But yeah, happy to come along and chat with you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It's worth saying, I think, that just to pick up on the phone call thing, I do think that each of the SOs and ACs, when we finish all of this, is obviously going, there's going to be public comment, it's going to be buy-in, we want each of the SOs and ACs to buy into what we're saying. You guys are going to be the most difficult simply because you probably won't all be on the same page.

So, what I think, we really do need to have these conversations clearly with you and get some ideas from you about ways of working through this that help you to fix a very specific problem that you have whilst not ruining the whole, ruining is a bit strong, but you know what I mean, interfering with the whole thing for everybody else. So, let's think about that, and Susan, Jen, let's see if we can get this on the agenda and have a special GNSO discussions. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thank you very much. I think yeah, we'll see what we can do to schedule something. That would be really appreciated. Anything you want to say?

AVRI DORIA

I think at the end of the day, you guys have to approve it. We can't do anything, the group can't do anything that you guys don't buy into at least grudgingly.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, it is worth us all remembering, like, ultimately, there'll be things like bylaw changes that come out of this. So, there's a whole host of approval stuff that has to happen. Yeah, okay. Well, thank you so much for coming and joining us.

And feel free to stay here if you'd like to, or you may well have other places you now need to go and present to. Next up, Edmon Chung

is here with us to talk about the work of the Universal Acceptance Group. And I think next steps and so on. So, over to you, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG

Edmon here. Thank you. So, yeah, I thank you for having the time here. I don't know how much time I have. It seems like I have plenty of time, but five minutes. No, I'll keep it pretty brief. I'm not going to talk about the background. I have a bunch of slides, but I wanted to start with highlighting that this is a report created by the UA Expert Working Group, and it's focused on providing guidance to ICANN staff team for their work on UA. So, it's not covering the community efforts on UA and those kinds of things. So, I just want to make sure that's the scope and the frame of it.

Can you jump to slide four? And so, this was created by the Board resolution back in March last year. And the group came together in August last year, and we've been having weekly calls to put together the report. That is out for public comments right now. Public comments is until April 13th or 14th, I forgot, mid-April, and really hope to hear feedback from GNSO because it's important and I'm sure we have blind spots that that could be used, feedback would be useful.

Going to the next slide, the makeup of the group is a little bit interesting, I guess. It includes representatives from the SO and ACs, including from, well, Nitin from GNSO, and then also from GAC,

ALAC, SSAC, ccNSO. And we had a board liaison to the team, to the group.

And next slide, please. And as an Expert Working Group, what is interesting is we also have some outside experts, including from UNESCO, from Unicode Consortium, from the W3C, a former IAB member from China, from Big Tech, and from academia. And that provides us with a kind of a perspective on creating those guidelines.

And if you can jump to slide nine. The work itself is organized by a charter with 10 questions, really, and we looked at how ICANN should engage with big tech, open-source communities, standards bodies, and software development professionals, system administrators, hosting providers, but also DNS industries, so registries and registrars specifically, and also to other aspects.

Looking at time, I will spend about three minutes just to highlight some of the kind of recommendations that I find is interesting. What we found is that there are two overarching concepts that ICANN needs to promote out, which is the issue of UA is really a broader matter of internationalization and the multilingual Internet. It has to be wrapped up in that in order to get the kind of motivations from other organizations to pick it up. And the other important overarching thing is that there are different stakeholders that will play roles in it. And the messaging to the different stakeholders needs to be customized.

Then particularly on big tech, one interesting thing is identifying that there are multiple value dimensions, not only business value, but also social and cultural value. And then also have a full tech stack consideration because UA is not something that is only on particular layer, but touches on all layers in the tech stack.

For open-source, an interesting observation was that it needs to focus on both verticals and horizontals. When we talk about horizontal, it means particular components of open-source code that is used across different platforms, like email validation and so on, but also verticals, popular platforms like WordPress and so on.

In terms of standard bodies, interesting thing is we believe that the RFCs at IETF already describes what we need, but bringing those to other standard bodies like credentials that use email address or any authentication process that requires domain names, the UA work needs to be brought down.

And then we found out one interesting thing about software developers, hosting providers, and system administrators is that the pool of talent for internationalization is actually quite small around the world. And so, one of the things that ICANN should spend effort on is capacity building, train the trainers, and make sure that the wider internationalization activities could be picked up by new software developers and so on. I will come to number six, which I think this council is probably most interested in.

On the DNS industry, on the ccNSO side, we identified that their connection with governments and with digital transformation and

digital agendas is going to be important. As for gTLDs, one of the recommendations is to look into an issue report. We are far from a PDP, so don't be too worried about it. But also looking at whether policy initiatives could actually help UA, for example, incentives for registries and registrars to be more UA ready. And that's one of the recommendations. Into the governments and academia, we identified that multiple relevant registry ministries, well, definitely through GAC, but beyond GAC, other ministries, including heritage, including linguistics, including culture, might be useful for engagement.

And then finally, in terms of the measurement, we identified a framework that looks not only into implementation or technical implementation, but also the awareness level, the policy support for UA, and capacity development initiatives supporting UA as a kind of a holistic measure framework, and of course, encouraging registries and registrars to self-report and other organizations to self-report on the readiness part.

And we can jump to slide 18. That's really the summary. And the next steps really is, well, waiting to hear from you. Slide 18, if you can go to. And that's the public comment period and we'd like to hear from you. Once comment closes, we'll go through another round to integrate them and hope to finalize it by May of this year so that by the next time we meet, we'll have a set of guidelines to support the staff team again. And this is not for the entire

community, we can have other UA works, but for the staff to prioritize and focus their efforts on UA. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks so much, Edmon. Can I just ask, is there a slide that has recommendations that are specific to the GNSO that we could maybe just show?

EDMON CHUNG

Sure. That is slide 14. I made it specifically for this group.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you. And maybe is that what you sort of ran through, but we just didn't have it on the screen?

EDMON CHUNG

No, I did. I jumped through that. There is going to be a deep dive session this afternoon at 1:15, which I'll go through each of them. But this is the one for the gTLD and ccTLDs, as I highlighted. Yeah.

SUSAN PAYNE

So, I think it's worth us as GNSO members being kind of aware of this. It may not be something that your groups have perhaps been focusing on. We've had a lot of other things sort of that we've been looking at. But as Edmon says, this is out for public comment. There are some suggestions or recommendations for guidelines that kind of impact registries, registrars, ccTLDs, resellers and so

on. So, perhaps if nothing else, the message to take back to your groups is it's important to have a look at this and feed into this public comment period before the report gets finalized. Okay, I've got Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. Vivek Goyal for the BC. Thank you, Edmon. Very thorough. Two points. The first one is, does the UA differentiate between the work that is being done on acceptability of IDNs and of dot brands in Latin script, or they combine in the same bucket?

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, it's combined in the same because, of course, I think the group is clear that IDNs would lead the way in a way, because governments and a lot of the organization, that's what they care about, and that's why it has to wrapped around internationalization. But long TLDs, new gTLDs, that's totally included.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. The reason I asked is because as we are trying to promote the next round, especially in India, Southeast Asian, Middle East, we are getting reports wherein brands applied for the first round, immediately start using it, and all their emails started going to spams. And they got so frustrated, they stopped using it immediately, dropped out of the program, and have been telling everybody else, don't do it, it's a waste of time.

So, if this falls into the UA bucket, then would love to see some specific metrics that you have either developed or some numbers you have to show that this has improved, which we can use to promote the next round and say, hey, this problem won't happen now. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG

No, I totally agree, and that's why, well, first, personally, I've been pushing for ICANN to do more on this because it's important. I can relay one really interesting thing which I plan to bring up at the public forum as well. We were shocked to find that our .kids email was not acceptable through the ASP program when we were trying to help someone go through the new gTLD process. So, it is not just an IDN issue.

SUSAN PAYNE

Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Edmon, for that nice whistle-stop tour. I encourage all councilors to take a look at the complete slide deck, which is available on the agenda. There is one that I'm looking at with just a slight concern or a little frown of the eyebrow, the second bullet there. I'm sure you realize, and I think, well, I hope you all realize, that GNSO Council has been more focused on our PDP efforts, focused on policy development.

So, looking at that suggestion about issue report, and I know, of course, issue reports don't always lead to the start of a PDP or anything like that. But it is something that council's actively looking at all of our processes to encourage efficiency in actual, especially with timing. And I say that because universal acceptance, and I see in the chat too from Volker, we've been talking about this for a very long time.

Obviously, we're still talking about it because it hasn't fully been solved. So, something like this, as opposed to something what council's looking at as a time-bound, time-limited, very focused policy development structure, may not be the perfect vehicle to take on this effort.

Not saying this effort isn't very worth council's looking at and taking up in some kind of aspect. Of course, again, we have a clash with the more deep dive session, I think we were with GAC at the same time. So, I also encourage us to take a look at the recording, and if we have questions, to really ask.

And finally, we have to thank, of course, Nitin, who is our GNSO rep on this particular group. He has sent some good detail to the council list as well. So, I encourage us to take a look at that and consider it all as a whole. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG

Edmon here. Just in terms of time bound, I wanted to add a little bit, because the way that I know it's not in the report right now, and

I intend to add it back. One of the frames of mind for the report, again, is for the staff team, and it comes from the strategic plan, the ICANN strategic plan for 2026 to 2030. So, this set of recommendations is talking about the next five years for the prioritization for staff team efforts on UA.

In terms of this particular point, yes, I'm well aware of that and that's why the issue report is supposed to identify whether or not policy incentives might be useful, and it could be narrowed down to a point that works for a policy development may not again.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah, after the example I gave you, UA has become very important certainly for me. My question is, how do you measure success and progress? Is there a number you can say the UA adoption today is this? And as per our plan in one year, it will be this and this is how we measure it? Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, that's a good point. And if you can jump to slide 16, that's where I was explaining. We have one particular question on how to measure the progress of UA adoption. There is, of course, an implementation side of things. So, if we identified a framework that includes four areas, the third area is implementation, and that's the technical implementation of, let's say, the top websites

in different countries and the top platforms or government services platforms and those things.

But also, a part of the measurement needs to be what's the awareness level, what's the policy support for it, and what's the capacity building support for it. Does that?

VIVEK GOYAL

I'm sorry I thought UA has been going on for more than five years before this. So, there is no metrics as of today to say this is the number today and this is the number it will be in five years?

EDMON CHUNG

Oh, well, so there is no one particular magic number, but previously, if you check back at some of the reports that previously UASG produced, they include, for example, the readiness of email servers, for example, it sweeps the email servers and see what percentage that is supporting long TLDs, what is percentage supporting IDN domains, IDN usernames, and so on and so forth, and there is a detailed reporting on that available in the UASG and ICANN website. But there is no magic number in saying that, okay, China, you have 30 ready. There is that.

What we're trying to ask ICANN to put together is like an index, a kind of a framework that would actually, well, that's why we're working with UNESCO, for example, so that member states can report back some of the numbers that we have been doing on a global level, but on a local level as well.

Again, this is what we're asking staff to try to work with UNESCO to do. If that's successful, then we'll have a set of data over time on how the UA adoption rate is going up. Does that make sense? But it's built on previous studies that was done through the UASG and published.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you, Edmon. And not to put you at the spot, like you're just reporting on behalf of it. Sorry, I'll just say this last comment. If you try to say we will come up with a metric, that will be so good, that you will be blinded by the shininess of it. It will never happen. Use a metric that is measurable, deliverable, and continually use it.

Use the 80-20 rule. If you can get at least 80% of email servers across the world to accept this, that is fantastic. If you say, no, no, we will come up with a plan when we cover 100 and then only work, not going to happen. So, my recommendation would be, use a metric that you have been using. Please show it so that everybody feels there is progress being made. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, I think that's exactly what we're trying to do. And we did some tests in the last few years through the UASG work, and that's the part where I said was published. We're taking that and scaling it to get the countries involved and, you know, have more global and local data.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, I'm conscious of the time. We've got a couple of hands in the Zoom room, so I think we'll close the queue after that. So, Christian and then Peter, thank you.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Thanks. My question is actually about measurement too. First of all, I think it's a great report. I think it's a fantastic framework for outreach for the community and an issue that I obviously think is extremely important. Making sure that I've securely got my GNSO hat on, Jen made a good point that the issue report isn't always a path to PDP.

But in thinking about how PDPs might emerge, you assume that you'd probably focus on registry and registrar readiness as a focus of that. And I'm wondering, back to measurement, whether we have an idea of the extent to which that is a significant part of the problem. Are we going into this knowing that that would actually be an area that would be fruitful for policy?

EDMON CHUNG

Very good point, and I'm smiling because two things. One, I want to know too. But also, the report has more details on it. There currently is a road map for both registries and registrars to become UA ready and it has different levels that are defined, and registries who are going through the RSP, Registry Service Provider process, is asked to self-report on their level of readiness.

In the future, if it might work for every registry and registrar to have to report, maybe that's something, maybe that's too much to do, but that maybe could be explored further. But on the measurement, there is actually a roadmap that has been produced and used.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, Peter, final question, and then we'll let Edmon go.

PETER AKINREMI

Yeah, thank you, Susan. Peter, for the record. I guess Christian has actually touched on what I wanted to touch on with regards to our specific, the context of the policy development process that we want to address from this point of view from the issue that has been raised with regards to issue report being developed for the incentive.

I'm trying to like get my head round around and see do we have a road map or more context that we need to look at this from if whether this has been discuss from the team, rather than, okay, GNSO needs to look at these, can you give us a bit of more context in that, in such a way that, okay, these are the issues that we need to address?

EDMON CHUNG

Edmon here. Just quickly in response. That is precisely what an issue report should do, in my mind, is to identify what should be in or out of scope of something and whether it's valuable to do any

policy work. But I want to make sure that I use the word roadmap for the registries and registrar. That's not the roadmap to the PDP at all.

That's the roadmap for registries and registrars becoming UA ready. And you can search for that on the ICANN website, and it talks about accepting email addresses with internationalized domain names for contact names, of course, domain name, of course, the name server names, and so on.

So, each level of that roadmap for registrants and registrars. How we get them to self-report more or going down the path of the road that what the roadmap identified is the question whether some incentives might help registries and registrars go along that path.

SUSAN PAYNE

All right. Thanks very much, Edmon. I think good discussion for some people. This is of more relevance. Certainly, there are some recommendations there that I think the registries and registrars will probably want to have a look at and should think about whether they need to feedback any public comment input there.

There are a few comments in the chat from other people saying, well, there may be implications for their group. So, just encouraging everyone to at least initially take a deeper look and comment. Thank you very much, Edmon, for your time.

Okay, we have nine minutes left on our session. So I think we can go back to what we were doing earlier, where we were doing our

prep for the GAC, just in case there's anything else we need to cover. So, I'll hand back to Sebastien, if that's okay with you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Thank you, Susan. This is Sebastien for the record. Sorry, give me a second. I was doing something else. So, we were reviewing the slides for the GAC meeting, which we're having right after lunch. And we were on the urgent request point. In the meantime, I was able to get confirmation that Gabe Andrews is fully aware that he's going to present and he's prepared something.

So, that should be good. I don't know if you still had points to go through. I'm getting a no from Ashley, so we're good to go there. Maybe the next slide we can look at is the RDRS one. And I don't know if Sam is still around.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

I'm here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

You're here. Do you want to walk us through those talking points?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Sure. Sorry. Making sure you guys can hear me?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Absolutely. Loud and clear.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Great. Sorry, just a little mic glitch on my end. All right. So, yeah, I think these talking points are really about getting the GAC up to speed with the way we've been approaching this conversation between the SPS that we held in January and our discussion with members of the Board's privacy and data caucus in February. It's also very handy that we now have a letter to the ICANN Board that Susan recently sent.

So, we can also, I think, refer GAC members to that. It lays out the approach if someone wants to review it in writing as well as listening to this presentation. But basically, the main crux of what we're saying is that we are going to be recommending that the Board not adopt all of the pending recommendations from phase two of the EPDP that have to do with establishing a standardized system for access and disclosure.

This would open up a path that's contemplated under the bylaws where the GNSO Council would have the opportunity to develop supplemental recommendations to potentially revise those initial policy recommendations.

While we are still deliberating the way we are going to go about doing that, we have reached some preliminary agreement that it will involve some subject matter experts beyond just the members of the GNSO Council, and that we will use the work in the RDRS Standing Committee's final report, which reviews all of the

individual SSAD recommendations and provides some guidance as to whether or not they should be modified.

That will be the starting point of this group's work so that we're hopeful that it will be able to wrap up in a matter of months and not drag this process out too much longer. And then I think the last point just on this slide that we'll touch on is the fact that there will be a dedicated dialogue on this at the end of this week on Thursday morning.

Oh, and the last part being that while all this is going on, the Registration Data Request System is not going to go away. It will continue to be operated and that will be at ICANN's cost. All right. I think that's all we were going to cover. Happy to take anyone's feedback if there's anything we want to add that's not reflected on the slide.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Thank you, Sam. I'm looking around the room and I see no hand. So, I guess you're good to go. Thank you very much. And I know it's getting late on your side, but I still count on you to be there in an hour's time. And the GAC is one that you're going to jump a bit early to test mics and everything. They're expecting you. So, the last point we have is on HRIA.

And I'm looking quickly through the list of attendees. And I am not seeing Bruna. Bruna, if you're there. She is? Okay. Sorry, I can't

find you on the list. Do you want to walk us through those points then, Bruna?

TERRI AGNEW

Bruna, it doesn't look like your mic is unmuted.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Oh, there she is, yeah. So, anyway, Bruna will be there in an hour's time. And Sam, in any case, she asked me to alternate for her. And so, essentially the points that she wanted to make is re-explaining to the GAC the processes that we've put in place in terms of HIRA in our PDPs. and inviting their participation. I think it would be better for her to say it than me as a liaison.

But here between us, I think that I've heard this weekend before, particularly from civil society, from the NCSG, a concern that the GAC in their participation in PDP, particularly on PDPs like DNS abuse, which we're just starting, and in general, where data is concerned, registrant data is concerned, that they're presenting a strong participation from law enforcement, from the PSWG, who's very active.

They would want to see also equivalent participation from government personnel that is responsible for data privacy, data protection, and so on and so forth. So, I think that's the call of action that she's trying to put forward. We'll hear her say that in an hour during the GAC meeting.

Again, just politically, diplomatically, I don't know in my role if I should push that point too much. But it's the point they want to make, and I think it's fair for them to do. Go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

The only thing I would suggest is maybe if one of the other NCSG councilors wants to be on the stage so that they could pick this up so that you didn't have to, Seb, that's also an option. Obviously, we are hoping Bruna will have no connectivity problems, but it's more of a backup. So, leave it to you guys to self-organize. But that's certainly an option.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

I'm sitting right next to one who I might designate at that point. Thank you. And with that, I think it concludes the points. Thank you very much.

SUSAN PAYNE

And with that, I'm noting that it's one minute till the top of the hour. So, I'm actually going to be shorter this time, but not if I keep talking for too long. So, we have a lunch break and then we are meeting with the GAC at 1:15, and don't be late. In fact, be super prompt, especially if you might be on the stage, and I'm saying that for myself. Don't turn up late. Thanks, everyone.

TERRI AGNEW

Lisa, you can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]