
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO Discussion on Next Steps for SSAD Recommendations
Thursday, March 12, 2026 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

TERRI AGNEW

The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Hello and welcome to the GNSO Small Team on Next Steps for SSAD Recommendations. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of 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 this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom 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 at a moderate pace.

I will now hand the floor back over to Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE

Hi everyone, it's Susan Payne. I'm the Chair of the GNSO Council for this year. Welcome to this session. This is sort of an opportunity for us to have a discussion on what the next steps are for the SSAD

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.

recommendations or the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations relating to registration data.

We've been talking about it within Council for a little while. We've had the opportunity of meeting with Wes and Greg from the Board Caucus to talk about next steps. And we wanted to have a session that was a bit more of a public session for others to listen and discuss as well. I will just say we're quite a small group and we've got quite a lot of seats at the table.

So, if anyone who is in the room wants to come and sit at the table and have a bit more comfort and someone to put their laptop, you're very welcome. But with that, I'm going to pass over to Caitlin who is kind of going to run the slideshow for this.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thank you, Susan. This is Caitlin Tubergen from ICANN Org. If we could go to the next slide, please. Thank you. We thought we'd begin today's session with just a very quick, and I mean very quick overview of where we are, what supplemental recommendations are, and how that process will work. And that's where we'll bring everyone into the discussion. But what you see on this slide is an overview of the bylaws process for supplemental recommendations.

And what's highlighted in number four will be the process of when the Council gets to develop supplemental recommendations. And that's what we're here to discuss is the composition of the group

that will ultimately develop those recommendations. From there, the Council would then vote on those recommendations and send them to the Board. But we're currently in step four. So, if we can go to the next slide, please.

This is just a reminder. I think many of you have seen this slide through the various Council discussions, but explanation of when the Board doesn't adopt a recommendation, what that means. And in this case, for the SSAD recommendations, this is ultimately the beginning of a dialogue between the Board and the Council.

It starts the process, which we just showed in the bylaws, of the opportunity for the Council to develop supplemental recommendations. Some of you have recently seen this with the subsequent procedures recommendations that the Board did not adopt.

And then ultimately, the Council charged the RDRS Standing Committee, or the Registration Data Request Service Standing Committee, with making a recommendation to the Council of how to treat those 18 recommendations related to the SSAD. And that committee recommended to the Council to consider having the Board not adopt those recommendations as a package to kick off the supplemental recommendations' procedure.

And as a reminder, if the Board were to not adopt the recommendation, this is not the equivalent to throwing all the recommendations away and starting over. It's not a signal that the Board would never adopt SSAD recommendations, and it's not an

invitation for the group that ultimately crafts the supplemental recommendations to undo years of the community's work and relitigate the careful compromises that went into those 18 recommendations.

Next slide, please. This slide shows some of the previous agreements from the GNSO Council that was reflected in the Council's discussion during its Strategic Planning Session. It was also a discussion with some of the members from the ICANN Board Caucus, some of whom are here with us today.

And the result of that discussion was communicated to the Board in a letter from the Council recently. But at a high level, what the Council agreed to is that this is a very limited scope of work in terms of the supplemental recommendations, and it's to be informed by the work that the RDRS Standing Committee already did.

The Council also agreed that the work is to be timely, done in an expeditious manner, and while no specific time commitment was given, the sentiment around the table was it should be completed in a matter of months, not years. Some of the concerns brought forward is that this group, while it needs to be small, it does need to have appropriate representation, which would include subject matter experts that are not counselors.

Also, the group talked about how the original EPDP team did have members that were outside of the GNSO, and so the Small Team should account for that as well.

And then lastly, but importantly, the RDRS Standing Committee, in making its recommendation, emphasized the fact that the original EPDP team spoke of the importance that the recommendations are considered as a package, and while adjustments to recommendations are expected through supplemental recommendations, deletion of recommendations is not.

Next slide, please. So, this slide shows some of the options that the Council talked about during its Strategic Planning Session about how this Small Team could look. So, the options that were floated was it could be the supplemental recommendations are developed by the full GNSO Council. It could be the full Council plus appointed subject matter experts from outside the Council. It could be a Council Small Team of only GNSO counselors, or it could be what we've referred to as a Council Small Team Plus, which is some counselors participate, and then the Council invites subject matter experts to also participate.

Where the group seemed to land was option four, which is counselors can participate, but also many of the counselors around the table emphasize the importance of including subject matter experts from both outside the GNSO and inside the GNSO. So, for example, some of the folks that participated in the RDRS standing committee who are very aware of what that group worked on, is familiar with the lessons learned from that, that they could take into the supplemental recommendations process.

So, support staff work with Council leadership on an initial proposal of what those numbers could look like, which we're about to show you, but I thought I would give a couple of disclaimers first before we open the discussion.

The numbers are based on the original composition of the EPDP team. It's also based on some of the recent discussions about parity between groups. And while there might never be perfect numbers, we endeavor to ensure that the right people are at the table. And I don't know if Susan, you have anything to add to that, or Jen about the --

SUSAN PAYNE

Not really. Only to emphasize that this is a starting point. So, if people think that the balance isn't quite right, this is one of the things we want to talk about. But it was a recognition that if there's someone on council who is interested in this topic and has the capacity, then the whole of council could be on this small team if they want to.

Realistically, that seems unlikely. But we're not precluding that. And then, as Caitlin was saying, the idea to allow for those who are the SMEs who aren't on council, then we've also tried to factor that in as well. And so, it's a balance between trying to keep the group sort of small enough and nimble enough that we actually can reach kind of quick compromises and work collaboratively together, in the same way that a PDP these days are half often, but not always,

has a more of a kind of representative model, the balancing of that with ensuring we have the right people in the room.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thank you, Susan. So, with that, if we can go to the next slide, which I think most of you are waiting for. And this is the initial proposal of what the Small Team could look like.

So, as noted, this was option four, which is any interested GNSO Councilor can participate, but we also noted the importance of including subject matter experts from outside the Council and outside the GNSO. So, from the GNSO, groups could appoint additional subject matter experts up to the following numbers.

So, from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, two additional subject matter experts, registries, three additional subject matter experts, and then three from the CSG. So, one rep from each of those groups, BC, IPC, and ISPCP. And then to match the CSG, we have three from the NCSG. And then in light of the original composition of the EPDP team, we, and as well as the RDRS standing committee, there was representation from ALAC, GAC, SSAC.

So, this accounts for those reps and their active participation in RDRS. And then similar to the EPDP team and similar to the supplemental recommendations work recently with subsequent procedures, we do anticipate that there would be an active Board liaison. There will likely also be active org liaisons from outside the

GNSO support team who will help work on the RDRS and coordinate internally.

So, with that, I will turn it over to Susan to manage the queue if anyone has any initial reactions to this. Okay.

SUSAN PAYNE

We do have a bit of a queue. So, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Susan. This is Justine. Two things. One is, Caitlin, if I can just reconfirm, it says two RSYG. I think you said three. So, I just want to make sure that it's not a typo or anything like that. So, it's two. Okay. Great. Thank you. The second question is obviously the Small Team Plus calls are open to observers as far as I understand. That's going to remain a practice?

SUSAN PAYNE

I mean, I don't think we've really thought about that, but I can't see a reason why it wouldn't be.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Sorry, not managing the queue very well there. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Hi, thank you, Susan and Caitlin. And this actually looks quite good to me. The only thing I would raise a question for councilors to consider is given Seb's role, as I believe he chaired the RDRS standing committee. I'm kind of wondering if the chair and our vice chair of the standing committee would be appropriate for inclusion on this Small Team. A question for councilors to consider.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for that suggestion, Anne. Thank you. Michael?

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Yeah, thank you. Michael Graham, IPC. One question I have in discussing the makeup, of course, we wanted to have the non-council councilor SMEs. How about the ability to add independent subject matter experts if that could be built into this? If the small council agreed that a particular person might be able to bring in from outside the ICANN community, some expertise in this area.

I don't see that here in the makeup. I understand we would want to avoid the no holds barred opening, but that seems to me something that might be useful. I know other working groups in the past have called in mediators and such, but I think somehow building in the possibility of participants in the small group to bring in independent experts might be useful. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Michael. I've got a long queue, so I'm just going to keep going down the queue and see what others have to say. Wes?

WES HARDAKER Yeah, just really briefly, I think Greg and I tag team quite a bit from the Board. It would actually be helpful for us both to be invited. I suspect that we would not be talking much, because our role would be primarily to listen, but it would be helpful if we could both be there.

SUSAN PAYNE Yeah, thank you. Okay, Seb?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS Yeah, I just wanted to react to bringing the SMEs in, Michael. It's always interesting to have points of view and better our knowledge of the market and et cetera, but this exercise is really reworking ICANN-built recommendations, community recommendations into a product that is going to work for the future.

We're not going to restart a two-year pilot now. We're not going to reopen all those things. We are all a bit nervous about reopening the Pandora's box, so we need to make sure that -- and I'm not saying that we shouldn't have any experts, particularly, for example, in terms of finding consensus, that sort of thing, but going back to the market and restudy what needs to be done, I think, is a bit dangerous.

No doors should be closed, but here the exercise is actually what we know how to do, which is draft policy, draft recommendations, do the ICANN stuff.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

If I could respond very quickly. Yeah, I agree, Seb. I certainly wouldn't want to bring them in to start looking at it anew and I suppose this is an open-ended question anyway, if the small group determined that it would be useful to have someone in, the ability to do that for whatever particular and narrow subject area might be appropriate.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, I'm not sure. At the minute, I can't envisage a scenario, but I suppose it's feasible for the group when they're working to feel like they need to invite someone in more in a kind of expert capacity kind of not as a member of the Working Group, if you know what I mean, but for some kind of a briefing or discussion on technology or something. But I don't know that that's really what we -- I mean, I think the rules would allow for that, but I'm not sure that that's something we're needing here.

I think really, we are looking at trying to just take the policy recommendations we've got at the moment and kind of put them into a new version that now aligns with the system as we're now sort of envisaging it. But yeah, thanks for that. Farzaneh?

TERRI AGNEW

Farzaneh, I see where your mic is open, but we're not hearing you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, I think we'll come back to you while you sort your mic out.

FARZANEH BADIEI

No, I'm sorry. Okay, I'm so sorry. I'm just a little bit confused here. I don't understand how we got here and it's very possible that maybe I missed something. So, during SSP, SPPS, or I don't know, whatever meeting we had during in Barcelona, we discussed this, and NCSG raised concerns with the council turning into a policymaking body, and then there was this back and forth, and we were just in the middle of the conversation.

We also raised concerns about Small Team and Small Team Plus, and we said that, like, we need to make this group, if we do it, we need to make it very inclusive and not just, like, even Small Team Plus. So, Small Team Plus is a governance structure that is like made up, right? What's the guidelines? Is it in operating procedures? I don't know.

If there's things about it, if you can put the link in the chat, if the staff can put the link in the chat, that would be great so that we can educate ourselves on Small Team Plus. So, we raised these concerns, and then today we are provided with this option. Are there other options that you are recommending, or is it just Small Team Plus?

SUSAN PAYNE

So, on the earlier slide that Caitlin put up, there were there were kind of a couple of sort of other structural options, but practically speaking, I'm not sure that it gets us to a different place, and I think what we're talking about here, what the bylaws annex A talks about is council developing supplemental recommendations, and so this is just a vehicle to do it, and this vehicle would allow the whole of council to volunteer if they want to.

Plus, we're also recognizing that perhaps the right people in the room might not be the ones at the council table, so we're trying to create a space where we add in extra people to be sure that we've got the people in the room that need to be doing the work.

I mean, realistically, my own guess is that not every single councilor will want to be in the room for this particular work effort, because they won't feel that they need to be, and they will feel that their colleagues have got it, but if every councilor from a particular group wanted to be in this Small Team Plus, they could be, and I think we have to move on from the kind of discussion of why are we using a Small Team to -- let's think about what's being suggested not meet the requirements? The requirements are to make sure that it's inclusive. There are concerns about making sure that people have parity of participation. What are the other concerns?

FARZANEH BADIEI

We have raised concerns, so we, so none of these other options are better than Small Team Plus, and we kind of, like, had, we raised concerns about council or council subject matter experts in Small Team and Small Team Plus to do these things, and we wanted, like, something more inclusive, and we have raised these concerns, and I don't think that we can move on without addressing some of the concerns that we have.

One is that, like we are going to overburden our council members, and then also we are going to have limited number of people that we call subject matter experts. It's not very obvious how that structure works, how many people from how many groups, how do we define subject matter experts.

As I said, is there, like, a process for Small Team Plus? I think if there could be other options, that is not -- like that can be as convenient as Small Team Plus, but it can be more transparent, more inclusive, and that would be great at the moment.

We don't know what subject matter experts are, who such subject matter experts are, and also, we don't know how many people can be appointed, and what if the councilors don't have time? How can others be -- like, can we replace the councilors with non-councilors? We don't know any of these, and I think that it merits another conversation at the council level, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for the comments, Farzi. So, I think I would just circle back to the fact that we started this discussion at the SPS in Barcelona, which was January. You did raise concerns. You were asked to suggest, as well, alternatives. I think as a group, we all have a responsibility for coming up with solutions and not just raising concerns.

This, I think, as we said when we kicked off, this was kind of a straw person to start the discussion on does this structure look right? So, if this structure doesn't look right, come up with some suggestions that will meet the specific concerns you've got, but there's no, I don't believe there's any transparency issue with a Small Team or a Small Team Plus. They have very open workspaces. We'll have observers. We'll have a mailing list. It will be run in the usual ICANN manner where anyone can see what is going on and can see all the documents, can attend meetings to observe. They can observe the mailing list.

So, I don't think there's a transparency issue here. There may back many years ago when the first Small Team was set up, I think there was a transparency issue, and I think that's been fixed, and if you have a concrete reason why you think it hasn't been fixed, I think it's time for you to identify it because otherwise we just keep talking in circles, but I'm not trying to -- no, no, no. Let me finish, let me finish. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI

I'm sorry, but no, we were not given a chance. We were not given a chance because --

SUSAN PAYNE

Farzi, just let me finish, please. Again, this is the starting point. This is a straw person. You have the opportunity to suggest improvements or things that you think will fix concerns, and I would really welcome you to do that and if there's a concern that SME that the councilor is not the right person, then let's talk about having a mechanism to make sure that there's a way to address that, but the SMEs will be identified by their groups.

We use that term SME all the time. We've been using it daily while we've been here in context of the DNS Abuse PDP, and groups seem to be pretty well able to work out who their SME is and identify them, so I'm struggling to understand some of the concerns, and now thank you. I will give you the mic back. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADIEI

No, thank you. I don't need the mic back. I think we have recorded our concerns, and quite clearly we were never given a chance to discuss this at the council level, and now we are presented with this, and we are told that we are not clear and our concerns are not, and I'm sorry, this is not -- like, I don't personally feel welcome in the conversation, and I don't think my mic should have been taken away. Thank you. I will not intervene any further.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, thank you. I do have a queue, so Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Susan. This is Justine. I have to say that I don't have a finger on how long this structure is going to operate for. I assume that's not going to be for much too long anyway, but I've been asked to inquire as to whether the group would entertain alternates, the inclusion of alternates.

So, maybe the need for alternates might be more pressing if the team is going to, like, rush through or maybe even longer. I don't know, but the question is, would this group entertain the option of alternates? Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Justine. Yeah, we're gathering feedback, and I think that's something we can certainly take on Board or consider. Thank you. Greg.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Susan. A couple of thoughts in my strictly personal capacity. This is not a Board opinion, but just on independent experts, I kind of agree with Seb. This is pretty far into the implementation details of an ICANN process, and I also don't want to get in, like, an expert war of, like, whose expert is right. So, unless the Small Team itself says we don't have the information we

need, I'd be inclined to echo what Seb said, that independent experts aren't necessary here.

And then I just want to talk just, like, high level about Small Teams, because there's been some back and forth on that. I think one way to think about them.

So, first of all, they are established, and there's documentation on the rules that they follow and how they're tracked. Second of all, I think there's always been work that's been done outside of formal council meetings, right? So, think about the team that replies to the GAC communiqué, right? That team goes away and drafts a reply to that GAC communiqué.

My way of thinking about Small Teams is just a way to provide transparency around that work that's being done outside the formal council meeting that's recorded, right? So, it's there's an acknowledgment that not every single detail can be decided during the formal public council meeting. There needs to be some work done on the side.

The Small Team and the guardrails that have been documented on the GNSO procedures, I don't know if it's a formal GNSO procedure, is on the GNSO site, are just a way to provide more transparency about that and confirm that those people aren't making decisions, they're just working towards the goal, and then that is brought back to council for final approval.

So, I think it's totally relevant to debate on the composition and how it will operate, but I just wanted to give those two cents about how I've thought about Small Teams when I was GNSO chair.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, John. Greg, sorry. John?

JOHN MCELWAIN

John McElwain for the record. So, maybe talking about adding another group to invite to this process, but it's something that we've talked about when I was on council, and it would be inviting somebody from, like, ICANN Finance to attend. We'd talked the reason why we're here is because we designed a very expensive SSAD model.

We now have two years of data and how much it costs to build it and operate it, and I think it would be nice to have somebody, a liaison from ICANN Org, to be watching over things. This may be another slide, too, by the way, but to be part of the group watching and try to help us calculate to make sure things aren't getting too expensive and can take a step and say, okay, if you're going to do that type of accreditation, they can go off and come out with a sort of prediction of how much it would cost so we don't go down a path and then find out it's too expensive. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks for that suggestion as well. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Hi, Susan, and everyone. It's Anne. Thank you. I'm wanting to kind of raise again the concern that NCSG expressed regarding the process that is essentially bylaws mandated and the inclusivity issue because, as I understood the NCSG objections, there seems to be some concern that council itself should not be making supplemental policy recommendations, but where we are in terms of governance is under the bylaws, council is mandated here to make supplemental policy recommendations, and I think that I do understand some of the concern about hey, we don't know what subject matter experts are and how many there will be and, gosh our counselors are spread thin or whatever.

I mean, I think everyone's counselors are spread a bit thin because it's an all-volunteer organization, but it occurs to me that the NCSG did have success in the chartering process for the DNS Abuse charter and that that could be a vehicle for proposing some further definition to what it means to be a subject matter expert and who might be needed for that purpose and some parameters around that and around balancing of subject matter experts.

I'm hopeful that NCSG won't give up, even though I know they're quite frustrated by the fact that this bylaw actually mandates, it's a trigger whereby council is in charge of making supplemental policy recommendations, and so I'm hoping that through the charter process that they could perhaps make some proposals that would

be comforting on the subject of inclusivity and defining a bit further some subject matter expert parameters. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Anne. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT

Well, let's just go back in history a little bit. We went through the temp spec. We went through projects that had names of all sorts of dishes and fruit. We had the EPDP. We had an IRT coming up with the policy. We had a standing committee for the RDRS, so it's fair to say that I've sacrificed my youth for this. So, I'm very interested in preserving the legitimacy of the process, and I guess that's what unites Farzaneh and myself on this, yet we have a take on this.

I think, Farzaneh, if we started fresh with this project, I would be all ears for making sure that we have as broad participation as possible.

With all these projects that we had, suggestions on how we can work on tiered access and whatsoever with Public Comment, with the PDP phases, with all the reports that enjoyed Public Comment, with the operational design phase, with the learnings from the RDRS standing committee, we know quite a bit, and the community had an opportunity to chime in quite a bit.

So, we're in a very different place, which is why I would support whatever format council chooses to embed this in. Certainly, the

Small Team, Small Team Plus, or whatever we might call this, will not have any decision-making capabilities, so the community will be heard, and the council will perform its function overseeing this, but I think we should rather think about substance and how we get this done in the shortest period of time with the least costs and with the most efficiency, and I guess that's what we should focus on.

So, the questions that I would be more interested in, and this is seamlessly adding to what you said, John, how can we make this a success and not end up in a situation where we come up with supplemental recommendations that suffer the same destiny as the original SSAC recommendations?

So, council should think hard about how are we going to approach this. I think we should learn from how agile software development is done.

There are different approaches to it. You can do, for example, design to budget, which would require us to go to ICANN finance and say how much do we have, right, and then specify priority of functionalities and features that we want to see, look at what we've learned from the RDRS, what requirements we definitely need to make this more valuable, and then go down in the list.

I guess that the Small Team or whatever team that might be can do valuable work in getting that work done, and maybe if you want to bring in someone from the outside, that's maybe ICANN finance and might be a good person with a grasp at what software development costs and entails, so that we can get that job done. I

think it's all on the table. We just have to rearrange the tiles to come up with a solid foundation for us to walk on.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Thomas. Benjamin?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE

Thank you. Benjamin, for the records. I think from NCSG, I just want to say that our concern is just that we have not discussed this, and we're saying can we discuss it as an agenda item in the council, and we're also saying is there a particular time that we have to suggest alternative recommendations, and also to clarify some questions like what is subject matter experts, who can bring how many.

Once we have that, we're happy with everybody, and then we can put all of our weight behind it, and in such suggestions, we'll put out things that will make us be effective on the team as well, so we don't, it's also from our historical experiences from such teams that we've raised these concerns, and we don't want to keep guessing whatever outcomes comes later. So, this is our way of joining the team wholeheartedly, so we're just raising those concerns. I'll be very excited if they're addressed, if there's other avenues for us to get them properly addressed. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thank you, Benjamin. I just wanted to respond to that. The idea for this session was to allow for some feedback from the other

community groups that are interested in this topic including ALAC, GAC, and SSAC, which I see representatives from the table. This is not a final decision. It's a starting point for discussion. It is part of the council's wrap-up agenda, so the council can continue to discuss.

That's not the final time we'll discuss it, but this was just, again, an initial opportunity to get some more community-wide feedback that council can consider, and we're not finalizing that today, so there will be additional discussion so that folks can be comfortable. So, I just want to make clear no decision is being made today.

This is an opportunity to provide feedback. This is not the final model, and we do appreciate feedback from around the table, from remote participants, and the council will ultimately make the decision of how they want to compose this team, but this is just an initial proposal for discussion. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

I've got Peter in the queue as well. Peter?

PETER AKINREMI

Thank you, Susan. Can you confirm you can hear me?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Yes, we can hear you, Peter. Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI

Yeah, thank you so much, and thank you, Caitlin, for weighing in and saying this is an initial conversation around this. I don't know to what extent this was discussed during the SPL, because I was not present in person, and I would like to thank Anne for raising that this is a beyond just outcome, and it talks about process, and Thomas also, I'd like to thank you for raising that. Also, we need to look at the outcome of this.

Also, we know that council uses Small Teams as a tool, but it should not replace or make policy. I want to remind us that, and another thing that we've actually been talking about, initial conversation around it when we started in NCSG, where we look at it and say, okay, well, we say Small Team Plus do make policy, but they make recommendation to the council, and we could see over time in the trends that this recommendation sometimes get approved.

I've not seen where most of the recommendation that Small Team Plus recommended, and we reject that. So, I just want us to look at different options and challenges that we could use.

Another concern or another thing that we've been discussing is we look at this supplemental recommendation that we want to use, or the Small Team Plus channels that we want to use to address this issue, and look at those recommendations that we want to address and see which ones will be new issues or new policies that can take new policy and try to address all those concerns and look at those issues and see which one can be addressed with supplemental

recommendation, which one are new issues that can take on maybe new tools that can be used to address that.

Obviously, we're not against how council can develop that, can move faster in the process and look at different things, but we should put every option that we could on the agenda if we want to really have open conversation of different tools and different process that we want to use to address it, not only talking about Small Team Plus.

Some of our members raises why can't we look at EPDB to address some certain things, but we should kind of look at different options. Like I say, I don't know how this was discussed during the SPS meeting, but we should start with conversations around different tools that are available that we could use to address this, but now we're moving forward talking about the compositions of Small Team.

Another thing I want to raise is we don't even know yet whether the Board, we know we've already received a signal, we're talking with the Board and they say, oh, they're going to make this, but we don't even know whether the Board is going to adopt this as a package, right? So, why can't we wait for the Board to do this before we started talking about composition? This is just my take. I've not discussed this with NCSGM, just my feeling of the patient.

So, I just wanted to raise this that when we say Small Team don't make policy, the recommendation will still come back to the council. Council will still look at this and they will agree. Definitely

they also make recommendation. They also make policy. So, we just need to look at the process and the outcome. We should not treat them separately. So, I just wanted to weigh in on that. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Peter. So, Greg has his hand up, which I think was before this. So, not necessarily to address your point, but I think we did hear quite clearly in our meeting with the Board yesterday that this is on the agenda for the board's meeting later today to pass that resolution to Un-Adopt.

So, it is correct that it hasn't happened yet, but I think we've had really quite strong signals that that's the path we're going down. And hence the idea to try to get the discussion moving on the kind of next steps. I'll hand to Greg. Greg?

GREG DIBIASE

Yes, I guess in my capacity as a Board member, yes, there'll be a resolution later today in the draft text right now is to Un-Adopt all recommendations. So, if you want to wait until that happens, you can wait until 4:30 p. m. today.

Now going back to my personal capacity, I wanted to highlight something I saw from John in the chat, which I thought was a great point. The original SSAD was rejected in part or was put on, set to pending because it was the estimate to build it was very expensive,

right? There now seems like there's a path to have a more lightweight, less expensive option.

So, I don't think there's a formal role here, but I do think ICANN staff should be following along and having estimates of cost in real time. So, we don't get dragged into an ODA or waste any time at the tail end of this asking for quotes from vendors and things like that. And I know that's a tall order to ask, but yeah, I just wanted to flag John's comment.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Greg. And I will note that Eleeza Agopian is here, but she has also put in the chat that the GDS team is kind of standing ready to provide a liaison if and when this group forms. So, I think that probably would be a helpful addition. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Hey, everyone. This is Samantha Demetriou. Definitely plus one to having real-time feedback from the Board and appreciate, or sorry, from staff and appreciate that staff is willing to participate in this group as well. I originally raised my hand because I think we are getting really bogged down in the baggage of language here.

I think that the terms Small Team, Small Team Plus, as well as subject matter experts seem to really be kind of messing us up a little bit in how we're considering this work. And maybe one way to get through that is to just discard those terms altogether. What

we have in front of us, and I will credit Anne who has been iterating this in the chat as well.

What we have in front of us is the likely event, right? I won't predict what happens at 4:30 p.m. today, but the likely event that the Board will not adopt policy recommendations. And that, whether we like it or not, puts us into the bylaws process that Caitlin described at the top of this meeting, where it becomes the responsibility of the GNSO council to issue supplemental recommendations or not, right? To do it or not do it. But that mantle rests with the council, even though there isn't then therefore a prescribed process that comes after the fact.

So, I think we just need to sort of do the best we can to make this as open, transparent, and accountable as we possibly can. And I think maybe it means we don't use the word Small Team Plus, right? Maybe that means opening it to the full council, which I personally would be fine with and even in favor of, as well as appointed community representatives.

We can dispatch with the terms subject matter expert. And maybe what we call this group is the supplemental recommendations development group, the SRDP. It's sort of inelegant, but it describes what this group is doing and hopefully eliminates some of the baggage of the Small Team.

I think we can have a fulsome discussion at council about chartering this group and making sure that everyone is in really, really good agreement about what the group is going to work on

and gets full input from our stakeholder groups and constituencies on what that looks like. And I think we can even entertain the idea of having this group, this SRDP, as I'm making up acronyms on the fly, put its work out for a Public Comment period even before it goes back to the full council for consideration.

Hoping that some of these suggestions start to address the concerns that others have raised, but still give us a path to move forward on this, because I think whether we like it or not, we are going to be faced with this task in, I don't know, what, six or seven hours, depending on what time zone you're in. So, yeah, just wanted to throw those things out there for some consideration. Thanks, everyone.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Sam. Yeah, let's not get bogged down in the baggage of the language. That's a very good suggestion. Wes?

WES HARDAKER

Thanks. And just to show how helpful it is to have both Greg and I here at the same time, because we differ sometimes. With respect to getting staff to participate, I have no doubt that we can get staff to participate. But I do want to push back a little bit on the notion of real-time cost estimates. Cost estimates cost, cost. I think that's the right verbiage.

So, you can't really get real-time feedback. So, please, as you go forward, do be considerate about how frequently you need a better

guess, because you end up having to talk to engineers and think, and it's just not immediate. So, do be cautious of that.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Wes. Noted. Okay, okay. I think I'm not seeing any more hands at the moment. Again, this is not the final discussion. This is the proposal for people to try to coalesce around in terms of when we know that this is on Council's plate, or at least it will be very shortly, to do this supplemental recommendation work, how do we get the right people in the room?

Bearing in mind that we had an original EPDP that had a certain number of participants. We had represented, that was a representative model. We had representatives come from the different groups. Whether we actually think they were subject matter experts or not, maybe a difference of opinion, but they were appointed by their individual stakeholder groups and constituencies or from the wider community to come and bring their sort of expertise and thinking hats, and that's, I think, nothing more than that is being considered when we talk about the term SMEs, but I'm happy to rebrand that as something else.

It is simply meant to be the opportunity for groups to identify their best people to try and put them in the room, or at least some of their best people. You know, we're trying to, again, keep a group that's nimble enough to do the work and work collaboratively, but if there are specific elements that you're people have made some really good suggestions here on inclusions of making sure that we

have the opportunity, say, for both of the Board caucus members to be liaisons thinking about staff liaison to the effort, that's also a very good idea.

We've had people say, have you thought about alternates to make sure that when someone's not able to attend, they can do so. We've had a reminder that we should make sure we have observers allowed for, and I think this Small Team concept already does in the kind of rules for Small Teams, I think that's already built in. If there are other suggestions, if there are other ways, if you feel this proposal doesn't get the right people in the room, then let's talk about what does.

But we do have this coming to us, and we've known for some time this is coming to us, because we have been talking about it with Greg and Chris when we were at the SPS, and then subsequently with Greg and Wes on a couple of occasions so we know this kind of Un-Adoption process or non-adoption process is coming, and the supplemental recommendation process gets triggered, and so it is on council's plate, and we have a responsibility to deal with that.

Okay, I have, I think, Wes, is that an old hand or a new one? I'm going to go to Steve, because it looks. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER

Thank you. The question on my mind goes back to, let's see, if I got feedback here. Let me try. I'm just a techie. I don't know how all this works.

At the very beginning, you put up a slide saying what is and what isn't all of this, and so I've been thinking about all of that, and I appreciate the form of that, but I actually genuinely don't understand the implications, which, let me frame it this way.

How much room is there between, since we can't throw out recommendations and we can only add supplemental recommendations, does that imply that the original SSAC design and all of the implications of that remain fixed, or at the other extreme, to what extent does a small modification turn into be a dramatic redo under another name? So, I don't understand sort of where the running room is between that, and I'm not trying to be facetious.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thank you, Steve. I can try to answer that question, and I invite others around the table if I mischaracterize anything. When the RDRS Standing Committee produced its findings report, they did a detailed analysis of each of the 18 SSAD recommendations and noted that some require significant modifications, and they, in the estimation of modifications versus small modifications, large modifications, the team noted where there's going to be a high-level of degree of change versus a low-level degree of change.

So, I think the expectation is some recommendations may have slight changes to them, others will have significant changes to them, but the RDRS Standing Committee does provide guidance as to what those changes should be based on data and lessons learned from the RDRS Standing Committee. So, to answer your question, I think some of the recommendations are going to change significantly, and I think it's going to be based off of the feedback provided by that group.

SUSAN PAYNE

Sorry, not keeping an eye on the queue there. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thanks, Caitlin. Thanks, Susan. Of course, during that whole Standing Committee process, when we accepted the report, we did confirm that the report and the work of the Standing Committee is not policy work, and so at the same time, I want us to recognize that the Standing Committee report is not policy work, but the development of supplemental recommendations is, in fact, policy work under the bylaws.

I would certainly consider, again, if I could raise, is there any chance I can drag the chair and vice chair of RDRS Standing Committee into this process and get them to devote their time, because to me, they are subject matter experts on this topic because they have I've been to a few of those meetings, and they've had some pretty

thorough discussions, and I feel as though their participation would be quite helpful.

Again, we all recognize that report and that committee, that's not policy. What's happening here, and I'm completely sympathetic to Sam's comments about language, supplemental recommendations, team, yeah maybe that's a much better term than using Small Team, okay, even though I don't honestly think there's a true difference, it at least recognizes that, hey, we are operating under the bylaws, but boy, oh boy, I sure hope that we could get the chair and vice chair of RDRS Standing Committee into this, loop them into this process, because they've been through it.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Anne. I'm reluctant to volunteer people, but I'm sure they, I believe both of them are sitting here in the room, and I'm just wondering if you have any thought to whether they want to pitch to be put into this group. So, I'm noting the time, we've got two minutes, well, one minute now, apparently, we can go about five minutes maximum over, and so I'm closing the queue at Alan, and, but so let's just final thoughts before we wrap up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

So, this is Sebastien, and I had my hand raised before Anne mentioned. Susan and I have already spoken about this. I'll let the GNSO Council decide what they need to decide. I've offered my hand. I have, in the meantime, also found a new employer who has

very ambitious plans for me for the next few months in terms of applications, so I don't know how to but I've offered my neck.

I wanted to make another point. We keep on talking about 18 recommendations that came out of SSAD. There are non-recommendations that were included in that document, too, with regards to, but whatever, there's small-r recommendations that document, too, that were discussed also by the RDRS.

We keep on focusing on the formal recommendations, I want to make sure that when we look at, re-look at the SSAD, it was hinted in a conversation that the Council had a few weeks back when we said, hey, can we send back to the GAC the full list of what we're talking about because I don't have the document in front of me, but from my recollection, there were recommendations with a very formal big R and smaller ones there, too.

I want to make sure that when we are looking at it, we're looking at it at SSAD holistically and not just because we've given a number of recommendations, and I think that was my point. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, thanks, we'll take that on board, and finally, Alan Greenberg, I don't think he's in the room, but you have the mic, Alan, and then we'll wrap up.

ALAN GREENBERG

No, I'm halfway around the world. Having participated in the full SSAD PDP and the RDRS group, in my opinion, the RDRS group did

not invest enough time and effort, nor could they in any reasonable world we're living in, to examine all of the SSAD recommendations in full detail and make recommendations which should be considered authoritative.

So, I hope that what is in the RDRS report will be considered guidelines and not taken as an absolute law. I think that would be putting far too much weight on it than it deserves based on the amount of time and effort we had to review those recommendations. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Alan. I don't think we've ever treated those as the final word in any way. I think we definitely all are viewing what's come from the Standing Committee as being a starting point and some guidance. This isn't a rubber-stamping exercise, but thanks for making that point.

Okay. Then, noting that we are at two minutes over time and trying to be respectful of the tech staff, I think we do need to wrap up at this point.

I've heard a lot of suggestions for things to consider when we're trying to put this working party together. So, we'll take all of this back and reflect on it, but this, again, to repeat, this isn't the final conversation on this and councilors are encouraged to get the views of their group, but also councilors are encouraged to make suggestions and we don't need to wait to the next council meeting

before people can make proposals of if they feel that something needs an improvement, they can float that between council meetings. We don't need to wait for a formal meeting.

Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. We can stop the recording and wrap this one up. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]