

---

ICANN86 Seville | PF – GNSO Work Session  
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 10:00 to 11:15 CEST

TERRI AGNEW

Hello, and welcome to the GNSO Working Session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in the session. I will also post them in chat for your reference. Only questions posted in 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 over to Susan Payne, GNSO Chair. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE

Hi, everyone, welcome. This is our only working session here at ICANN86. We would sometimes have two working slots, but because this is a policy meeting and we have fewer of those kind of bilateral meetings to prepare for, we just have the one slot today.

So on our agenda, and we have an agenda on the slide. Perfect. So we thought it was helpful to give a sort of relatively brief update of

---

***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.***

a couple of the sessions that the GAC are running that they had asked for participation from the GNSO or from sort of particular GNSO groups. In particular, there will be a session about the current registrar obligation to verify registration data or a part of registration data within 15 days. So we will give a quick update on that.

I think that session is happening later on this morning and is very much a sort of informational kind of scene setting thing. But I think probably if there are things people want to talk about on this topic more generally, we probably will have a good opportunity later today when we have our informal meeting. And that might be a good chance for people to share views if they have them on the issue more generally and on how we kind of take this topic forward.

Then we'll have a review of some of the action items from our strategic planning session earlier in the year and look at some follow up from that in relation to checklists for council liaisons and some principles around engagement and the submission of motions and so on. And then I've got any other business on there, but I don't know that we have AOB. I'll see if anyone -- actually, I think Terri has one item she's going to mention for us, but we will see if anything else comes to light. And with that, I'm going to hand over to Jen, who's just going to talk about the GAC session.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Susan. Good morning, everyone, and good day to those who are kind of beaming in remotely. This is Jen, your vice chair.

Just a bit of an update on our participation in the GAC sessions. A reminder, we got that lovely email, not email, it was emailed to us, but it was a letter on the 11th of May requesting a webinar on the 15-day verification timeline under the RAA during the prep week.

Now, that was kind of a very tight timeline, and so I think council leadership and our, of course, our GAC liaison and also topic leads were really scrambling to take a look at how we were going to do this, and leadership had a little bit of discussion. So we said that this time to organize this webinar is really limited.

So instead of doing it during prep week, we suggested to leverage the time that was identified in the letter for this trilateral dialogue to use this as the information session instead. And then when we have that kind of baseline level of understanding what this problem is or what the problems they want to understand more with this information, then we can organize something after ICANN86 to have a little bit more of a planning time to see where we can land on what this dialogue might look like.

So we then, again, scrambled and planned with the GAC via the leadership and also our GAC liaison and the GAC topic leads to look at the two items that are to be the information sessions. This is actually going to start at 11:45 local time and right after the session. So the first one is a five-minute overview of the progress of the SSAD SRT and what is going to be discussed during this meeting, so during ICANN86, where we're going to get to. And that's then going to follow with a 45-minute information session on the 15-day

verification timeline. So kind of giving the background of it and trying to scope and understand what the problem space might be and is.

Mark Anderson, our SSAD SRT team lead, will be providing this short update on the progress of the SSAD SRT. And I, being our council DNS abuse topic lead, will be giving an overview of the 15-day verification timeline, kind of in relation to DNS abuse. I'll be joined by a few registrar friends. I will be joined also by Ashley and Susan, trying to just give that overview and information.

So again, we've been trying to do this in this very limited time. Again, I know I've heard councilors and others have been saying this is kind of pushing the timeline very quick to prepare for something, but this is what's going to happen. And again, what Susan said, we'll have a chance to talk about this more during our informal meeting in terms of how we can get around not needing to prepare for something in such a short turnaround and being able to plan a little better for how we're trying to get to the goals.

I think that's my update. And I'll pass it back to Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, I think one other topic that we also were contacted about, just less formally, but more sort of like, can you identify anyone who could come along, is for that, we don't call them plenaries, do we, community session on Thursday afternoon, which is about exploring whether there's the possibility of a platform that can be

provided by ICANN that would allow applicants, support applicants in the next round to sort of transition over to operating their own backend, so becoming their own RSP.

And that session, it was a little unclear exactly what was needed, but ultimately, one of the Registrar Stakeholder Group members, so Edmund Chung has put his hand up and said that he operates a registry and works with a backend provider and could perhaps go along and talk to the kind of considerations that you have when you're thinking about how you run the backend of your registry.

I think probably a number of us are still a little unclear on exactly what it is that the GAC have been sort of, are kind of pushing for on this, but hopefully that might become a bit clearer for folks after that session, where there'll be a number of different members of the community will be kind of discussing that issue. And so I guess if anyone's interested in the topic, it's a good session to attend, which is on Thursday.

But yeah, I think that's probably all. I'm not seeing any hands. I don't know if anyone does have any questions, but again, we probably have a good chance to talk in a bit more detail. You know, if people have particular sort of thoughts on this 15 day issue and kind of the GAC ask, which is to kind of that this should be one that's prioritized, I guess, is what they're asking. We have our informal meeting later. Yes, Christian.

---

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Just a question about whether, in addition to answering their questions, whether we want to talk about the broader topic of GNSO GAC communication and whether the method used to deliver this message is the way that we want to communicate with them. I think that it's useful to probably give them some aspirations of how we would like to be engaged on these topics in the process as well.

SUSAN PAYNE

I'll start. Yeah, we obviously, we do have our liaison to the GAC and Seb and I have had some conversations about this. There certainly has, I think there are some changes in kind of personnel on the GAC side that have been perhaps driving some of this, both in the GAC themselves and on their staff side, which perhaps has not helped here. But yeah, it's definitely a sort of bigger topic. And again, I probably would speak more in the informal meeting than I will maybe say here.

But we certainly, we got quite late requests for participation. And then when we had a call to discuss how they were envisaging a session versus maybe how we were, there was a really long list of very detailed data that they wanted someone to come along, probably registrars to come along and give them. And we were sort of looking at this list and going, well I don't know that some of this data is ever available, but it's certainly kind of, it's not available like next week. So yeah, there definitely has been a bit of a disconnect in expectations, let's say, I think. Jen, did you want to add?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Well, part of it is a disconnect in expectations. I think that's an important topic, but also the method, we don't want to end up in a situation where it looks like these are the methods being used to sort of direct the work of the GNSO. And just having the mechanisms that we've all got in place already with the liaison process, be very back and forth so that we are always understanding their priorities is the one thing that we need to reinforce to make sure that they know that that's the proper venue.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Sorry, I didn't put my hand up, but just a very quick response. And I see Seb moving towards his mic as well. I was going to see if there's anything our liaison wanted to say. But just before I do that, I wanted to mention, I think the format of communication is interesting. And again, I don't want to assume anything, but perhaps for GAC a letter to them may be very informal. And for us, it might be very formal. So maybe just again, I'm sorry, I'm jumping in the queue. But Susan, please, I'll give it to you.

SUSAN PAYNE

I was also going to say, we do actually have like Farzaneh and Peter in the queue on online. So is it okay if I go to them first Seb? Yeah. Farzaneh?

---

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yeah, sorry, I couldn't be in the room this morning. There are some logistical issues, so I apologize for that. So, the GAC letter is very problematic. In our view, it wants to circumvent the multi-stakeholder policy development process, and it is not an informal request. In their communiqué, they mention that they want to reduce the number of days for verification, and they invoke informal reports, which is just a piece of research and should have stayed like that and should not have been invoked. And they do not consider any other community input on this.

And then they also say that one of the suggested ways could be a bilateral contractual amendment. So, in effect, GAC wants to tell us that we don't need to make policy about this. We don't need to go through the multi-stakeholder model. We can just do a contractual amendment. And this is very problematic because this idea of reducing the days, also from the NCSG point of view, is not good for the registrants, and our members have had concerns.

And let's not forget how we came up with this suggestion. There was a small team at the Council that I was also involved with. And these are not even small teams that should make policy. They can inform policy, but they cannot make policy in effect. So aside from this issue, I just want to mention that in your communication with GAC, if you could also tell them that some of the members, like the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is concerned about reducing the duration of verification for the registrant. So if you can relate that to them as well.

---

And I think that we should be very concerned about this, because aside from the accuracy issue, what if they want to send us letters about other issues and they ask us for contractual amendments that are in effect policy? And we should be very clear to GAC that we have our processes. We have a multi-stakeholder, bottom-up process, and it's through that that we make policy. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for that Farzi. We'll probably respond on that in a minute. Peter?

PETER AKINREMI

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

SUSAN PAYNE

Yes, we can hear you fine. Thanks.

PETER AKINREMI

Yeah, thank you so much. My apologies that I'm unable to join in person due to some family issues and personal issues. Just wanted to reiterate what Susan and Jen said that the GNSO-GAC session is framed to understand the problem space and helping GAC to really understand what they're requesting for. So GAC is being GAC in their nature by usually letting and saying this is what we want to achieve.

However, so we are reframing this in understanding and helping GAC to understand what the problems there, what the issues they

---

are talking about, whether they understand these and also us to better understand that we don't want to say, oh, this is what you're discussing later, but we want to better understand this issue. And that's the whole essence of the meeting with the GAC in understanding what their requests were and also that I understand the issues they're talking about.

And also, I dropped something in chat. I'm sure that Susan already touched on that, that the registrar is also going to present some data. I don't know if that data set is, or the council is aware of that data set. I don't know if some link could be shared about some of those data sets for the councilors to know, get aware or understand some of those data sets before we go ahead and discuss that with, or maybe the registrar could share some light on that so that we could be all on the same page on what we want to discuss with the GAC. But the whole essence is for the GAC to understand the problems faced and understand more on this issue, not just the same or the one contract you're amending. And that's the point of the session. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Peter. Did you take your hand down, Seb? Okay. Do you want to? Seb, yeah.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Sorry, I'm not in this room. That might be part of the problem. I won't speak to the content of the letter, just to the form. There was

---

indeed a bit of a perfect storm over the last few months, because the leadership of the GAC is changing, the leadership within the GAC support team is changing, because it just so happened that both liaisons decided that they weren't coming to this meeting and may have been in their own life a bit distracted.

I personally, and I've organized meetings both with the staff and with the incoming chair, who's going to start in October. I don't understand a group of people that says, we can't meet you because we have no time for it. Let's instead do peer-to-peer meetings with the different interest groups that we have, and then don't come up with the goods because we don't have those meetings. Have these conversations directly because we're such buddies, but I'm going to send you a letter instead of going and communicating with the peers that we had also designated. None of that communication is happening, and we need to go back and insist on it.

This said, you're absolutely right. This letter is just a letter. We may take a lot more formally than the GAC does. If the GAC wanted to be formal, it would have been a communiqué, and if they wanted to make it authoritative, it would have been an advice. There are levels there, and they're stepping up. This is just level one, but the form is not great. The way it's done, the lack of warning, none of this is great, and we need to repair that.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Susan. Thanks, Seb. Thank you for addressing, again, just honing in on the format. I'll touch on a little bit of what Farzi and

Peter mentioned. Peter mentioned about some additional data and research from the registrars. Hopefully, counselors who have some time to be able to go to the information session on the times that I indicated will be happy to know that we will have some discussion there. I think preliminarily, we can probably share that after they talk about it a little bit. I think there's a few stats that they provided.

The second thing is I think really the information session is to get us all on a baseline level of understanding what the problem space is. Absolutely take note of your concern, Farzi. I think, again, that will be an attempt for us to ease that information both ways to the GAC and from council and others who actually need to be impacted by this particular topic to get to a point where we can have a deeper dialogue. I think that's really the point of having the info session, but point well taken. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Lovely. Thanks for that. Again, we perhaps can have a bit more of a robust conversation on this later today if folks want to. Okay. I think we should move on. I've probably gone way off the timing on the agenda already.

Our next agenda item was for us to do a review of a couple of the items that came out of the GNSO strategic planning session. The first one of those was this concept of having a checklist for council liaisons. If you think back to January when many of us were able to

be in person in Barcelona, you might remember we talked quite a lot about council's role and the council liaisons role in the PDP.

We particularly talked about sort of, well, the two issues I suppose that are there on the slide came out quite strongly. One was around getting updates from liaisons and was there more we could do to help liaisons understand their role and the kind of things that maybe they should or shouldn't be reporting and making sure that we're giving those sort of clear regular opportunities where liaisons feel that they can just give a check in.

The second one was around just some thinking around some sort of better rules around engagement on when a motion is submitted and how we all handle that and how we ensure that we, in so far as possible, can be putting feedback on a motion or suggesting amendments in a particular, in a kind of timely manner and that sort of issue.

So those were two of the things that were kind of takeaways and action items for the leadership team and staff to look at. And so we're sort of circling back on these two now. I think it's probably the next slide. The issue of the council liaisons, we talked about the role they play in kind of following the work of the PDP or the IRT that they're the liaison to and we do have a job description for liaisons and this is a kind of high level summary of the main roles that the council liaison does.

So in terms of acting in a neutral manner, monitoring the discussions, reporting from the working group or IRT back to

council where there are key points sort of points of note reporting from council back to the working group or IRT if council has a particular view it's been asked to express or if council had concerns about things they're hearing about how a working group is functioning, for example, and then assisting the working group and IRT leadership or indeed the groups generally on if there are questions or problems and they want council to opine on something.

So those are some of the key roles for the council liaison. And we had some questions about kind of how do liaisons do this and how are they expected to monitor discussions and report back, what types of things should be flagged to council. Those kind of questions were things that we talked about. And so we sort of, we agreed that we'd kind of take a bit of a first cut on looking at that and sort of can we just give a bit more guidance to liaisons to help them when they're doing their role. I think that's probably, hopefully on the next slide.

Yes, so what should they be providing updates on and what we think, and I think probably we discussed obviously some of this as well, but essentially the kind of issues that we're looking for liaisons to give us an update on are sort of decisions that have been reached in the group that they're the liaison to, so that could be something like the selection of the chair or the selection of a vice chair or that there's a the group has now agreed their work plan and here it is, that kind of thing. Some from time to time check-ins, if we're having these regular check-in, somewhat regular check-in points

sort of the kind of, what are the main topics of discussion that are going to be happening.

So for example, the working group this week is or during ICANN86 the working group will be talking about charter questions four to six or whatever or they'll be talking about the definition of a privacy proxy provider or that kind of thing, not expecting the liaison to be telling council absolutely everything that's happening in the PDP, but just the high level of this is what they're up to.

Particularly important, I think, is are there any issues or challenges or conflict. So, for example, the group is talking about charter question four, whatever that is, and they're stuck. There are two strong opposing views on that, or they're stuck on the definition of X, or because of this the group is falling behind schedule. They're having to spend more time than had been anticipated. Or this was a working group, either a representative model or even an open one, but we've noticed that over time the participation from such and such a GNSO group has dropped off and we're concerned that it's not getting the true multi-stakeholder input that we would really expect. Those kinds of issues and concerns.

Then something about timelines, particularly if there are concerns about timelines. For example, we were expected to get the initial report out by X. The group is going to be behind schedule or if the group is going to be ahead of schedule, that's also wonderful. In fact, that's great to know. The staff who work on the working group will know that, obviously, and would be scheduling that into

council's agenda, but it's worth us all having in mind that, actually, we thought we'd be having a vote on something at the end of the year, but it's looking like it might be three months early. That's good information to be starting to get.

And then finally, if there have been any changes to working practices. For example, the working group's been meeting once a week. We're actually upping that to twice a week because we were falling behind schedule, and so this is what we're doing to try to address our timeline concerns, for example. Those are all the kinds of things that I think the leadership think would be helpful for a liaison to be thinking about and almost doing a sort of run-through in their minds of, are there any of these things happening that I need to bring back to council and just mention to people so they know?

So I think I'll just pause there briefly and see if there's any immediate reaction to that. Obviously, there'll be opportunities to reflect on this as well, but really just wanting to see if that's landing okay with councilors or if anything seems really obviously missing. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure, Susan. I'm a liaison to one of the IRTs, and I think what you've done here, leadership has done a great job. I think this is fantastic. What I would recommend is if we can, can we reduce this into like a one page or maybe a one and a half page document and just get that ready for our future liaisons? And could we have that ready

---

well in advance of the meeting in Bali? I'm willing to work with staff on that. If leadership would like me, I think this is pretty simple.

And I would also suggest for first time liaisons before they actually step into the role, maybe have them have a short call with leadership just to go over everything. And that can be like a 10 or 15 minute call. I think this is excellent. I think it's a great improvement. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks very much, Damon. Yeah, nice suggestion. Thank you. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Susan. This is Sam. At the risk of making a very obvious comment, but when you ask for something that might be missing here, there are instances, especially on IRTs in particular recently, where the IRT has had to come back to council with a question. And that's kind of a formal written process. But I think if we have the liaison flag those as early as they can, it's going to facilitate the individual councilors going back to their stakeholder groups and constituencies for input to hopefully make the turnaround on that a bit faster. So that's one I would just add to this, but otherwise support everything Damon said, too. Those are good suggestions.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Sam. That's a really good catch. Yeah, I think that definitely. And that is the kind of thing, I mean, that's that probably

---

falls within the issues, conflicts, challenges, but yeah, an absolute call out on that, that the more notice we can give folks, the better they're at the chance that they can get instructions. And I guess I was going to say it may come up in the context text of the next round, but I suppose that's less so, because that isn't an ongoing working group at the moment. But we have, I suppose, it's just something for us to all bear in mind. Okay, I'm not seeing any other hands. I'll just keep or does that new one, Damon, or?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

No, it's an old hand.

SUSAN PAYNE

Oh, and now I see Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Sorry, I just wanted to mention that there should be clarity for the council members that they're liaison and not an advocate for the ideas that IRT is coming up with. Their role is more of clarification and telling us what's happening and not to advocate for an idea. So, but I totally understand if they want to say what they think about the issue, but I think that it should be clear that it's not an advocacy role.

And I have another, I don't know how to deal with this, but this role of the liaison, I think the challenges might differ in like from one IRT to another. So, I think that we need to give them a little bit of flexibility as well on how they should communicate and what they

---

should bring in and stuff like that. But I'm not, I'm not adding to this criteria, just like flagging that.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks Farzi, the point's well noted. And on the liaison not advocate, I think I agree that's a really good catch. You know, we all know that, but I think sometimes in the moment we don't remember that. And I think I mentioned when we were talking about this at the SPS that actually you can tend to have an incentive to put your hand up to be the liaison on something that you feel very strongly about.

But actually, I felt maybe a bit of self-reflection would have been good that perhaps you, if you really care about something and feel very deeply entrenched in some of the issues, maybe you're not the best person to be the liaison from council because you, it's very hard not to be an advocate in that situation. And maybe it needs someone a little bit more impartial. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL

I'm okay to wait for Steve if he wants to add something. Okay. Just an observation, all the action items or work of liaison seems to be from the IRT or the working group to the council, I think we should add a line to say, they will also communicate the decision of the council to the working group or the IRT. I think that seems to be missing. Or maybe I'm not reading it right.

---

SUSAN PAYNE

I think we had it on the previous slide as one of the roles of the liaison, but yes, it's not captured there. And maybe we can have a think about whether we need to capture that. Yeah, that's what I mean. It's on the list of the high level explanation of the different roles of the liaison, but on the next page about the kind of principles to think about. We'll have a ponder and see whether we think that's missing from there. Thanks, Vivek. Steve?

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Susan. This is Steve from staff. I guess this is sort of a, just a procedural point. There's a fair amount of guidance already on liaisons. So I think all the feedback we're receiving now is great. And I think what we want to do before we start creating new documents or add in things that might already be there is just sort of doing an assessment to make sure that the points that are raised here are, if they are indeed new, that they are incorporated and that we're not just creating new guidance that is, I don't know, redundant or contradictory or, or something to that effect.

I know Damon will already volunteer to help us. So we'll do that assessment, I think, before we start adding new things. And then we're very much welcome the support to help to develop additional guidance. Thanks. Or as needed, that is.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah. Thanks, Steve. That makes sense. But I think we had all come away from the SPS thinking that some kind of a checklist was

---

going to be helpful. So maybe it's not a standalone, but maybe it goes into the liaison doc. Yeah, okay. Thanks very much. I'm not seeing any other hands. Peter.

PETER AKINREMI

Thanks, Susan. Just wanted to have that. These, we should actually focus, irrespective of whatever things that we're implementing, we should focus on the liaison, on how they get their job done. That's a good template that will help the liaisons to focus on their roads and reporting back to the council. However, implementation should largely focus on the liaison rather than the body.

So I'm saying I know that that's what we're trying to do. It's a checklist so that liaisons can be able to understand the issues and report back to the council. So there's a nice ones and it's something that will help liaisons to report back to the council. So just wanted to have that. During the implementation of that, it should be something that is focused on the liaison helping them to understand and also report it back to the council. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Great. Thanks for that, Peter. All right. And then the next sort of part of the piece is obviously kind of when should liaisons be giving an update? And again, this is a sort of first thinking, but again, for thoughts and views. Really, we have our monthly council meetings where we do that project list update, and we now are using that as

an opportunity and leaving a sort of space for liaisons to raise something at the beginning of those council meetings every month.

Secondly, obviously, if something is urgent or it would benefit from some explanation that could more readily be understood if something gets circulated in writing, obviously council liaisons can use the mailing list. And I think probably in many cases we'd be having a combination of those first two items probably happening. You might give council a quick sort of heads up, and if you haven't already sent an email, it would be keep an eye out for the email that's coming. It explains it in more detail.

And then the third opportunity in particular that we have is the pre-ICANN preparatory webinar that we do before each in-person ICANN meeting. And that's generally used to hear from working group chairs of PDPs, who'll tell us something about how the PDP is going along, but that could also be an opportunity where liaisons can add some additional color or chip in. And I suppose I'm thinking as I'm talking that we definitely are very much focused on the PDP in those preparatory webinars.

But it may be that, depending on the life cycle of some work, it may be that actually there is some important IRT work that's happening too. And so we might want to have some check-in from a liaison to an IRT to flag that, hey, can I get five minutes on the council preparatory webinar? I think it'd be a good opportunity to give people an update, that kind of thing. So we don't necessarily have

---

that as quite such a formal thing at the moment, but maybe that's something we should be thinking about.

So again, a bit of a sort of are there any questions about this? Does that make sense to everyone? Does anyone feel that that isn't the right approach? And I suppose more generally, do councilors feel that this will give each of us enough necessary and timely information in order for us as a council as a whole to do that task that we have of being the manager of the PDP? So again, I'd like a bit of a pause to see if anyone has any kind of immediate feedback. Jen, yeah.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Susan. This is Jen. I guess now I'll answer a little bit now with being one of the active council liaisons to a PDP working group. I think this makes a lot of sense. It lays out very clearly what liaison should be doing, when liaison should be bringing things back to council and all of that. Here, the opportunities to hear from our liaisons is actually quite is already built into, to all of these things. It's not a humongous heavy lift, in addition to what we already supposed to do our commitments. So I think this is a really good way to look at it. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Jen. Okay. Oh, Steve.

---

STEVE CHAN

Yeah. Thanks, Susan. I think this has been a good discussion because it's also causing us or me at least to reflect, I haven't talked about it with staff friends, but I don't think it's necessarily an easy thing, but it's a good reminder for us to start connecting the dots. We have tons of guidance on the Ops Procedures page. And so when a new liaison is coming on board, like making sure we point them to it so they know it's there at least.

And there's probably other instances on that Ops Procedures page where it's probably timely to provide reminders about the existence of all these different things that could have been developed through PDP 3.0. so just reflecting that, I think it's a good reminder that that page is this. There's a lot of resources on there. And then on the staff side, we can do a better job of trying to connect the dots for when they are applicable. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, yeah, sorry. Okay.

VIVEK GOYAL

Just thinking out loud, what we need is like an LLM or an agent which has all the information about ICANN in it. And instead of trying to write to Steve, saying, "Hey, Steve, I can't find this," or "Can somebody help me find this?" I just go and ask this, tell me what a liaison is supposed to do. It will look through one document, 10 documents, 15 documents, and give me the answer.

---

Because sometimes when you really want to do it, that is the time you sit down and say, "Okay, what do I do now?" Then you spend the next half an hour trying to find the document, and by that time you're done with the time you wanted to spend on that. So honestly, please take it as feedback. We need an LLM to consume all ICANN's information and make it like a chat thing. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Christian. That made me laugh. Apparently, there's a question in the chat, it says, but hang on, I will just say we're giggling because I think we probably have these conversations very frequently in the community where we ask for certain things, and I think we regularly express the same frustration, many of us from different parts of the ICANN community as well.

And it's not that you haven't been heard. But separately, we had a sort of update at an SO/AC roundtable a couple of days ago, and then we met with Tripti and Kurtis. The question of having these more interactive ways of working, rather than having to fire emails back and forwards or having to work in a Google Doc that can get very, very unmanageable with numerous comments, I mean that's another of these similar kinds of same conversations. And it's one that is being raised, and we continue to hope for some progress, I guess is the best way to put it.

All right. So there is a question from Benjamin in the chat that says, "Is there still an avenue to contact liaisons if you have to clarify an issue outside of these standard approaches?" I'm speaking

completely off the top of my head here, but I would say absolutely. I think you certainly should be able to establish very easily who the liaison is because they are listed.

So if we're talking about, I don't know, the IGO, Damon's doing the IGO-INGO Curative Rights, and there is a wiki page for that IRT, and it will include Damon as the liaison. So hopefully you have a way to find out. But if you couldn't work it out, again, you could do a quick message to the mailing list and say, "Hey, who's the liaison on such and such?"

And then I think, depending on it, it may be something you want to raise with them privately, at least initially, if you're just not sure if it's something that the wider council needs to know. But you may want to raise it on the mailing list if you think that this might be a question that council as a whole could do with knowing the answer to. I mean, I would say absolutely. We should definitely. We're here to kind of work as a team. So yeah, definitely.

And I'm not doing a very good job on the chat, so I don't know if there are any other questions in the chat. And if not, I'm not seeing any other hands, so I'm thinking at this point we perhaps can go on to the next slide. So the next topic then was this proposed rules of engagement, and I'm going to hand over to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Hi, everyone. Jen is back. So this is something that we talked about during our SPS earlier this year as well. We talked about trying to

avoid last minute changes, especially changes to motions and increase transparency around our respective SG&C issues on, on these considerations. I think, a lot of this had to do with, we actually also worked through some hypotheticals during SPS, we all remember. So I think this is something that came out of that good discussion.

We collectively as council discussed around a few things and we are translating and leadership took a first cut to try to translate this into kind of rules of engagement around the motions. So you can see there it's a list there. I'm not going to read it out in its entirety, do take a look at it, but first really as councilors is our job to flag upcoming voting items to our SGs and Cs when we have our regular updates or calls that we schedule. So there's enough time for discussion and there's enough time for alignment, especially for councilors who, who are directed to vote by their SGs or Cs.

One thing that is really important that the support staff has already acted, added to our action decision radar is the visual marker that we requested for. So it's apparently a siren icon. I don't know what a siren icon is. Oh, it's a siren. I was thinking about siren as in a mermaid or a mer creature, but no, not that kind of siren. A siren icon for when there is an upcoming voting item. So it will be added in advance as far in advance as possible.

So with this really the rule of engagement is for councilors to agree to assist their stakeholder groups and constituencies to prepare for these votes by flagging these votes early on to allow all of this to

happen using the ADR, using everything that you're receiving from any updates from leadership or staff, or of course our mailing list. Many of us already do this, but of course, adding this into writing kind of formalizes and makes clear the expectation.

And the second thing is concerns with votes really need to be signal as early as possible on the list. And that's the number two you see up there on the screen. That gives the other councilors, you give your fellow councilors that courtesy of time, if they need to go back to their constituencies to have this discussion so that there is this time.

And the final thing again, the third thing up there about the 48 hours before scheduled vote, it's to recognize that we are a global community. All of this, all of the council work in different time zones. It could be midnight or past midnight somewhere. And it's like daytime in your time zone and you think, oh, there's plenty of time for people to look at it. But in actual fact, that is not the case. So there really needs to be, if there's new or material information, the council that has not considered or has not discussed yet, this needs to be proposed 48 hours before. This is, of course, separate for any issue that didn't receive wide support from other councilors.

I'm going to pause here to see if there's any specific questions or concerns with these items and if they reflect what we did discuss during SPS. Let me check our Zoom. There is one hand. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Maybe related to this, just wanted to understand why the vote that we did on Sunday could not have been done over email. Was that a process challenge, timeline challenge?

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, basically. And so there's a couple of challenges there. I think if, and I probably will get this wrong and staff will have to correct me, but I think there is, when there's an email vote, the procedures around an email vote have a certain timeline. And I think it just is too long. It's like something like 48 hours or something, or possibly even longer. I can't remember, but I think we looked at it and it wasn't really achievable.

But the whole kind of, we got the notice in at the kind of last possible moment that the petition had been filed. And the bylaws give us seven days, and effectively give us six, because by the sixth day we, in our own procedures, are required to make a decision. And then on the seventh day we have to communicate that if we were supporting. And so it just couldn't be fitted in.

One of the things I discovered, and this is my fault, I didn't even know it, but apparently we should, when there is one of these board decisions that might be subject to this kind of a challenge, we're actually supposed to have slotted a meeting in our agenda and then take it out if we don't need it. But I don't think this has ever really come up before, so we didn't have one. So we were

---

actually just kind of lucky that we happened to be meeting then anyway, or many of us were already meeting on Sunday.

JENNIFER CHUNG

I see a hand from Anne, is it about this specific topic or if I can? Okay, so yeah.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, it's just a note. And it's Anne, non-comm, non-voting councilor. My recollection of the operating procedures is that when the council does email voting, it's supposed to be in connection with the topic that has been explored and discussed at council prior to the email vote being put out. But I mean, staff could take a look at that, but that's my recollection of what we did when we amended the operating procedures.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Anne, thank you Vivek for the question. I think we're going to our final slide just to summarize what we are going to do with this. So we also looked at, I guess, understanding the amendments to the motion. So there is like three proposed rules of engagement there. So when we're submitting it, you need to take a look at whether it is part of the fundamental issue with the motion and if there's updated language for clarity and grammar to make sure that is clear. It's important to signal all of that.

Second thing is it's really important to utilize, well, we talked about during SPS, the importance of utilizing the dissenting statements

---

when it's quite evident the concern is not widely shared. I think this council has also during our votes and all of that, there's been some statements that's been read. I think this council exercises this well. So in other words we discuss also while deferral can be used when additional discussion is needed. If it's just one council or one group that has shared the view and the view is not supported by any other SG&C, this is a good avenue to consider when we go to this vote.

In cases like this, of course in the past and we in this particular council also has relied on these dissenting statements rather than a delay to kind of push the motion to the next council meeting to discuss. I think this is the summary of what we see on the screen. Now I'm going to open the floor for any questions, and I think I'll pass to Susan to manage the queue.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay. I mean, I'm not seeing any. And in which case, I guess we should just agree on kind of how we close this off. I don't know that we've talked yet about kind of what happens with something like this, these proposed rules of engagement. Is this something that we would just update into one of our operating, like not formal operating procedures, but do we have some kind of guidelines that we would incorporate these into?

Again, we all know this at the moment. I'm just saying we've had this conversation, but where does this end up for future councilors they're also aware that we had this conversation and agreement? That's probably a hard question to ask in the moment, but we'll

---

work out where this lives, let me put it that way. Oh, and now I've got some hands anyway, so that's good. And you can save me from myself, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks, Susan. I put my hand up to ask the same exact question, where this rules of engagement would go. And at the same time as a follow-up one, I'm not sure I quite agree with point three on the document, but maybe I'm misreading or the language is not yet clear.

But what you're suggesting here is that the councilor himself should not request a deferral to the vote or? I mean, because it might be the case that in some situations we should consider deferring the votes and so on, depending on council agreement and etc. So if you could give us a bit more background into this language specifically, I would appreciate that.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah. I certainly think where this comes up for me, I guess it's more of a, obviously any councilor can ask for a deferral and it's in the discretion of the chair, so it's not an automatic thing. But I think there might be some situations where the deferral might genuinely give an opportunity to go back to one's group and talk it through further and maybe we'll be able to come around. But sometimes I think we know that that isn't really the case, and so perhaps it's

---

more appropriate to actually express your views and have it go to a vote because things aren't really going to change.

BRUNA SANTOS

Can I just do a quick follow-up? Yes, but at the same time, the deferral is still a tool, right? So my perception is that we're hindering a little bit the use of these tools. I don't mind and NCSG is, we have done these statements very commonly, but at the same time I feel that the language that's suggested here, I know it's still a suggestion, but it hinders the use of the deferral or the possibility of proposing a deferral as a tool for councilors in general. So yeah.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, I hear what you're saying, not trying to take that concept of deferral off the table, but more like let's do our best to see if we can get our groups to a point where they've made a decision one way or the other rather than us feeling like, oh well, we'll just try and push this out. I think it's that really. Tapani?

TAPANI TARVAINEN

Tapani speaking for the record. I was pretty much trying to raise the same point as Bruna that I don't quite understand the significance of this language here. It's just kind of discouraging the use of deferral or whatever is the point. Has it been used too much or is the feeling that it is too easy to ask for deferral instead of doing anything else? So what is the meaning of this language? But I guess that Bruna pretty much made the same question already. I'm not

---

sure, but I'm still not sure I understand what this language would actually do.

SUSAN PAYNE

All right. Thank you. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yes, thank you. It's Anne. You know, a couple of the points that have been raised here and a possibility, I guess, of this landing somewhere in operating procedures raised a question for me about whether the proposal should be referred to the standing committee on continuous improvement for the GNSO committee that's in charge of improvements, particularly if you are going to amend operating procedures, but that's just a question raised for your consideration.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Anne. Steve?

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Susan. It's Steve. I was distracted when you asked the original question, so I did a little bit of background poking around, and I see where the aspirational statement, because this sort of strikes me as something similar. It's not intended to be binding. It's aspirational for, I think, mutual expectations for the councilors and having a better understanding of how the motions should be considered and amended. And so I think that one point or point

---

three is not intended to limit or take away that option for deferral. It's just trying to set up those mutual expectations.

So because it's aspirational, perhaps on the GNSO operating procedures right beneath the aspirational statement is maybe where you can have additional guidance, because I don't think, because it's not intended to be binding, that it belongs in the operating procedures. It's a supplemental thing that helps set expectations for the councilors. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks, Steve. And I think I'd agree with that. I don't think any of this is meant to really be a change to operating procedures. But maybe we can have a bit more of a think, and indeed if you have any suggestions as well, Bruno or Tapani, we'll have a bit more of a think about that number three and see if we can find a better way to say that.

But again, just to reiterate, it's not meant to stop people asking for a deferral, but it is, I suppose, have a pause and think, will a deferral make a difference? You know, I guess that's the question we ask ourselves, or really does our group already know what its position is? Anne, I think that's an old hand, right?

Yeah, absolutely. So I think at this point we're up to AOB. I know that Terri has one AOB item to mention. I just quickly will mention one other thing, since it occurred to me again as we were speaking. I mentioned that we had had this SO/AC leaders sort of roundtable

that we have with Tripti and Kurtis and others. And one of the things that was mentioned during that meeting was that Russ gave an update that the board at its last board meeting, which happened just a few days ago, has approved the PDP recommendations on the transfer policy and the PDP recommendations from the EPDP Phase 2 on IDNs.

And I mentioned that firstly because obviously they are some PDP recommendations that have been outstanding for quite some time. And so for us as council it's great to know that the board has now adopted them. But secondly also to just mention that although this letter that was sent on the 25th of May wasn't sent by council, it was sent by our individual SGs and Cs and was something that the registrars amongst us put together and then went to the other SGs and Cs. And I think I'm right in saying that I think all the SGs and Cs in the end signed on to that letter.

But that letter did have an impact. And I think, you know, undoubtedly those PDPs were being looked at and would at some point have been approved, but I think the fact that the GNSO community was coming together and saying, come on guys, this is too much, these have been sitting with you for too long, has had an impact. So I thought it was worth just giving everyone an update on that. Which is very good news, those two PDPs are now approved by the board and then they can move on now to actually be implemented.

Okay. And then Terri.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Terri, did you did you want to touch on the other item?

TERRI AGNEW

Sure. This is Terri Agnew. Hi, everyone. Just as a reminder tonight, during the community networking reception from six to seven on level one downstairs, it's our working group chair reception as well. And we as council put forward 13 names. So it'd be really great if you could all go down there support our working group chairs, the names we put forward down there. Just a quick little side note, SSAD names were not put forward because the leadership wasn't in play by the time I had the deadline. So don't think I forgot them. It just wasn't possible this round. But anyway, I just wanted to encourage you to attend the reception tonight. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Right. Thanks, Terri. Okay, I'm looking at the time we have a few minutes left. I'll just pause and see if there are any hands for anyone who has anything else. Otherwise, we can break for the tea maker a few minutes early. Oh, Sam, sorry, I didn't see your hand.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Hi, everyone. Sorry to keep us late. We got some questions on a recent Registry Stakeholder Group call about where we landed on the process for referring items to the SPIRT, for council to refer items to the SPIRT. I know we did discuss this.

---

So I was just wondering if first of all, if I just missed it, like, if we could just go back and maybe get an email on that, that we can share with the stakeholder groups, or if it bears a little bit more discussion, then maybe we put that on the agenda for an upcoming call. We were just we had some questions from members, and we realized we didn't fully land on exactly like how items if they bubble up, go through that approval process to be sent over to the SPIRT.

SUSAN PAYNE

I'm somewhat looking at Steve, but I think we did reach a conclusion. I would have to check if it might be just in the minutes or something like that. I do know that we had sort of reached the conclusion that we would do this by a vote, and that we would ideally if time permitted, it would be kind of at the next available council meeting, but that we would also utilize quicker mechanisms if we had to, including doing something over an email vote or moving to a sort of an expedited meeting or something of that nature if we had to. Lawrence has his hand up. So it may be to say this. So perhaps I'll let Lawrence speak first.

LAWRENCE  
ROBERTS

OLAWALE- Thank you. Lawrence, for the records. I happen to be the liaison to the SPIRT. So after the council meeting and the decision reached, I'd communicated to the SPIRT mailing list, the new council's process to referring issues to the SPIRT. And I built and from the

---

feedback I got, I'm not sure members were too disappointed, but rather happy that the council now has process in place.

I can also understand where Sam's comes from, because there happen to be individuals who might be interested in issues that they feel the SPIRT might be able to mitigate. And those individuals might not particularly be identified within stakeholder groups, the likes of the registries business and all that.

And I believe it was Justin that raised that question at our last council meeting, the process for which people who are not aligned with any stakeholder group sitting in council can get issues brought to the council attention. Because as it is right now, issues will have to come through a council rep, so to say. So if there were end users or any other group that does not sit within council with an issue, we definitely might need to look into the process for that. But we are good to go with what we have. And I believe we can test that process and come back if there are challenges with it. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay. Thanks, Lawrence. I'll just quickly say, there may be a gap where we haven't properly put something on our council mailing list. And so I made myself a note to do that. So hopefully that will address that point. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

I think that was exactly the missing piece, right? I'm remembering now. The question that bubbled up in the stakeholder group was

---

essentially like if the liaison himself in this case can bring something up to the council for the council to vote on, or if it always has to be through, I mean, obviously Lawrence is also a councilor, but like if it had to be through a stakeholder group or constituency, or if like a SPIRT team member understanding that an issue might exist that needs to be discussed by the SPIRT formally can ask Lawrence as the liaison to bubble it up to the council so we can formally, I think that's the piece that we were missing or that Registry Stakeholder Group members were confused about.

SUSAN PAYNE

I don't think that was what we landed on. I think that felt a bit like the SPIRT referring back to that original question of the SPIRT referring things to themselves. But I'm not sure. You know that there are other parts of the community, for example, Justin is sitting here as the liaison to the ALAC. So if something had been identified in the ALAC, it's possible it could come to council's attention through Justin, for example. So one is looking very keen to speak.

SAEWON LEE

So just to clarify, the way that it was decided in the last council meeting was that only council councilors can refer the issue to SPIRT. So spirit members cannot bring the issue up. And that's what was changed. And that's what Lawrence was mentioning. It's only through a councilor that a SPIRT issue can be brought up, not a SPIRT issue, sorry, an issue can be brought up. Obviously,

---

Lawrence is a councilor. You can go through any council member, but it cannot go through the SPIRT. And that's what was changed in the middle. And that's what he was mentioning as well. And just to clarify, it can only go through a council member for the change to be requested for an issue to be raised, let's say. So I hope that piece is the, yeah.

SUSAN PAYNE

Justine, yeah.

JUSTINE CHEW

Yeah, just back to what Lawrence was saying, I did raise this at the last meeting, because the all the SGs and Cs are represented here in council, but other peoples that don't fall into any of these groups will have a problem using that mechanism. So I used an At-Large position as an example. So if there were two, and this is how I would envisage it. If there was someone within, if there is a SPIRT member who does not associate with any of the SGs and Cs in council, but they could typically associate with At-Large, then they would raise it through the At-Large channel. But in any case, I would need to have instructions from ALAC in order to bring it to council.

So it's not an automatic process, right? So they have to raise it through the At-Large channel, it gets discussed, ALAC would have to decide whether, yes, this is something that we will instruct the liaison to bring it to council. So that is not an issue per se. The only

---

thing I want to point out is the fact that although I kind of am a councilor in many ways, I cannot put up a motion to council. So that is the only difficulty that I would see. So I would have to convince one of you to move that motion for me or for ALAC.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, but I think that's kind of the point though, isn't it? It's like, even if someone was in no community whatsoever, but they were just sort of milling around, like the issue needs to get to council and council would have to be persuaded that it's something we need to vote on. So really, like if that person can't find someone and persuade them that it even needs to be brought to council, then they're kind of maybe it's a personal issue that isn't one that should be going to the SPIRT in the first place.

I might be being naive here, but I sort of feel like we as a council will need to consider this issue and vote on whether we refer it to the SPIRT. So surely like the first step is like kind of find some support, right? And then bring it and that way it gets brought to council.

Terri is messaging me and saying it's 11:15. Oh, Anne, did I miss you? Okay.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thanks, Susan. I agree with what you said. It was quite intentional that only Council or the Board or ICANN, in other words, the person who, and certainly don't object to ALAC raising something as a topic as an AOB or something like that, but really

---

the notion behind the creation of the SPIRT and the very fact that the SPIRT cannot raise issues itself is exactly as you just described it. And a person could even go into public comment to the Board and say, I have this issue and I'm not affiliated with anyone. And if the Board feels it's important, the board can raise it with the SPIRT. ICANN can raise it with the SPIRT and otherwise on the council side, it's to come through the CR or SG. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Sorry. Lovely. All right. Thanks everyone. That was actually a really useful final kind of discussion. So I'm glad we had that. All right, everyone, we are breaking for tea. We do have our informal meeting later this afternoon. Don't forget, bring your chairs along or their vice chairs if their chairs can't come. And have a good day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**