ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO Council Wrap-Up Session
Thursday, March 12, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

TERRI AGNEW

Hello and welcome to the GNSO Council Wrap-Up Session. 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. Quick note, I just want you all to note we have a cute little guest back here. So, everybody look back here, look at our cute little guest. The vexed son. There you go. Okay, now I'll hand the floor back over to our GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, everyone. Okay, this is the last of our council sessions for ICANN85. So, it's the wrap up session. It's really an opportunity for us to sort of pick up on things we've heard during the week. If actions, Action Items have become obvious or if there are particular discussions that maybe it's worth us just circling back is probably too strong a word. But just kind of noting and reflecting that we will that there is some more work to do.

So, we have a short agenda, I think, is that in there? I think it's on the slide. A few things that have sort of come up. I think this was circulated last night. So, hopefully not too big a surprise. But first off, I think there are a couple of areas where we need to do a call for volunteers.

The first is for the GAC communiqué response. We do. I don't think we know yet exactly what the GAC communiqué is saying. I'm hearing that there isn't any advice in there, or at least it appears there may not be any advice. But we have in recent times still been doing a kind of council response, even on the issues of importance where they impact. Sorry, obviously council matters or GNSO matters. And so, we usually try and get a call for volunteers out here.

And then that way we can schedule a couple of one or two calls to kick that effort off in short order after the meeting. And I'm looking at Sebastien, first of all, and hoping that he's able to kind of shepherd this exercise in the usual way. Thank you for that.

And then, yes, this call for volunteers either now in in the chat. There'll obviously be a chance to do so after the meeting as well. But if you'd like to volunteer to work on the communiqué, then that's the first one. And I'm noting a couple of volunteers already. So, thanks very much for that. And we'll try and get something set up shortly afterwards to be able to work on that. And I think one of the first orders we'll need. I don't know if we probably don't know yet what our timeline, we'd be working to in terms of when the GAC and the Board are meeting. But hopefully we'll have that shortly. Thanks.

Okay. And then the second one was we heard when we met with the Board that we were we were being sort of encouraged, let's say, for there to be a GNSO Public Comment input on the Strategic Plan effort that's going on at the moment.

I don't know whether this is something that we would normally comment on as a council. I'm certainly urging all of our groups to take a look at this from their own perspectives and comment. But I think since we have been specifically asked, it probably does seem wise for us to at least take a look at whether we should be doing a GNSO wide comment. If there's something that we can all agree on at a kind of GNSO level.

So, I don't know if there are any if anyone has any views on that or if anyone would like to volunteer to at least take a sort of first pass at looking at it and seeing if they think there's some work to be done there. Thank you, Osvaldo. I'm noting Osvaldo would like to comment. Sorry, not to comment, to volunteer. I feel like I should probably know more about the Strategic Plan than I do. So, I'm probably put myself in that in that group as well to have a look at it and see a couple of hands. Steve?

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Susan. This is Steve Chan from staff and I just went to the Public Comment page just to make sure that there is one. I don't think there is one. I think it might be a little bit of a miscommunication. I think in right now there's essentially sort of an environmental scan about the ongoing Strat Plan to make sure it's still fit for purpose. So, I think what the council is being asked to do is whether or not there's trends that might impact and cause reconsideration about the next year of the Strat Plan.

And so, at least from my perspective, we actually also did an exercise internally. And the way I looked at it is, unless there is something, some trend that is unknown, like starting with the presumption that it's probably okay, we actually approach it from a different perspective.

It probably doesn't need change unless there's something we know it's missing. And so that could be something the council could do is, is there a trend that is not clear that's not accounted for that should cause a change. Like I said, that's the way I approached it when I went through the exercise internally, but I think that's what he was referring to. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Sorry about that, the echo, I mean, thank you for that. That's really helpful, Steve. I'm obviously got the wrong end of the stick then, but so it's not that there's a formal comment opportunity per se, but more that they are seeking input. Yes, okay. I think we still have a call for volunteers out then for if anyone is keen to kind of engage on that effort.

And again, I noted Osvaldo put his hand up. I think I'll put my hand up as well. And we'll see if anyone else wants to join on that and in taking that pass on the Strat Plan, just to see. Okay. Next item is the SSAD Next Steps. I think, again, do we have some slides. Okay. If you want to.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thank you, Susan. So, some of you attended the session that we had this morning where we presented a proposal in terms of how the group that produces the supplemental recommendations could look. I'll emphasize again that this is a proposal for the council to consider.

So, we welcome all feedback. And so, we received some feedback this morning, including from some non-GNSO councilors. And we wanted to invite those groups to the table so that the council could consider the feedback.

So, if we can go to the next slide, there's been a couple of terminology changes. But again, this is nothing. Nothing is set in stone. But I think it may have been Sam who said we could maybe call it the supplemental recommendations team. And similar to how a council team that's working on supplemental recommendations has worked in the past.

There are some topics that benefit from additional community participation that might not be just on the council. And so, the idea was to invite non-councilors to participate if the group so wish to send volunteers and also for non-GNSO groups.

So, based on some of the discussions we've had, we put together this proposal, which is any councilor who would like to participate is welcome to do so. But then also in recognition of some of the expertise that may be needed in the discussion. We have a proposal for adding an additional community member from GNSO groups and non-GNSO groups.

So, you'll see that the proposal that was floated this morning was two from registrar stakeholder group, two from registry stakeholder group, three CSG. So, one BC, one IPC, one ISPCP, three NCSG and then ALAC, GAC, SSAC and Board participation. It was also noted today that there's going to be participation from ICANN Org, the folks that helped or will be developing these or implementing these policy recommendations should they be adopted.

And I think we noted this morning that this proposal was based on discussions to date, but also largely based off of the composition of the EPDP team, the phase two team that originally worked on these recommendations. So, it tries to account for some of those careful balances. But again, it's open for feedback.

And if there is if anyone wants to provide that now, welcome to do so. But we can also, we don't anticipate making a decision today unless folks would like to, because I think some groups would like to take this back and provide additional feedback and potential alternative proposals. So, that would be welcomed. But I'll hand it back over to Susan to see if anybody has any questions or comments about this proposal.

SUSAN PAYNE Gaurav?

GAURAV VEDI Hi, Gaurav Vedi, GNSO NomCom appointee, CPH. My question is looking at the structure here. So, can a NomCom appointee also participate in this one? Because I don't see that. But I'm curious and really excited to participate if there's an option. That's all.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Gaurav. That's another one we should probably capture because I don't think it is captured. NomCom.

JENNIFER CHUNG Interested councilors.

SUSAN PAYNE

Oh, interested councilors. Yes, indeed. There you go. Even I'm misunderstanding the slide. Yes, I think that was the idea was any of the councilors who want to, could be participants. I don't see any other hands at the minute. So, I suppose I'll just quickly, I know many people were in that session this morning, but maybe not everyone.

And again, certainly it wasn't all of the feedback, but some feedback that I kind of scribbled down as things that perhaps we should be taking back and thinking about are things like alternates. There was a reference to staff liaisons or staff participation, particularly on the finance side.

And we heard from Eleeza that yes, the GDS team sort of stand ready to support the two Board caucus members were quite keen to both have the opportunity to participate, particularly since they might tag team on this. And so that's, again, something that we kind of take on board as some feedback and potential improvement. And I think those were probably the main ones that I had made. Jen is looking at me and I may have forgotten something.

JENNIFER CHUNG

I think it was also mentioned that the chair and vice chair of the RDR standing committee would probably have quite a lot of expertise on this topic and would probably be very good candidates to, and I'm looking at Seb be part of this as well.

SUSAN PAYNE But otherwise, yes open.

JENNIFER CHUNG No, I don't think so.

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you. Yes, just, again, there's probably other suggestions that were made during the meeting that I maybe will need to go back to notes and review, but again, please do review this and think about it and think about improvements. And we can pick this up hopefully we can if we can start sharing thoughts on the email, then that would be great. Be super not to have to leave it until April, but undoubtedly this is something that will probably be on the agenda in April.

TAPANI TARVAINEN And just a quick question about this. Would it be possible that the participants are not councilors? Because we are, if I take it out, 23 councilors there, but we might want to appoint someone else from our community instead, because councilors are not available or too busy otherwise.

SUSAN PAYNE So, that was the thinking behind the additional community members' part. So, the bit in the box on the slide is the kind of additional sort of councilors being on top of that rather than this being sort of only two councilors. It was not the intention. The intention was kind of if there's anyone from council who is keen to be involved in the effort, then they could put their hand up. But then we would also seek additional people.

But if you're looking at this and it's causing you to think that none of your councilors would want to do it, but there are people elsewhere, maybe that's a suggestion to make. I'm not sure if I'm understanding.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

Maybe some of our councilors might not have three councilors who are able to attend. So, maybe in addition, one of the three or two of the three could be a non-councilor.

SUSAN PAYNE

Again, the suggestion is there's two, there's any of, I'll just use your group, any of your group's councilors plus three who are not councilors. Apologies, but we're thinking maybe it's the slide that's doing it, but that's the intent. Okay, all right. Oh, suggestion for observers. That was the other one that I was missing. Thank you, Samantha.

I think that we also felt that that in fact, I think the procedure we usually use if we're using a Small Team, has that observer concept. But certainly, it's something we'd want to bake in full transparency on everything that's going on. Absolutely. Okay. All right. I'm not seeing on the other hand, so I think then perhaps should we go to the next agenda item?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thanks, Susan. Just to close out this item, I think what we can do is obviously circulate this proposal to the group and we might consider circulating this along with what the assignment form could look like. I think the scope of this group's work so that we could get feedback on both of those items since they're related.

And again, feedback is welcome. So, if you have an alternative proposal, please feel free to share it with the council.

SUSAN PAYNE

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

It's Sebastien. I had a quick question on expected timelines around it, because some of us are going to be extremely busy between May and August. And I just wanted to make sure that that we were before we put our neck on the on the line here, that we knew exactly what the expectations were. Last time we had that sort of work, it took over a year, if I remember well, just about. But what are we thinking here?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thanks, Seb. We touched on this slightly in the session this morning, but in the both during the conversations at the Strategic

Planning Session, as well as in the letter to the Board that followed the Board council dialogue. The messaging has been this is going to take months, not years.

So, the idea is it will probably be going full speed ahead those months that you folks might be busy. So, maybe some others can put their hands up if May through August is not an ideal time, but there will be work going on during those months. So, thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, thanks for that. Thanks, Caitlin. So, would you mind going back to the agenda for me briefly, Andrew? Yes. Okay, next steps on Urgent Requests, is the next item. And again, we've got, I think, one slide or no slides. The first slide. Yeah, should we have that one just?

I think we all are aware we've had the conversations this week with the Board caucus members on this how do we take forward this Recommendation 18? And specifically, the kind of incorporation of the concept of authentication into the timeline language for Urgent Requests. And when presented to us, the two Board members, Greg and Wes had what they were sort of proposing as kind of three possible paths forward for us to think about, which are essentially one.

Firstly, to treat it as kind of implementation and for there to be some form of communication from council back to the Board, saying that we believe that that incorporating that kind of the concept that the request is from an authenticated requester is consistent with what Recommendation 18 intends and therefore it's a point of implementation.

The second approach was going more down in within the work on the SSAD supplemental recommendations. And then option three, which I think was least attractive and perhaps we've we I think we have had a bit of conversation about this already and weren't really coalescing in in favor of this one, but was to for the Board to reverse the adoption on Recommendation 18 and send it back so that we could do a separate supplemental recommendation process on that.

I think we did we talked about this earlier in the week. We also I think we had a bit of a conversation during the INFERMAL meeting when we had the SG&C chairs with us. And that that was not found in favor, I think, for many reasons partly we don't actually have an agreed process on what that on Un-Adoption actually looks like yet. And also, that Recommendation 18 contains other quite important things and a significant amount of work has gone on agreeing on what the timeline should be.

So, we then we then ended up with a kind of a compromise suggestion that that came from Samantha, which is kind of a combination of one and two. And involves that that first step of kind of getting the timeline language out the work, the sort of amended language that that goes into the consensus policy that deals with the urgent response timeline. But that also, we would then work on incorporating that kind of this on a more policy basis by using the opportunity of when we're considering the SSAD recommendations.

And I think that that certainly was getting a bit of favor, but it's really with all of us to take this back to our groups and again to get instructions and for us to come to some agreement, hopefully by our next meeting, really. I think there's certainly a desire for us to be able to signal the path forward. And certainly, that it seems as though that would also signal the path forward for getting that 24-hour response time language actually published as well.

So, I think I'll pause there and just see if there are any kind of preliminary thoughts or things people want to raise. But I mean, otherwise, it's really with us for getting the feedback from our groups. Okay, Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. I think we pretty much had consensus around the idea of the GNSO council writing back to the Board and having that place where we have the placeholder in terms of no more than 24 hours defined. While we go back to speak to different constituencies with what's with the language that we're expecting some to volunteer, I think it will also be helpful to review a draft of the letter that should go to the Board.

What we're basically saying is the placeholder be replaced with the actual timeline. And for us, that should be sufficient to cover to allow Recommendation 18 to proceed. While we work on subsequent side of the accuracy authentication mechanism. So, I would expect that possibly in the days ahead, we might want to surface a letter that we can review in terms of the draft that will go to the Board.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks for that, Lawrence. That's a really good suggestion. And I should just mention that Samantha has done her job already, but she sent the language to me and Jen and I confess on my side, I hadn't actually spotted it. So, it's with me in my inbox to have a look at and get circulated out. But that suggestion of perhaps we try and incorporate or try also to have a draft of what a letter might look like. That seems very sensible and would help move things along promptly. Thanks. Thanks for that.

Okay, I'm not again not seeing any other hands. So, unless there's anything else I think we can move on to the next agenda item, which I believe may be DNS Abuse Next Steps. And again, from, from my perspective, really, I just feel it's helpful to just kind of for us to sort of flag to ourselves the sorts of things we've been hearing this week.

This is absolutely not an attempt to make decisions on any of these items. But I think what we first of all, we should say fantastic news the PDP is underway. We now have appointed the chair formally. And he is in harness and meet future meetings are being organized and that is all great. I think what we here this week, and I'm now losing track of whether where exactly we heard from, but we did have some discussion.

I think it was during one of our working sessions about PDP 2, not specifically about that we should be getting that work underway, although I believe you know some are of the opinion that we ought to. But more that in the spirit of showing that we are being efficient and thinking in advance rather than waiting until the last possible moment and then finding that we need to do lots of steps.

At some point shortly, is it the time for us to think about putting together a group that would look just at the charter and do that kind of conversation that took place over a few weeks around Christmastime and actually was a very sort of speedy effort and required a lot of people to work on really short notice. We have a bit of time over the coming months when maybe we could do that in a bit more of a managed effort.

So, that was one of the main things I suppose I wanted to just suggest that we think about and again I'm not suggesting we think about it at this minute and I'm not suggesting, I'm not asking for people to put their hand up to start working on the charter now.

I think it would at least at a minimum, we should allow the DNS Abuse PDP to sort of get underway. If we were to start working on the next charter for the next PDP we'd need someone to lead that charter effort and we currently have a lot of the people who are most deeply involved in this are already a bit tied up on the PDP one. So, I'm not thinking about this for like right this minute, but in the next couple of months, my suggestion is that we think about it. And again, I'm kind of floating that, but it's captured a few hands. So, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS

Thank you, Chair. So in the course of this week, definitely we're happy to see the progress. First of all, happy to see the progress we're making with DNS Abuse. In the course of this week, we were also, this week's meeting, we're also exposed to the timelines for the current PDP that is ongoing. And I must say that while that PDP was being designed, it was designed, it was narrowly scoped.

The membership was -- it was intriguing that the membership had to be representative rather than the open model that some of us really wanted, because we felt that making it representative will cause us to quickly reach consensus on issues that we're going to be on the discussion and so it's going to make the timeline slimmer and get us to work faster.

Also, we had to ensure that we got some form of guarantee from Org, the CEO, that whatever resources were needed will be put behind the Working Group. And so, definitely, it came as a surprise to see that the timelines still looked like what we would have had if we had an open Working Group and was inter-representative, nimble, and all that.

And with the responses that came from the GAC and then from the Board, it's, I would say, yes, we could have done better in terms of the timelines that we put out there. So, while we have definitely reassured the community that this isn't final, it's still up for discussion, I'm hoping that where we continue to go down this line in future with the other PDPs, we try and guide against the kind of feedback we've received in the course of this week based on the timelines for the PDP.

Yes, I agree, Chair, that we should begin to look at the charter for the second PDP. It would mean council having to reconvene the Small Group on DNS Abuse or whatever mechanism we want to use. But since we already have a draft from the issues report, it would be nice to start finalizing that and to also take into consideration all that I've said that has happened in the course of this particular week.

One final note, because I know there might be others who want to speak about this, is the Small Team actually had three proposals. So, we had two PDPs designed, and then there was a third issue, which for some reasons we felt could easily be dealt with by putting more teeth to this is the issue concerning DGAs.

And the thinking amongst the small group was that we could have some more coordinated activity to help with the best practice documents that was to be produced already. We understand some work has been done in this regard from the contracted parties, and I feel it's with input from PSWG, which is GAC. And so, we want to be starting this work from the scratch. Possibly I don't know what the mechanism is that we want to use to finalize that work, but it's nice that we also put that on our radar and begin to deal with how we want to implement this.

There are definitely questions to be answered. What's the modality? Even while it might not end up in a PDP, we still have to look at how we're going to get to implement this work. What's the framework? Is it going to be open for Public Comments? And whatever the feedback is, will be articulated. So, definitely there's also work to be done in these regards, and I feel that we should see this as a low-hanging fruit and begin to put mechanisms in place to have it resolved. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for bringing that up, Lawrence, and really interesting to hear about that work that's going on anyway in the community, so thanks for that. Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks, Susan. I'll start first of all with something more direct. I want to put my hand up to help chair drafting the charter for the next PDP. I presume Jen's hand up is also for the same reason, so Jen, if you're willing to work together on that one, I'm willing to, and also to help share the load.

As for the current DNS Abuse PDP, I think I feel like we missed an opportunity of having a more structured discussion on the PDP, the timeline, and so on, and maybe that's the main reason why I raised my hand for.

Perhaps on the next council session, we can invite Paul to talk to us, now that he's the confirmed chair, so he can present to council officially what the timeline will be, and we can have this kind of more formalized interaction with the PDP, because as I said in a previous meeting, to me, it feels a little bit like council is trying to micromanage the PDP and not really allowing for the proper time for the members to read through the timeline, for us to agree with it and see how is it going to work.

And it also seems that we're ignoring some of Paul's mentions to willing to do this under the one-year timeline and willing to do this as fast as possible.

So, I feel a little bit caught up between distinction. I know it's a relevant matter, but at the same time, I don't agree with what Lawrence just said, that we're seeing a similar timeline to other PDPs, because if we look at the real ICANN tradition, we're used to eight years or six years and stuff like that. One and a half year, it's still a reasonable timeline, and I would maybe urge for us to have a formalized interaction with Paul, and then offer our feedback in a more clear, transparent, and open way, and more structured even, because that's what I missed throughout this meeting.

So, just to summarize these two points, I'd like to help charter, put my hand up to help chair whatever chartering group for the second PDP we come up with, and I would really appreciate some more structured discussions on how council will offer its feedback to the PDP timeline and so on. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Bruno. Gemma, were you going to talk to the timeline? I was just going to say, yeah, thanks for that, Bruno. I think we're all aware, but perhaps it wasn't quite so obvious to the wider community that it is actually one of the first tasks of the Working Group in the charter is for them to work on their timeline.

And so, whilst there's a draft timeline being shared that was for the Working Group members to review and get input and for that to be finalized. And yes, then that timeline comes to council. It's not our job to be setting the timeline per se. Obviously, we will have to review it and we may well have feelings on that when we see it. But at the moment it's firmly the responsibility of the Working Group. Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

I'm glad I let you respond first. Thank you, Susan. And thanks, Bruno and Lawrence for bringing up a lot of these things that have been discussed throughout this whole week.

I think I cannot underline more importantly that council should not be seen or should not really be micromanaging this timeline. We should trust the EPDP Working Group to be able to have that expert assessment themselves to see what this work entails. And I expect that the very next meeting of the ADC PDP, notice I'm using ADC PDP, it will stick somehow, that this will be discussed.

I'm sure also Paul, staff, myself, we've all taken a lot of notes on this input that we've heard. And you'll see that reflected in the next draft, which will be then, of course, discussed, confirmed by the Working Group itself before it comes to council. That brings me to my second point.

I think a lot of us have also kind of noted that, oh, there's, of course, the other charter of PDP 2. I think a good and natural point for us to start taking a look at that, noting that we've had quite a lot of work, even before we said we would do the next steps. We're calling for volunteers for all of these other efforts as well. A natural point for council to take a look at the second charter might be when we receive the work plan for PDP 1.

So, then council will understand a fuller picture of what PDP 1 will work on. Then we can say, okay, well, this makes sense. Let's look at the charter for PDP 2 in more detail, including, of course, chartering, drafting charter. I don't have words anymore. Getting together a charter drafting team as necessary. I think that's it.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks for that, Jen. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL Thank you. We are a multi stakeholder model. And you saw the reactions everybody had to the draft timelines that were shared, right? And the draft word was absolutely there. And the reason I believe why there was such a strong reaction from almost one year

PDP, so we can really achieve something in this year when the eyes of the world are at ICANN, right?

The Next Round is happening. We have finally started to work on abuse. And slowly, if you look around the world, you'll see governments have started taking things in their own hands. Indian government, Indian judiciary has released or set about asking registrars around the world to suspend things, suspend domains if they have caught abusing, right? This is catching on.

And this is what we have been worried about across the world. If we do not self-regulate or do something that is needed, then it will be taken out of our hands.

So, when everybody was promised, we'll do this in one-year, short focus, like Lawrence said, every time we had to make a decision, it was made based on decision. Okay, what will help us do it faster? We'll all compromise and do that, right? And now that we have made all the compromises, everything again and again, and then we see this. And that is why you see the reaction that is coming from everywhere else.

I want to put something very clear. It is a plan. This is not written in stone. If we plan for one year, and during deliberations, we need to take extra six months, nobody can stop us from doing that. We are not saying just because you plan for one year, and to do a good job, you need longer, you take longer. I mean, I'm sure we will all take longer if it needed. But let's not plan for two years and say, hey, we'll go about it. And let's see where we reach.

Let's plan for one year so that the Org can also dedicate the resources required for that. Everybody can plan their workloads. According to that, if it takes longer, it takes longer. But let's be very strict in our timelines, very efficient. So, we all can plan our lives. And the time we need to dedicate to this to get this done. That's all my request is. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE All right. Thank you for making those points, Vivek. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW Thanks, Susan. This is Justine. So, I think I was the one who suggested that maybe council could start looking at PDP 2 charter. And I think one of the reasons for that is now that we have gotten ourselves a little bit of buffer with getting the PDP 1, we can spread out the work, the work of the next charter drafting team a little better.

I think we were rushing and trying to squeeze in things in a very short timeline for PDP 1 charter. The other thing also is I really would not like to see an extended discussion on the Human Rights impact assessment stuff delay council's approval for charter for the PDP 2. So, if we want to have a look at that, then we have time to look at that right now. Not right now, but moving towards the PDP 2.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Justine. Bruna?

BRUNA SANTOS So, thanks, Susan. First of all, I don't think Human Rights will be delaying any discussions, because it's been implemented in the broader conversation. So, from the beginning. So, I don't really understand, Justine, why you're saying that. And to be very honest, like, I'm a little bit tired of these discussions of Human Rights always being placed as kind of a disruptor to the broader conversation. And honestly, this is a serious failure in acknowledging any user's relevance in this conversation. And I'm a little bit irritated with this point.

Second of all, I feel like we are really rushing in this conversation and not really allowing for the PDP 2 to start. Like, we had four meetings. They were just presentation meetings, a consensus building exercise. And now, next week on the 23rd, in two weeks' time, we will get to review the proper timeline. And as PDP members, we will get to say what we feel about the timeline, yes or no, and how do we rush that or not. And I feel like I don't really understand why this rush about it when the chair has already said it's willing to work under the timeline.

The chair has already said and tried to come with agreements and commitments with the broader PDP members in a way that it doesn't overburden us and we're still allowed to reach consensus in a way.

So, to me, it really feels like we're undermining the membership and the leadership of this PDP kind of ability of kick-start the process, and we're rushing into that. That's why I was urging, and Susan, you're correct of, like, stating that more clearly on the chat, that we need to wait until the timeline is approved by the PDP members and formalized to council.

So, then we will be able to discuss this as councilors, because right now it just feels like we're rushing and we're not really listening to the points that are being raised by community. And just so to put this on, my last point is, yes, some parts of the community have been saying that this is a long timeline, but NCSG has also been saying that this is a realistic timeline, and I think we have been disregarded enough in this conversation as well. So, I'm sorry for the frustrated comments here, but I'm just a little bit irritated with being disregarded all the times and the points we bring in this sense as well. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Bruna. I don't think anyone's disregarding your input, and indeed you are one of the PDP members, so you're going to be giving your input into the PDP, which is where the timeline conversation is happening. But I think in the room, we've all been going to various sessions and some of us have been in different meetings to other people.

But I think Vivek was trying to bring the perspective that around the meeting here, people have been hearing a lot of comment about the timeline. It's kind of inevitable. This is the first PDP. Everyone's very excited about it. It's finally started work. People all have views, and I think it's not much more than that. We're all just reflecting that we're hearing views that people hope this will get done faster, I guess. But yes, it is for the PDP to discuss and agree their timeline, and then bring it back to us here in Council. Christian.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Thanks. I wanted to say that in reflecting upon some of the things that Vivek was saying, I think that there has been a general acknowledgement that I've heard throughout the week from people that there's a fire lit under us to get things done as quickly as possible for good reason.

And I think that people generally understand that this needs to happen as quickly as it can. It's been an education for me, though, in talking with Paul and talking with others to figure out why the timelines as proposed are the way they are. Because there's a lot of bylaws requirements that go into the various parts that need to go into any sort of effective PDP, including things like Public Comment periods that extend periods.

And I don't think in the chartering of this organization, we've agreed to sort of opt out of any of those important points, particularly things like Public Comment periods. So, we're left with a situation where we've got a number that is in some ways a real good educator for the entire ICANN community and how long a PDP takes, even when we get it as nimble as possible.

I wonder how much efficiency is in there. I do know after having talked with Paul that he's motivated to make it as quick as possible. So, I'm willing to put some faith that that's happening. I do like the ideas of doing some preliminary work to try and make sure that we are lined up as well as possible for the next one. But I think that before we start talking about how slow this is, we should figure out what, like, a minimum PDP can be under the bylaws. And this may not be all that far off of what that line is. So, unless we want to change some bylaws requirements, this might be where we're left.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Christian. That is a good point. And I think one of the points Paul has been making, he's been mentioning a number of days kind of thing that pretty much, which I think is one of those, there are certain steps that are baked in. But perhaps it would be we're always supposed to be continuously improving. Perhaps it would be no bad thing for us to take a look at those steps again and reflect on whether any of them can be shorter.

But I mean, there are some that for all the desire in the community for things to be faster. I mean I don't think if we went to anyone and said, but well, we've decided we won't do the Public Comment, that's not a starter. If we said, well people can get away with two-week Public Comment, again that's not a starter. So, there are some things we cannot move. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Susan. Thank you, Christian. You said 90 percent of what I put my hand up to say. So, thank you for that. I think it's really important for council also to be ones to educate, I guess, the way that we do PDPs, because the understanding of certain set pieces and what I mean by set pieces are things that were acquired that we cannot shorten, for example, Public Comment periods. But things that we can find efficiencies, for example, the time that the Working Group needs to take on specific charter items or charter question deliberations. Those are things we can take a look at.

So, the suggestion might be when we take a look inside the PDP, of course, the Working Group, the next iteration of the work plan may have a lot more detail than just a single slide that shows a kind of line and just kind of markers here, there and others. You'll be able to see a really detailed breakdown of what these Public Comment periods look like, what the timing would look like for each of the charter questions.

Then you'll start to have a real appreciation of why these timelines are the way it is. I'm not saying again that this is the final. Of course, it's not. It's a starting point. It is a draft.

One more item I really wanted to pick up, and I know Vivek's hand is up again. I would really strongly caution us against encouraging the Working Group to revise their work plan. This is an exceptional item for any PDP Working Group to come to council again and say we need to revise our work plan. So, it's not, unfortunately, it's not like a business kind of environment where you can always revise your work plan and it's fine. That's not an iterative process that council would encourage.

So, when we're looking at the work plan, it really should be quite the Working Group should be following such a thing, especially when they need to discuss and look at it and then submit to council for approval.

One last thing that I remember, I forgot when I was responding to Lawrence in the first place. I encourage us to take a look at the session that the I think the CPH or the registries had on the DGAs. There was one that was done during this meeting. Unfortunately, I had a clash either with council or the other PDPs. So, do take a look at that. We are starting to do some work on that. So, people are really looking at it. People are starting work on that as well. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

No matter which session you go, DNS Abuse take the most amount of time. I'm surprised that the PDP has to come back for a larger approval if the timelines and change, because whenever we look at the ADR, it seems like, oh, this was deferred for 10 years and now let's discuss again.

So, there's a disbalance between things being so planned and then things lying around for 10 years before they're discussed in ICANN world. My point was not this. What I was going to say is that ending the PDP will not help the ADC work that still needs to be implemented.

Now, the implementation may not be an IRT if the implementation is changes in the RAA or something else. That is a timeline we have not even started thinking about. So, it's not as if the ADC, PDP, I'm going to use ADC now. So, not ACDC, ADC. So, the ADC PDP finishes. What is the timeline from then till when we will actually see it implemented and making something happen?

When is the first time ICANN compliance will be able to start measuring or asking registrars, have you done this or not? What is the timeline that we have in mind? And we should communicate that also clearly to the community now. Otherwise, once we finish the next question, we're going to get it. Okay. When are we going to see results? Right.

So, let's start to put that in place. What mechanism there will be to implement this PDP? Because I know IRT is not one of them. And what those timelines will be so we set the right expectations.

Everybody from Board to GAC and everybody else, all our community. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Steve, did you want to comment?

STEVE CHAN

Yep. Thanks, Susan. This is Steve Chan from staff. And I certainly can't predict the timeline for the implementation of the outputs. But what I can say is that what we're trying to do is make sure there's a cross-functional team within ICANN that is paying attention to the PDP. So, it doesn't come as a surprise to any of the groups that are going to be responsible for implementing.

So, our friends in global demand strategy will be involved, compliance, probably legal. All these different groups will be a part of the at least periphery of the PDP so that the recommendations are well known, well in advance. So, they can probably maybe do some of the advance work before they're actually adopted by the Board. Because we're well aware of the eyes on this PDP and we want to do everything we can to make sure that the timeline is as compressed as possible. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Steve. Okay. I mean, this ended up being more of a discussion on timeline than I was perhaps expecting. But I think what people were trying to do was bring back the feedback that they'd heard around the meeting, and to some extent to Vivek's point just now, it's better for us to manage expectations. So, we don't want to have a situation where a PDP has finished its work and then everyone's saying, well, why isn't this enforced yet?

But I think my understanding of what the PDP is attempting to do, and I think let's see how it pans out. But they're looking at as far as possible coming up with suggested new language so that hopefully the implementation is light touch. But again, that again is very much something for the PDP to work on.

All right. I think that was a good a good discussion. We've reminded ourselves of what we've heard here. Really, as I say, I had put this on the agenda more to reflect on that idea of, do we have a slightly more peaceful process of coming up with a charter for the next PDP where we don't have to do it in a rush over a holiday period and make everyone work really hard for two weeks. You know, let's kind of try to circle back on that.

Jen's very sensible suggestion is let's see what the work plan is for the for the first one first. And then and then we can reflect on whether it's then a good opportunity for us to take a sort of a little drafting effort on the on the charter for the second PDP at that point while we have some breathing space.

Okay, that is it, I think, for DNS Abuse unless anyone has anything else. But otherwise, I think we're at AOB. And if there isn't any AOB, I don't personally have any. If there isn't anything else, it would just be an opportunity to thank everyone for their efforts, to thank our remote participants who has probably have probably had a really trying week dialing in at very difficult times of the day. Yes. And to hope that the sort of world efforts allow us to be all in person or as many of us as possible in person for our next meeting. Okay. All right. I now do have a hand. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADIE

Sorry, Susan. Lawrence and Vivek yesterday wanted to make an AOB and it would be comment today, I think. And I was wondering what happened to that.

SUSAN PAYNE

I think that may have been a bit of a misunderstanding. Basically, I got my agendaring wrong. It became clear when we were discussing with them that they were items with things that had come up in the meeting and we were bringing back. So, we're already on the proposed agenda. But I may be, I see Vivek has his hand up now. So, I may be.

VIVEK GOYAL

No, you're correct. I have nothing on this topic. It's done. I have something else to say or nothing on the Farzaneh's comment. What you said is right. I have something else. Nothing else. I just wanted to thank everybody who made it to Mumbai with all the global challenges coming. Really appreciate that you all came, experienced this wonderful city.

I hope you now are better equipped to cross roads and intersections without getting run over. You know how to navigate.

Traffic does not bother you and hope you have a new perspective of India. Then we are not sitting on elephants and moving around half naked.

So, I hope you appreciated the hospitality, what the Nixie team did. If you liked it, please do let them know. They are a semi-government body and they generally don't get appreciation. So, it will be good if you can show your appreciation to them. So, thank you again for coming to Mumbai. I am so pleased you all made it here. Thank you so much.

SUSAN PAYNE

And in turn, I think I think we will have to thank you, Vivek, both for being a tremendous host generally and a marvelous host last night. Thank you for organizing our council dinner, which was really special. I'm sorry for those who couldn't be there, but Vivek took us to a lovely restaurant and we had a really enjoyable evening.

Thank you also to all of our staff colleagues. Worked very hard. I think you don't always see it, but when we all go off to have dinners and drinks with people, sometimes they are beavering away kind of changing slides and drafting agendas and so on. So, thank you for that. And thank you to the tech team and general support team as well for a productive meeting. Okay. All right. Thank you very much. I didn't miss anything, did I?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you to you, Susan, for Chairing all of this.

TERRI AGNEW We can stop recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]