

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Ashley Heineman? I don't see Ashley in the room or online. I'm sure she'll be running in any minute now. So we will circle back in a moment. Volker Greimann?

VOLKER GREIMANN Thanks, Terri. Present.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Gaurav VEDI?

GAURAV VEDI Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. As a reminder, please turn off your Zoom speakers if you're in the room, as we'll be using the microphone. Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR I'm here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Farzaneh Badii?

FARZANEH BADI I Present.

TERRI AGNEW Peter Akinremi? He is remote. In case there's connectivity issues, the proxy will be Farzaneh Badii. But Peter is in, so Peter Akinremi?

PETER AKINREMI Yeah. Sorry. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Bruna Martins dos Santos?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS Present, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Welcome. Anne Aikman Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW

Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW

Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW

Most welcome. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU

Present online. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW

Most welcome. One more check before we begin. Ashley Heineman? I saw a bunch of folks coming in the room. I thought I'd pause. Okay. Not here yet, but we'll try to track her down.

You have the Policy Team supporting the GNSO in the room. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as the call is being recorded. All are welcome to use the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod to select Everyone if you would like everyone to see your chat messages.

Councilors, if you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will

be given permission to unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. And for the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

There will be an open mic at the end of the session, where attendees' microphones will be activated. Those in the meeting room will be invited to queue at the standalone mic, again the back of the room, back here. Those participants remotely will be able to raise their hand in Zoom and unmute their mics when called upon.

As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including the session, 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. With this, I'll turn the call back over to the GNSO chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you so much, Terri. Hi, everyone. Welcome to our GNSO Council meeting for March... for June. I'm losing myself here. Obviously, it's not the first time we've met. We've had a number of different meetings together already, but this is our regular monthly meeting.

So, first order of business is does anyone have any updates to their Statements of Interest? Hurrah! Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

I just got kicked out of the Zoom. So as I look to come back on, I made a very small change to my Statement of Interest this week to add an additional new role of Chief Evangelist of the CloudFest and NamesCon conferences.

SUSAN PAYNE

Congratulations. And yeah, good plug. Any other Statements of Interest? Perfect. All right, then next up, are there any proposed amendments to the agenda for today? I think we'll mention the Consent Agenda when we get to it, right? Yeah. Okay. I'm not seeing any hands or hearing anyone, so that's good as well.

All right, then I'll note that the minutes from our Council meeting on the 16th of April were posted on the 30th of April 2026. And the minutes from the Council meeting on the 21st of May were posted on the 5th of June 2026.

So now we will move on to agenda item two which is the review of our projects and action list. As we've been doing, we now are taking an opportunity to hear, to pause and see if any of our current liaisons have anything that they want to flag, any particular milestones or issues that they think should be flagged to Council at this point. Okay. Again, I'm not seeing any hands. I will just give a moment.

Okay. Perfect. Hearing none, we can now move on to the item three, which is the Consent Agenda, and I am handing over to Jennifer Chung.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Susan. We do have two motions to commemorate. The first one being the motion to commemorate Arinola Akinyemi, and the second one, the motion to commemorate Alan Barrett. I have been told that we will be moving this to the end of our Council meeting after the open mic. So with that, I can go on to item four, which I'm going to pass over to our councilor, Sam Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks very much, Jen. We introduced this item on our last monthly call, which was actually just a couple weeks ago, on May 21st. We are requesting that an item regarding registry service providers be referred to the SPIRT for consideration. This has to do with an inconsistency between what is required in the base registry agreement for 2026 registry operators and what is tested for in registry service provider evaluation and registry system testing. The Registry Stakeholder Group would like the SPIRT to work with ICANN to potentially resolve this inconsistency, and so therefore we would like to refer this issue to the SPIRT. I'm going into less detail than I did in May because we have heard it, it's on the record, but I'm happy to elaborate further if anyone would like me to before we proceed to vote.

SUSAN PAYNE

I would say I'm not seeing any hands from anyone who is looking for more information, so I think probably everyone feels they're properly briefed on this. Thanks, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Okay. Perfect. So, then, is there any discussion? Anyone want to make any comments before we do the motion? All right. Do I read the resolve clauses now? Is that the plan?

I'm reading the resolve clauses for this motion. One, the GNSO Council confirms the referral of the RSP issue brought forth by the Registry Stakeholder Group to the SPIRT for discussion and alignment with ICANN Org. Two, the GNSO Council requests that its liaison to the SPIRT provide this information to the SPIRT for discussion and alignment with ICANN Org. And three, the GNSO Council requests that the liaison to the SPIRT advise the Council of the proposed solution when finalized by ICANN Org in cooperation with the SPIRT.

TERRI AGNEW

Great. We'll go ahead and go for a vote at this time. And just to note, all councilors are present for the vote. Sorry about that. Here we go.

Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion?

Please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS

Aye.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you. With no abstention nor objection, the motion passes.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thank you all.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks very much, everyone. I think, then, in accordance with that motion we are asking, we'll probably put something in an e-mail as well. But asking you, please, Lawrence, to let the SPIRT know. Thank you.

Okay. Our next agenda item then is item five. If we could get the agenda back. Yes. And this is something that we discussed during one of the Council Strategic Planning sessions, the idea that it would be a good thing to highlight some of the work of the GNSO to the kind of wider community audience and particularly to kind of highlight some accomplishments or milestones that happened between each of these in-person meetings. So we now have this opportunity here to just take a bit of time to highlight some of the

different accomplishments that have happened since the Mumbai meeting, ICANN85, which was in March.

So, first off, since we met in Mumbai or indeed the work started in Mumbai, we have kicked off officially the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1, which it started its meetings in in Mumbai, and since that time has had at least initial discussions on all of the charter questions, again having started working in in March. And indeed the messages coming back from that PDP generally are that they're making really solid progress on the charter questions and moving through the work, hopefully even in advance of the anticipated timeline.

The second item is the Standing Committee for Continuous Improvements or SCCI, which has completed its work on criteria and indicators to support the GNSO's Continuous Improvement Program. So, thanks to that group as well.

Then we have the SSAD Supplemental Recommendation Team or SRT. That group began meeting in May 2025. The task, as we all know, is to develop supplemental recommendations relating to the SSAD, following the Board non-adoption of those original PDP recommendations. One of the first orders of business was the appointment of Marc Anderson to lead the SSAD SRT, and the group has begun meeting in May but has again been very, very active during this in-person meeting in Seville.

Then finally, in terms of some Council work, we have adopted some amendments to the PDP and GGP manuals to incorporate a process for Board un-adoption of policy recommendations that had

previously been adopted in very limited and extraordinary circumstances.

So I think it's just an opportunity really for thanking all of the volunteers, community members, Council, and staff who have worked on all of these initiatives or are working on all these initiatives. Thanks for everyone's hard work and volunteerism. We're looking forward to what we'll be accomplishing prior to our next in-person meeting in October time where we'll be in Bali. And who knows, perhaps we will even be reporting that something like the DNS abuse PDP has hit a really significant milestone, and certainly that's, I think, a hope for all of us. Anne, I see your hand.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Thank you, Susan. It's Anne Aikman Scalese, NomCom non-voting councilor. I haven't really been following DNS abuse closely because I've been involved in other stuff, but I was a tourist in the meeting this morning and I was very impressed with how far they've gone with DNS abuse and the language that they're working on, and the spirit of good faith operating in the room. I just want to compliment all those involved—Paul, Jen, etc., whoever. There's several of you very much involved. Just to say thank you for that hard work, it's coming along. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for that, Anne. That's really kind of you to say that. It's really nice to have that called out by someone. And I love the idea of

attending meetings as a tourist. I think I'm going to do that frequently now.

Okay. All right, I'm just pausing and looking around the room to see if there's anything else anyone wants to flag at this point. Again, thanks to everyone. Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

I'll just add one sentence to Ann's congratulations, which is that also I think that it was acknowledged during previous meetings that the eyes of the community are on this, and that swiftness is a goal, and it is clear that the group is taking that seriously and moving it forward, so that it's also something that should be acknowledged and praised.

SUSAN PAYNE

Very much so. Thanks for that, particularly given some of the slightly angsty conversations we perhaps had last time when the work was first kicking off about the work plan and the timeline and so on, and actually that group is, as you say, it's really, really steaming ahead and powering through the work. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Susan. Originally I wasn't going to put my hand up because I can't pat myself on the back, but what I can do is indicate, again, agree absolutely with what Anne and Christian said, but big thanks also to our support staff who has been supporting us through this incredible clip of work we've been doing. So I wanted to absolutely

do that and make you feel uncomfortable, or you do feel comfortable. Thank you so much, support staff.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, absolutely. All right, then I think with that, we can move on to our next agenda item, which is item six, which is a Council discussion on the update on the Curative Rights Implementation Review Team or IRT. Damon Ashcraft is our GNSO Council liaison to that IRT, and so he is going to give us an update of that work.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. Thank you very much, Susan. This IRT has struggled a bit recently, and the issue that they've struggled with is the timing of arbitrations within the UDRP process for these, for domain name disputes relate to these NGOs and for these new strings which are not yet delegated. Where the IRT got stuck was, is that when should you have an arbitration after a UDRP is filed?

In a traditional UDRP, you file the UDRP and either side can file an arbitration or a lawsuit at any time, and it immediately terminates the UDRP, and then they go on to that alternative means of dispute resolution. Because of the nature of NGOs that these strings are for, they are not subject to normal court jurisdiction, and so they developed a special arbitration procedure to handle disputes. And the issue was, well, can you just file that? Apparently, the PDP was silent with respect to, can you file an arbitration at any time after a UDRP is initiated? Or do you need to wait until there's a decision

and then file an arbitration within that 10-day window if you want to go ahead and seek arbitration as a different way of dispute resolution?

We had discussed this issue as a Council back in January. We passed a resolution that basically said it was our understanding that we wanted to harmonize “regular” UDRPs with these special UDRPs, and at any time a party could go ahead and file an arbitration action that would terminate the UDRP. The NGOs respectfully disagreed with us. They preferred not to have arbitration at any time, and so that has delayed the process.

So, ICANN staff proposed a compromise, which it looks like everybody on the IRT has accepted. What that compromise looks like is that people, the litigants within the UDRP, can file an arbitration. And if the NGO accepts, consents to it at that point, the UDRP will terminate and will go straight to arbitration. If they don’t consent to it, the UDRP will go to a decision. The losing party in the decision is obviously free to file an arbitration.

So that looks like that’s going to be the compromise. This issue being brought up is that these strings of gTLDs have been delayed until probably—I think the estimate I heard at the meeting yesterday would be the second quarter of 2027, so not a great result there, but that is what it is. I think things are on track.

There is going to be a Public Comment Period about this specific compromise and about this issue that should open up at the end of

June. We don't have a specific date. Staff has told me sometime in June.

Last thing I wanted to bring up is that there has been one member of the IRT, Jeff Neuman, who has suggested that Council—they've reached a compromise. It's not exactly in line with our motion in January that Council should go forth and go ahead and put in a comment supporting the compromise. So that's what I've got. It's disappointing that we're delayed on this, but they have reached a compromise. It looks like the train is back on the tracks. Does anybody have any questions? Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE

Sorry about this. I was trying to raise my hand in Zoom. I wondered if you could clarify for me because I may not have caught it properly. Do they give notice that they're intending to go to arbitration and see if they get the consent from the IGO, or do they actually commence an arbitration and see whether the IGO consents? Does that make sense?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

It does. It's actually a good question. I don't know the exact specific answer as to whether you would give notice of it. I would think from a practical standpoint, a party would not want to go through the expense of starting an arbitration until they knew the NGO was going to consent to it. I don't know if the specifics of that have been worked out yet, but I suspect it would be more of a notice or

question, giving you something back in writing that you'll consent to the arbitration.

SUSAN PAYNE

Sorry. I can't use the hand. This is more of just a question than where the group is in its work. Is this the only really outstanding issue for that group? So, once this item is concluded, is that basically the group done, or is there anything else the group is still grappling with, or anything that Council can do to help generally?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Yeah. I think this is the last remaining issue. I mean, it is subject to public comment. I will say this has gone back and forth. And 45 days ago, this compromise was not seen as an effective solution, it now is. Some minds have been changed.

As far as Council helping, the only thing I could suggest, I guess, would be kind of to echo Jeff's comment about, do we want to go ahead, and when the comment period comes out, do we want to put forth a comment? We've all got a lot to do but I suspect that comment could be extremely short and just say the Council appreciates the IRT's work and compromise and supports it, even in lieu that it's not exactly matching our motion in January.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for that, Damon. So, in terms of timing, when do you think this is going out to public comment? I'm only asking so we can make sure we have this on our radar as a group.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

I asked the question yesterday. They don't have a specific date it's going to go. I've been told by the end of June. And so we'll have 40 days, which is not great because it's right over the summer holidays and everything, but it will be by the end of June. I will obviously receive notice of it and I will let folks know and let you know that the comment period is open.

SUSAN PAYNE

Perfect. Thanks very much. Then I'm just looking at our staff team as well and saying maybe we would put this on the agenda for our next meeting in July. If we don't need to because something hasn't happened yet, we can take it off. But perfect. Thank you. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL

Damon, just using this time so I don't have to read it again and try and understand myself. If the NGO decides not to go for arbitration, then at the conclusion of the current process, then if an arbitration is filed, will they be forced to participate?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Correct. So it'd be like at the end of the process, if they say no arbitration during the process, decision is reached and the other

side is unhappy with the decision, it's just like a regular UDRP. The UDRP panelist decision isn't binding on anybody. They start arbitration and they basically start over from scratch.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay. Thanks very much for that, Damon. I'm pausing. Not seeing any more hands. Thanks very much for that update. That's really helpful for us to know as a Council how this matter is hopefully finally coming to resolution and giving us a heads up that we may have something brief to do in the next month or so.

All right, with that, then I think we can move on to our next agenda item seven which is about the Board Approval of the ICANN Fundamental Bylaws Amendments Regarding the Customer Standing Committee and the IANA Naming Function Review. I think Jen was going to take this item, although indeed I think you were handing it to Caitlin, weren't you?

JENNIFER CHUNG

I'm actually handing this straight over to Caitlin who will bring us through the background and what we're going to do next. I don't see where Caitlin is. She's online. So, Caitlin, over to you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

I'm online. Can everybody hear me?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Yes.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thank you. If we can go to the slides, please. Thank you.

I will warn everyone that this item is quite technical, but the good news is that the Council has already reviewed both of these things, and so it should be fairly non-controversial, but just providing the history to remind everybody. So, if we can go to the next slide.

So we're talking about two fundamental Bylaws changes. The Board provided notice of these Bylaws changes. They're both to, as Susan noted, the IANA Naming Function Review Team (the IFR2) and also the Customer Standing Committee. They were presented together because both topics relate to how the community oversees ICANN and its performance of the IANA functions.

So, we'll start with the IFR2. Again, this group is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the performance of the PTI. You might remember, for those of you who were there, that last July the IFR2 team came to present all of the recommendations to the Council. Actually, one of the presenters was Ashley. But don't worry, Ashley, I won't call on you, but we do have an expert in the room. But the important point here is that the Council voted to approve these recommendations, they haven't changed, and this is what that fundamental Bylaw change is based on.

In essence, the fundamental Bylaw change deals with the timing of the review. It's every five years, but the trigger point is changing

from the date that the most recent IFRT submits its final report. And that is coming from instead of when the IFRT convenes, it's when the IFRT submits its final report. The rationale was it ensures sufficient time between delivering the recommendations and commencing the next review. This recommendation was not controversial. It received substantial support from the community. Again, and importantly, the Council adopted this recommendation back in August and the recommendation hasn't changed. Moving on to the next slide, please.

Another fundamental Bylaw change this time for the Customer Standing Committee. The Customer Standing Committee Effectiveness Review Team presented its recommendations to the Council back in April 2023. The CSC is the entity responsible for monitoring the performance of the PTI. And there were two recommendations in this final report from 2023 that triggered fundamental Bylaws changes.

The first is that the Effectiveness Review Team recommended the ability for appointing organizations to appoint alternates. And the reason for that is twofold: it's to ensure that meeting quorum can be met and having alternates will allow for that or facilitate that better. And secondly, the team thought that having alternates allows for education for potential new members in the future. So the alternates could potentially be considered being full-time members in the future, but this allows kind of a ramp-up period for them to do so.

Similar to the IFRT, the cadence of reviews is changing or was recommended to be changed from every three years to every five years. And it was a similar rationale. It just recommends ensuring there's sufficient time between delivering the recommendations and commencing the next review. As noted, Council has already approved this a while ago. We can go to the next slide, please.

The reason that we're bringing this up is that these fundamental Bylaw changes are being considered tomorrow in a session. We can go to the next slide, please.

And the change to the CSC results in changes to the CSC charter. Based on the draft Bylaws changes, CSC leadership worked with ccNSO leadership and GNSO leadership at the time. It's not our currently in panel leadership, but previous leadership saw the edits to the CSC charter, worked with these groups. The CSC charter was published. There weren't objections to this. But because of the time period, the updates to the charter need to be approved within 21 days after that fundamental Bylaws changes approved. And accordingly, in order to meet this deadline, the ccNSO and the GNSO both need to approve the charter update. It would need to be approved 21 days from the approval of that Bylaws change, which the timing works out such that the July meeting is not within that 21 days. So the proposal is to have the Council vote on the changes to the charter as a mail-in vote later in June.

That is the essence of the update from us, is that the Council needs to vote on this. The Council has seen this. The Council leadership

worked on these amendments, they're non-controversial, but the Council does need to vote on this as part of the process and it will have to be a mail-in vote. But I will pause to see if there are any questions or concerns with this.

JENNIFER CHUNG

I see a hand. Vivek, please go ahead.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you, Caitlin. I think you've done a wonderful job of reducing the technical part of it so we can understand. We'll have to take this to the BC, obviously, before we vote, but I wanted to understand this. This has already been discussed in the Council and agreed, and now it's just the formality of voting on it. Am I understanding it correct?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

That's correct. Council discussed the changes that would be applied to the charter. The changes have been drafted, applied to the charter, they've been published, and now the Council would just be voting as a formality.

VIVEK GOYAL

My question is have these been discussed in the Council before?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Yes.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

The particular changes in terms of the CSC, those were discussed back in 2023. So, it's been a while, but yes. Again, the change is just deal with making sure that there can be alternates added to the CSC and that the review of the CSC, which happens through their Effectiveness Review Team, is changing from every three years to five years. But the Council adopted that report, approved it. It's now just implementing that into a charter, but the charter has been published with those updates, so there shouldn't be any surprises, but just making sure that everyone has an opportunity to ask questions before being asked to vote. Thanks.

VIVEK GOYAL

Sorry to keep at it, Gaurav. Please allow me one more. So you're saying we discussed this in 2023 and this is coming now to vote in 2026 because of process? I mean, it just wipes out the celebration of what ICANN has done in the past year in one go. Am I correct in that? Because of process, this has been not voted on for three years?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Maybe Susan first? Okay. Caitlin or staff, can you provide us with a little bit more background on this? I don't think this is specifically to do with Council process, so we're not wiping out Council

achievements, but maybe if you can clarify your question, or was there a question?

VIVEK GOYAL

ICANN achievements, not Council achievements. I'm just trying to figure out why it has taken three years for something that was agreed, discussed in Council to come back for voting. Three years to vote, why?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Vivek, for that question. I believe this is also a fundamental Bylaws change with that requires a lot of different process, but I don't have the specifics for this. I don't know, Caitlin, if you could give us a little bit more detail. If not, then we'll get back to this.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN

Thanks, Jen. I don't have an exact response. The one thing that I know is that the changes to these groups had inputs or outputs that were separate timings but they're being streamlined to be considered together in terms of fundamental Bylaws changes, and just noting when the group originally issued its report and when it was adopted by the Council. But this isn't a Council process so I can't speak to the timing. I'm just presenting on this. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you very much, Caitlin. You confirmed what we were also thinking, that it's not a Council process. However, we'll find that information, of course, and we will get back to you, Vivek, and I guess Council as well, other councilors who are curious about this. I see another hand. Gaurav?

GAURAV VEDI

Hi. This is Gaurav VEDI, GNSO NomCom. I served on Customer Standing Committee for almost five years, and all the issues that are brought up here, they are very close. Some of these issues date back to the time when I was on the committee back in 2018-19 timeframe at least. So, I'm glad to see these issues getting brought up here and getting resolved finally, seeing the end of the tunnel. So I'm really thankful to the entire community bringing these issues and getting them resolved.

Now, just for the awareness, CSC in the context of the alternates, CSC is a very small committee. So just four members and a few liaisons, and there's always been a challenge because if the liaisons are not available as a primary member, there was always a challenge for members not attending the corresponding meetings. So there was always a challenge with that, and that was one of the issues that we always raised since 2018. But finally, it's getting resolved, so I'm happy to see that here. I just wanted to share my thoughts. Again, I'm not speaking on behalf of GNSO Council, but again, I'm glad to see that happening. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Gaurav. That gave us some more context. And I hope that also helps our understanding of why we're coming to this now.

I see Anne. Please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Hi. I know you guys must have reviewed Operating Procedures 4.10 regarding voting outside a meeting. Is that what is applicable here for voting outside a meeting? And essentially, I think 4.10 has this condition requiring the chair to say we've consulted with all the councilors, and it's been properly discussed, and we can move forward. I'm just looking for staff to verify that. Certainly the deadline comes before our next meeting, absolutely, and that is one of the conditions. I don't know if we need to formally have Susan document the portion in 4.10 that relates to what the chair is supposed to do, but staff could perhaps just verify all that, and I certainly don't have any problem with it. If that's where we're operating under 4.10, just be good to document it. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Anne. I think to the extent that this needs to be discussed amongst Council, including the notion that we will vote by e-mail rather than at a meeting, because we don't really have time for a meeting, I think this is our opportunity to discuss that. That is why it's on the agenda, to ensure that we have done that, and that

Council are aware that this thing is coming, and that we will have to vote on it before the next meeting.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Anne. Thank you, Susan. Anne, does that answer your question?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Yeah. Really, it's more a question to just make sure that staff can document compliance with 4.10 and to the extent that it might be needed to document it in the future, that it is documented. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Anne. I see some nods over in staff side, so this will be done.

I don't see any more hands in the Zoom Room on this agenda item, so I think we can move on to the next one. It's item eight, Council discussion on the prioritization of upcoming work. I'm going to pass it to myself. Can we get the slides for that up, please?

Okay. Perfect. A little bit of a background here. We mentioned back in—well, the last time we talked about it was actually during this week, but in our May Council meeting, we spent some time talking about how we can best prioritize our work. There is a clear need to do that to complement the action decision radar that we have with a dedicated real prioritization mechanism and approach. So, the

last meeting, the Council leadership team proposed a way forward, which blended a hybrid, I guess, approach of identifying criteria that needs to be scored, but also ensuring that the scoring is not the final, it's not a determinative item, but it is a start of a conversation, it's an input to what prioritization means for us. And of course, in addition, SGs and Cs can adjust their scores as warranted. I note here that there's also been some discussion on Council list about that, and there was some back and forth, and hopefully there was some clarification that I think some councilors brought up. I think the transparency item was absolutely clarified there.

Council agreed to at least pursue a pilot. I think this is very important for us to do that. And staff has helped us try to operationalize this pilot, which we will talk about today. We really hope to kick things off before we all got to Seville, but of course other things got into our preparation time. We want to take a look here a little bit clearer to go through the step-by-step guide to make sure we understand the next steps, including the proposed timeline. So let's go through the next steps for the pilot.

There's also in-between step things that is really important. Here they are. It is important for us because we need to, as a Council, be able to prioritize all the work that's coming down. These are the main points. We need to have a common understanding of everything coming down before launching the pilot.

The second thing, again, this is very important and highlighted by several councilors who actually sent some concerns to the list, is to promote the transparency and accountability of Council, and also for others who are following Council's work to see how we are doing this. I think there are a lot of eyes on Council right now, a lot of questions. At least yesterday we had the exact question during the GAC session about this.

The third one is, of course, to build confidence and trust in the process. I will say that this is a pilot, this is something for us to really use and test out first, and of course, if there's adjustments needed, if we need to do something else, of course, this is opportunity for us to learn from it but we need to build confidence and trust in whatever we do use as a mechanism.

The fourth one is to have a reference framework. This is something for us internally to guide our work, for us to be able to report back and have alignment and discussion, and bring our matters back to our different stakeholder groups and constituencies. This will be test it and it will be actually predictable for us to understand and our community to understand as well.

And then the last thing is to reduce the misunderstanding. We don't want relitigation of topics that we're bringing up again. We don't want any procedural disputes. If we are able to trust in a mechanism that collectively we build together, this will actually make things a lot easier for us to be able to work through.

Oh, there's the next slide here. Okay. So this is the guiding principles. I think we talked about this a little bit already, and I think this is also in the Step-by-Step document that you've all looked at when we circulated.

First thing is it has to be simple. It cannot add burden to what we already need to do, so it needs to actually be a tool that helps us and not hinders us. The output of the scoring, I stress again, that's the first step. It's the first beginning of a conversation, and I can't highlight enough that this is not determinative of what we do at the end. I know there's been a lot of concerns that have been raised about that, so we certainly can talk about this more as required.

Then the final, but very important step, is it has to be transparent. I see there's an extra punctuation mark there. I can see now from here. It should not be rigid that it becomes a burden again. This tool needs to help us and not hinder us. Next slide.

So we're going into our project list. This one looks at the items that we actually are going to test out for the pilot, and there they are. They're coming up. We've seen them in our Prioritization document, previously we've seen them on the ADR, things that previous Councils have committed to are underway. Again, this is not in this prioritization. So if we have had commitments that we said we were going to do, past Councils, those are things we absolutely have to do and it's outside of this prioritization exercise. So you see there, there's the RPMs Phase 2, the UDRP. There is the new gTLDs moving from rounds to an open process. There's the

expiration policies. There's a Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, and then there's the DNS Abuse, the additional items in the Final Issue Report.

So I'm going to say here with the caveat that you'll see that this is the big chunks, this is the projects themselves. I know for the last item, DNS Abuse, there are a list of gaps. So what we'll do for there, we'll do a two-step, we'll do a prioritization with those gaps, and then, of course, there's this larger, I guess, the five that you see on there as our candidate projects for the pilot. I'm not keeping an eye on the Zoom Room, but I don't see any hands yet, so let's move on to the next slide.

The criteria. Let's go on the next one. Here they are. I think it hasn't really moved too much from the initial draft that we've looked at, and I guess it's been in our inboxes for a little bit of time. We need to make sure as a Council here that we do agree on the criteria here, and it's really on the left-hand column in bold there. There's the five of them.

So, the first is importance. This is quite self-explanatory, right? It's the significance, the issue to ICANN's mission, the system, the Internet Unique Identifier System, and also ICANN community.

The second part is community demand. This is something that obviously we can—it will differ from different SGs and Cs, what it is that the community is demanding. But the level of demonstrated

interest is what we're looking to measure here. Expectation need demonstrated interest from the community.

The third one, complexity is interesting because complexity gives quite a lot of things for us to all consider as well, what's coming out of this, the policy, operational, legal, other, I guess, risks, expertise, and interdependencies on, I guess, current policies, other impacts, and this is something that is kind of categorized in complexity.

The fourth is resources, not only just the expected level of commitment and resourcing on Council itself, but also community volunteers. Very good example, when we are looking at scheduling or I guess approving new PDPs, we need to also take into account the volunteers that will be in these PDPs doing this policy development work. So community volunteers and ICANN Org, of course, staff level support as well.

The last one is deliverability. I guess that's kind of a little bit beyond kind of Board readiness, because for Council, we're looking at how we are delivering things and we had a whole piece of Board-readiness work that we did. But deliverability here also, I guess, could mean if we're looking at it the likelihood of these meaningful outcomes being able to be achieved in our planning horizon. I think this is a scoring criteria. Maybe we can move on to the next slide.

Scoring scale. Numerical scale here. So it's a simple scale, 1 being very low, very difficult. Very low means the likelihood of being able to achieve this is easy, it's very low, or it's very difficult, all the way to 5, which is very high and highly favorable. If we're looking at the

different criteria, just as an example that you can see there—oh, there's an extra S after resource. There's a resource. If you score it out of the 5, it means very easy to resource it, 1 means it's very intensive deliverability. Again, 5 means high likelihood of timely outcomes, 1 means that's the opposite or it's probably not going to be likely for us to get to timely outcomes or it becomes very long. I think that is something that we obviously want to avoid.

Step 4 and 5, I think we can go to the next slide to actually do the exercise. There is an example. I think councilors are wondering what this might look like. Just for example, you can see on the screen here, if there were these scores, that is going to be on a transparent spreadsheet. I think Tapani and other councilors have mentioned they want to see these scores. I don't see why there isn't any reason to be able to do that. But the overview matrix will be able to be seen by all Council. So they would be the aggregate scores there. For example, you see all of that. For Project 1, the total is 20, Project 2, 13. Project 3, 17. Then obviously here you can see there as a starting point of what it is. Then we would probably come together for the next step to actually talk about it. Is this still this slide or the next one that we're going to? So let's go to the next slide.

To discuss. So, when we have the numerical score as a starting point of our discussions, we will then come together and review. I'm going to backtrack a little bit more. Of course, councilors are not expected to score individually. You are going to talk to your SGs and Cs and discuss the prioritization of those projects and topics,

priorities that your constituency thinks. So that's a little bit backtrack.

Here we're at Step 6, 7, and 8. We're going to be looking at coming back together as Council. We're going to review and discuss to see what these scores actually mean for us. I guess when we are discussing as a group and assumptions are clarified or challenged or have changed, I think here is where Council altogether can look at it as a whole and be able to adjust up-down, however the nuances of understanding, because again, a numeric score doesn't tell you much, it just is a number. We need to actually have the qualitative reasoning behind that for us to all understand how it is.

Then finally, of course, for us to share this outcome. So a discussion that we would kind of use. And you see all these questions on the screen. I'm not going to read them out loud, but I think what we need to keep in mind, especially here, is whether are these shared assumptions when we're actually scoring this. If one SG decides a score is 3 for whatever reason, another SG scored it at 1 but they had a different assumption of what the actual criteria meant. I think this is a really good opportunity and time for us to clarify and understand the scoring instead of just saying, "Oh, well, you don't think this is important at all. This is very important to us." I think this is the time to actually look through and talk through the complexities there.

The last point is also really important. Again, having a low score might not mean it's unimportant. I think every single piece of

project there eventually needs to come to Council. We need to have a way to organize the work coming down the pipeline. So nothing that receives a lower score means it's unimportant to us, rather we're trying to balance it on this kind of spread of criteria that we have decided on. Next slide.

The timeline. I guess really looking at when we are going to start this pilot, I think when we talked about it first in the SPS and the subsequent discussions, we said that this exercise needs to be repeated periodically. I think people have kind of coalesced around thinking about talking through this either at the SPS before the SPS so we can discuss results at the SPS. That makes a lot of sense because that we plan our year's work there. The model that we eventually use—and of course this pilot, hopefully—needs to be flexible, it needs to be revisable to adjust to how Council works and how councilors—as we're going through a note how we can have best practices or learnings coming out of it. And then, of course, we have our timeline.

So here there's a bunch of bullets about what we are proposing. There's this nice flashing GIF over there saying it's time. We're hoping to be able to start this pilot scoring exercise in July, hopefully to be announced in our July Council meeting on the 9th, and then we'll be able to run the scoring exercise for each of the SGs and Cs, and of course the NomCom appointees as well, starting from 9th of July to the 13th of August. Then we'll have staff look at the overview, aggregate, all of that, starting from 13th of August, and to be ready for our Council meeting on the 10th of December.

Oh, sorry, not December, September. Definitely not December. Then we will talk about the outcome of this exercise during our Council meeting in September.

That was a lot of slides, that's a lot of me talking. Hopefully we can go to the next slide because we're going to Q&A. I'm going to check to see if we have hands. There are lots of hands. Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Thank you. Thank you for being persistent about this exercise and getting it up there in that form on the slides and for taking the input that's come on the list on this. It's a question related to importance. Because in the ranking for importance, do we want to put in scores? I'm assuming that even though I'm non-voting, I could put in a score in the project list. Or is it only for voting councilors, first of all? I don't know.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Anne, for the question. We actually discussed really briefly within the leadership team when we're looking at this, and we were looking at the groupings, and we were like, "Our NomCom appointees also are part of the Council." I think it's useful for you to also go through this exercise and we can talk through it. But if we're going to go through the details of how we take out the score, I think staff and leadership can take a closer look to see how that works

out. I would really hate to say, “No, don’t look at it, don’t score it.”
And I think it’s useful to have a full discussion.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Okay. Thanks. But the specific question then that I have—and if anybody feels very strongly that I shouldn’t vote, I’m happy to hear that. Come talk to me—the question about importance. My first assumption would be that that would be a vote that extends from your stakeholder group or your constituency, but there’s also an aspect of it that one could consider to be a question about, is it important to the community?

So I’ll raise the whole issue of DNS Abuse and the difficult meeting that we had with the GAC, and the fact that I think we have DNS Abuse 1, we have DNS Abuse 2, and then I think there are three other topics, and I think one of those does take a look at the 15-day thing or whatever, but that’s not necessarily important to certain constituencies or stakeholder groups in Council, but there may be an importance that relates to community relations. So I don’t exactly know. Is it like just consult your constituency and consult your own best thinking and wisdom on whether it’s of importance to the community even if not particularly important to your constituency or stakeholder group? What would be the guidelines if there are any?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Anne. That's a very good question. Can we flip back to the slide that has that? I think that might be slide 11. Slide 11, yeah. Oh no, before that.

I think we tried to articulate a differentiation between importance and community demand. I know there's a little bit there about community as well, but I think maybe framing it in ICANN's Mission and Scope in that sense. Does that help differentiate a little bit more? And then community demand can change. Even though something that, for example, is very, very crucial and critical to ICANN's Mission, but a different SG and C could have the bigger demand on another topic that may not score as high, for example, on certain things. I'm just giving a random attempt to explain. Does it? Okay. Thank you.

There's a long queue. So I'll get to our next person who is Tapani. Please go ahead.

TAPANI TARVAINEN

Thank you. I have been fairly critical of this from the beginning, but this is a fairly good-looking proposal as it is. But the thing I'm concerned here is that sometimes the mathematics is surprising, that there are some times the results are not as trustworthy as at other times, and it would be useful to be able to gauge that somehow.

There are some obvious criteria, for example, how brittle the results are, so how small a change in the input will change the order

the projects in the final scoring is more obvious but not easy to see. But there are also others where it seems that it's, let's say, easy for some group to have an outsized influence on the results by scoring them in some surprising way. So that's why I propose that this summary in Step 5 we provide it as a spreadsheet form, though, that it's easy to play with it and experiment what kind of changes will make, what kind of effect in the outcome final tally. Because there are certainly situations, this is well-known by old mathematics that's not trivial but still possible that sometimes we get surprises, and that's okay. The adjustment step is a good one there. But before that, it would be nice to be able to think what kind of adjustments and what kind of effect. And also make maybe some automated tests for checking if there are loops, for example, the Condorcet cycle is a classical example of that.

There is really no good mathematical solution. So we want to have a criteria pointing out, "Okay, we see that these numbers don't actually work. Let's talk this out." So that kind of criteria could be useful to have there. I'm not ready to have them, but at this pilot stage, especially you have a spreadsheet to play with, which would be possible to notice some of these effects and maybe fix them or have some procedure in the future that, "Okay, numbers didn't do it, we have to talk," or if the numbers are clear enough, we know that this will not change much whatever happens, and then they are good to go. I guess that's enough for now.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Tapani. I don't see there any reason for staff to not be able to provide us with that spreadsheet for you to play with regarding numbers. We are very fortunate to have your mathematical brain and thankful for your offer on the mailing list to come up with these hypothetical scenarios where you stress test that specific spreadsheet. So, I think we are fortunate as a Council to be able to benefit from your wisdom. Again, this is a starting point, and of course, as a pilot. I think let's take a look at it and try it out. Thank you, Tapani. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL

I think Christian was before me so I would yield.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Am I looking at the wrong... I'm looking at the list on top. I will look at this list then. I am very sorry. Christian, please go ahead.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Thank you, Vivek. I want to start with a thanks to the staff and Jen for your work on this, to get this to a place where I'm very comfortable moving forward in the pilot. And that was a different position than I was in when we started talking about this in January. I think reflecting on why, we are in an era of AI where there's a real fear of us losing control to algorithms of how things are run. We didn't want to get into a situation where we were subjugating the things that we were going to do to any sort of mechanism or algorithm, and I don't think that this is it. In fact, I

love what Sam said the other day, which is that, particularly for this pilot period, we can think of this as a vibe check and something that will allow us to better understand that ecosystem. I think that we should hold that and maybe that's all that it should ever be, but we should make sure that we gather the data.

I'm going to find a lot of this data valuable because we are all subject to our own blinders that are made up of only having the people within our own circles talking to us about what's important, and having the broader ecosystem is very important. It is important for us to note—and I'm glad that you put it out there—that community demand is only one condition that we're looking at. We need to make sure that it's not a popularity contest. One of the things that I agree with you on is human rights should not be put up to a popularity vote. So I love that it's just one aspect of it. So, great work and I'm a proponent of moving forward. We worked through all my issues. Let's go vibe check.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Christian. Let's go vibe check indeed. Now I'll go to Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. Vivek from the BC for the record. I like the word vibe check. Maybe we should change the name of this to vibe check. It will make it more easy for everybody.

My question is—if you can go back to the earlier slide, please, where they have criteria? While the slide is coming up, the complexity of

something is judgmental and it's based on a lot of factors. For example, if you ask the complexity of running a PDP to a nuclear scientist, it might be much more difficult, and if you ask the complexity of the same process to somebody who is used to dealing with something very simple, it will be very high, right? So, if I go back to the BC and ask them, "Okay, we need to put the complexity and the resources of this," they'll be like, "Give me some benchmark."

For example, for DNS PDP 1, what was the complexity? What was the resource? What score would you give to resources, deliverability, community demand, importance? Then there's the same benchmark for everybody, so then we can say, "Okay, if we think DNS PDP 1 was poor in resources, then this project will be 5 or 3 or 2." It gives everybody the same benchmark to compare against to decide and rank these. Otherwise, the same process could be very complex for me and not at all complex for Lawrence. Then you will get scores which are all over the place and people will say, "Yes, we think it's very complex." Somebody will say, "No, we don't think it's complex at all." And then you just go into discussions as to who's right, who's wrong, right? So, if we have a benchmark that we can share with everybody, it will be very helpful and you will get much better scores.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Vivek. Just a question of clarification. Are you asking us to do kind of a review back on whenever our, I guess, current PDP is working on and apply the scoring as some kind of guideline?

VIVEK GOYAL

Yes. Otherwise, I mean, resource allocation. Just looking at the project, you will get varied answers. But if we say that for DNS PDP 1, the resource allocation score is 4, then that forms a benchmark and you can compare your thinking against that and give a score. So everybody will work against the same benchmark and they decide on scores.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Vivek. Sorry, I know there's a long queue, but I just wanted to clarify. Just on your point, I think this is what we're expected to do when we come back as Council together to explain why that score was that way and give the illustrative example so rest of the Council can also understand. Again, there's no right or wrong in a score, there's only the perspectives of what that score represents for that SG and C. So, I think it's okay to have a difference. In fact, I think I'll be expecting some differences because the Council is not homogeneous and we do have different perspectives on certain things. So I think that is actually valuable to be able to bring out. In other words, I think having that doesn't mean the pilot is failing, if you understand what I'm trying to say.

VIVEK GOYAL

Jen, maybe you and I are coming at from different things. See, importance is something you can decide, right? But things like complexity and resources is something which will be more fixed, if that's the word I can use, whether something is complex in ICANN environment or it is not. But if you have a benchmark to work against, then it's easy for people to decide on complexity. I mean, I'm asking, sitting here, can anybody decide on the complexity for DNS PDP 2 accurately? No. Then imagine trying to decide on complexity on projects which are just a line item right now. So, having a benchmark will help get you answers. You might still get varied answers, but I still think giving everybody a benchmark to work against will be helpful.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Vivek. I don't want to belabor this point, but I do want to point councilors to the Step-by-Step document. In Step 2, there is a link that gives reference and background information, as well as strategic estimates on all the projects, so they'll give you at least a starting baseline. I'm seeing some nods on staff. Is that what you wanted to point out? Yes. Okay. Good.

Going back to the queue. It's a long queue. Who's next on the queue? It's Sam. Sam, please go ahead.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Jen. I wanted to first say you're welcome for coining the term vibe check, but also to kind of echo some points that you just

raised, which is that most of these criteria at their core are pretty subjective vibes, notoriously a subjective thing. But I agree that—I actually am looking forward to the criteria where we do have the most diversity and where we have the greatest spread because that’s going to be the most interesting conversation. I think that’s where we have the opportunity to learn from each other’s perspectives.

So, I think it’s great that we have a starting point for the complexity issue. I think staff does have a level of insight into how complex a matter is based on the way you guys have watched PDPs unfold over your years of experience. So, yeah, I’ll certainly be consulting with that to help inform our scores on the complexity level. So, I think that is a good benchmark. I wanted to say thanks for putting that together. Yeah, just looking forward to giving this a shot.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Sam. And yes, thank you for the vibe check phrase. We will use it. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks, Jen. I just wanted to comment again on the vibe check thing. That’s what we’re trying to do. I hear what Vivek is saying and when we’ve done this as a pilot and it hasn’t worked and it’s all blown up in our face, maybe we’ll all go, “Vivek, you were right.” But at the same time, we’re not doing these scorings, and then the one with the highest score is the winner. We’re doing these scorings

for the vibe check, and then we'll all come and talk about it. I think it's absolutely expected that probably I might say a PDP on such and such is going to be low resource, but another group might say, "No for us. That one's a high resource for us," and so they would score it differently, and then we come back and we understand why.

I just wanted to flag again that the document that Jen was alluding to. It's like when we first were talking about prioritization, which feels like it was some time back in last year, we had a list of projects and a bit of an explanation of what they were and they were all listed out, and then we kind of went like, "Oh, we can't decide. Let's ask staff to tell us how much work that would be, how much effort." So they went away and they put an extra column in and they gave some indication insofar as they could about what the level of effort was. And then we looked at the document and we're like, "We still don't know how to prioritize these."

So, I think at some point we just have to go for it, because we keep going to staff like, "Give us more, give us more, give us more," but at the end of the day, we just have to give it a go and see where we come out. And because we've been talking to people in the community at large about how we're doing this prioritization exercise and telling the Board for, I think, about a year now, and I think sometimes you start being an embarrassment if you can't just at least try the exercise and see how it works.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Susan. Absolutely agree. I'm double-checking I'm looking at the right order. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADI

Thank you. I never thought that a prioritization process was needed. I also never thought that having a ranking method was a good idea, just going to be misinterpreted, it's a can of worms that we're opening, but we are opening many cans of worms. About the criteria of importance. Importance, I like it that it's about significance of the issue to ICANN's mission and the community but that criteria is very ambiguous. And at the end of the day, everybody is going to answer based on their interest. So it's not going to be truly the importance. It depends on how you define importance, but this criterion is a little bit ambiguous. So I just don't know.

Also, you keep saying that we are going to pilot this. How are we going to pilot it? Tell me.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Can we have that last slide of the pilot, show the next steps? Just so everyone have it on the screen. The last one. Yeah, that's how. Is that your question, or did I misinterpret your question?

FARZANEH BADI

So, you are piloting the scoring mechanism, not the whole prioritization process? But this is just about the scoring mechanism.

JENNIFER CHUNG

The scoring mechanism is only the first few steps. The subsequent steps is the actual meat of what we're doing, the discussion. I will point us back to the step-by-step that we circulated, so all of the steps equals the entire pilot. So not just the steps up to the scoring. So we're doing the whole thing as a pilot.

FARZANEH BADI

So on what topic are you doing this?

JENNIFER CHUNG

Can we go back to the slide that shows the candidate projects? I think that might be a very early slide. These ones, one to five, and then for DNS Abuse, there will be another step. So we're prioritizing the remaining gaps in the report. So that, and then this as a bigger whole.

FARZANEH BADI

I wanted to make a point when I kept asking this. These are real issues and it's not like if we are piloting it, it is going to turn into a real thing. And I don't think we can stop it if we are testing it. If we have not agreed on the process, and then start the process and just say it's a pilot, I don't think it's going to end well.

But I'm going to stop here. I'm sorry I raised concerns. It seems like it's bothering some people here, so I will stop.

JENNIFER CHUNG

No, Farzi, I think this is exactly the time to raise concerns. For example, what we will say is, if we run through this exercise before we embark on those real items, if we decide that this pilot is actually not working out for us—is that my understanding? There seems to be some nods—then we don't embark on it. These are real pieces of work, as you've mentioned. So the pilot exercise does not include then embarking on all of it in that list.

There's also remote people, so maybe use the mic. Okay. So I'll carry on in the list. We have Bruna. Oh, nope. Sorry. We have Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Thank you very much. I think this is a good start. I don't like everything about this, but that's okay. I think there's probably kind of a bigger issue here, which is we have a lot of work to do and we owe the community, and frankly, we owe the public as a whole an explanation of why we pick certain things to do them ahead of other things. I think we don't want to have paralysis through analysis. It's never going to be perfect, it's never going to please everybody, and that's okay. But I think we should give this a shot. You guys have done a good job on it. Again, I don't like everything

about it. I don't like all these topics on here. That's fine. I say let's give it a shot. So, thank you very much.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Damon. Moving on to Volker. I thought I saw Bruna. Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN

Thank you. Maybe instead of a pilot, we could call it a test run. That would probably just clarify that this is not immediately to make a decision, but rather that this is just to test the principle and how that works. It would also allow us to see whether one group or one councilor voting in the extreme for something that they might not want would affect the overall outcome. I think that would be helpful.

And just one clarification, I might have missed that, but this is a ranking, i.e., we only have each number once to vote for. For example, if we have five topics, we would have five votes, and then we would have to rank them to know 5, 5, 5, 1, 1, 1. So we would have to go 5, 4 by ranking of preference. Or is that really everything could be highest score?

JENNIFER CHUNG

First of all, thank you for suggesting a less permanent phrase or suggesting phrasing that councilors will be more comfortable with. So test, or whatever it is, would actually achieve that.

The second one that it's a more substantive question is I don't think we're advocating for a ranked scoring, I think it's just scoring. But I'm looking over to staff, so there's nods, so it's not you can only use one number once, not a rank scoring. Thanks. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS Thanks, Jen. I was just going to raise again the point that Farzi raised on the criteria, because I feel like we could do some extra work on the criteria to bring it closer to GNSO mission, and so on. The first tier on the importance, I agree that they're rather generic and whether it's important for the community, which part of the community are we talking about? And are we presuming it's exclusively to the GNSO community or are we talking about external requests, and so on? I think I'm raising that because we always get requests to prioritize a certain thing in detriment to others, so perhaps connecting it further to the GNSO points would be helpful here.

The other point was just on what if it doesn't work? Perhaps it's not now. Perhaps we can talk about it in July. But it would be interesting to also have the discussion on what is the next step in case this doesn't work? Do we go back to the ADR? What would be a feasible step in case Council decides this is not a good solution?

JENNIFER CHUNG Thanks, Bruna. Really constructive comments there. I think doing this test run—I'm not going to use the word pilot anymore—will

bring out all of this. I think we welcome any suggestions to improve the clarity of the criteria. And also, of course, when we're talking about it, that's also a good time to be able to bring this up too. I think there is multiple occasions where we can do that as well.

Your second question about what happens if this doesn't work? We carry on doing what we're doing. We don't have a prioritization mechanism but we just have to do the work that we're doing. The sky is not going to fall down and we'll still have a lot of work. This is real work we have to do, but I think it really will be harder for us and harder for us to even vis-à-vis the other parts of the community when they're looking at Council to understand, "Hey, why are you doing this first? Why are you doing the second?" So I think actually having something or maybe looking at another test run will be helpful for us. In the end, we're going to do the work. We'd like to do the work better. I think that's the answer. All right, Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Jen. Sorry, I hit the computer button, my mistake. To just add-on to what Jen says, I mean, we have a list of projects in front of us. The work needs to get done at some point. We need to make a decision about how that work gets done. I think we can't escape the fact that that is the task ahead of us, right? We are councilors, we are managers of the PDP. This is work that needs to get done. Maybe there are even things that don't need to get done. Maybe this prioritization exercise will tell us that some project that

someone has proposed shouldn't be tackled by the GNSO at all. I think that's a totally fair outcome.

But I think when we talk about testing this mechanism—I'm not going to use the P word—when we're testing this mechanism, I think what we're talking about is making tweaks to the rankings, tweaks to the criteria, and things like that. But personally, what I would like to see us move towards is doing an exercise like this, at least on an annual basis, where we are then incorporating new suggestions for new types of work into this and putting it into the system, and having kind of a long-term roadmap for what Council is going to work on. Sorry, not Council, really, the GNSO community is going to work on, so that we don't have to get bogged down with a backlog in the future and kind of giving that gift to future Councils.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Sam. I like giving the gift to future Council. Ben, please go ahead.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE

Thank you. I was just thinking on a practical level that are there already metrics to show when this pilot is successful or not working? I know there's a timeline between now and August to review it, but how do we know when it succeeds and know that it's going the right way we want it to go?

Then also another question is how would this pilot not affect the importance of any of these topics we have put to test this test drive? Because one way or the other, they will affect these topics because we are testing it. And how do we know that, look, this is test, it doesn't compromise any of the value that these topics or discussion points carry. So those are some of the things I'm looking at. Because there are various issues that come into pilot—buy-in, feasibility, and the SMART criteria you are going to look at. So, do we have all of that in place? Just talking from a practical point of view. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Benjamin. I don't think for this we have any "metrics" yet. We haven't started with it, it's test run. However, I will say, again, this is not just a numbers exercise, this is a qualitative exercise. This is the Council coming in to sequence our work. It's work that we really do have to do so. It's a sequencing thing for us to order our work going forward, future Council as well.

I think—and this is my personal thought on this and we haven't discussed, of course, it's not a stakeholder group position on this—what I would see as success is we are able to test this out and find that this actually helps us with understanding the work that's coming down and also helps community who's looking at us, for example, the GAC, for example, the Board looking at the GNSO work and understanding, "Okay, with predictability, these things are going to be tackled now, and then these other things are going

to be tackled in a little bit in the medium-term future, and then these things also will be tackled but after the first two groups.”

I think it's not a matter, again, of a numbers game, but it's more on having that accountability and visibility to others that are looking at Council work. We currently are still doing our work, but every time there could be other SO/ACs asking us, “Well, why are you doing this first? Why are you not doing what we want you to do first?” A classic example is a discussion we had probably with the GAC yesterday. As I'm trying to explain, this is probably what success might look like. Hopefully that's helpful. Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR

Hi. Thanks. This is Susan Mohr from the ISPCP for the record. I just want to again echo some of the comments on thank you for the work that's been done to put this together, to both staff and you all. I think that the numbers at the end of the day are likely going to be less relevant to the point that's been made here. It's really going to come down to the qualitative discussion. And the value that we're going to get out of this is that each of us are going to go back to our constituencies, get an understanding of how we view the numbers and the criteria, we'll be able to come together as a group, talk about it as a group, and I think as a result of that, we'll be able to come up with a set of criteria or a set of priorities. And having that long-term roadmap in a methodology for getting there is what's most important. To me, that success out of the—if you want to call it a pilot, not so much do we have the numbers right or do

we have the criteria right, because I think we can evolve that over time. So, thanks for your work on this.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks so much, Susan. Peter?

PETER AKINREMI

Thank you, Jen. I just wanted to thank you and the staff for putting this together and the leadership working on it, which I know that I'm part of the leadership. I put some comment on the chat that this is just a pilot. I know that a lot of people is defining pilot in different forms, which simply means a test. And thanks for the colleagues that use the word test run. We are trying to show that we have something to really test the process. I hear that people are concerned about the process. People are concerned about the criterion, the transparency of the system or the pilot or test run system. How do we know whether this process works? How do we know whether these criteria are right? How do we know whether this system is transparent? It's for us to be able to try our hands on something and have a conversation.

The end goal of this system for us to run the system is just for us to be able to have a handy conversation in how to know whether we have the resources, we have the right mechanism in place to be able to prioritize our work. That's the way we should deal with this. And this document has been shared with us. I want us to take a look

at it and see something is not right in it, let us propose changes so that we can carry on the implementation.

I know that most of us, it's not their favorite, right? Especially the NCSG that I belong, we have been on it and say, "You know what? Let's leave it to ADR that we have." But we insisted in going on. Now, this is the conversation that they're having over time. Now is the time for us that we have the [inaudible] template of criteria so the process that we're thinking of how it can help us to look at the resources, it can help us to prioritize our work better. The community is also looking at the GNSO on the work at hand.

So, to fellow councilors, let's propose changes to this criteria if needs to be, or let's agree on whether we need to implement these at a test run level for us to have a conversation and see whether the system is transparent enough for us to use, whether the criteria is right, whether the metric can provide the right metrics for us and the process is good. That's I just wanted to say. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Peter, for very useful suggestions there. I'm hearing a lot of, I guess, just willingness from different councilors to test things out, to look at it, to suggest to clarifications on criteria. I urge us all to send that to councilors so we can look at it. Ashley, please, go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

Hi. Thanks. Ashley with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. It sounds like we're all coming to the same conclusion so I will keep it brief. But personally, I am more concerned that we don't have a process for prioritizing. I think that goes to the efficacy of our work, our credibility, and our ability to defend our decisions and how we proceed. I think, yeah, let's try it out. Whether it means just changing up the issues, but I think this is something that we need to have in place. We need something. If it's not this, it needs to be something, and you've got to start somewhere. So thank you for starting this.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Ashley. I think we have exhausted the queue on this. And I'm hearing a general willingness to try. There's a lot of offers to help improve the process, which I welcome very much for all of us. We'll take it to the next steps according to the timeline. Thank you to staff to prepare that material and also share it with council when ready. With that, I think I pass it to the next agenda item which is AOB. Back to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks very much, Jen. We have a couple of AOB items. The first one is an update on the ALAC liaison. I'm going to hand this to Justine Chew who is our ALAC liaison.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thank you, Susan. I'll be very quick. At ICANN85 Mumbai, I did announce to Council that I would be stepping down at some point in time to take my seat on the Board at the end of ICANN87. That kicked off a process of selection within ALAC to find my replacement. And I'm happy to announce and to introduce my replacement, not immediately. He's Greg Shatan who is sitting behind me. So, you will probably see Greg replacing me at some point in time. We haven't settled on a final date yet, but this will be my last face-to-face meeting as the ALAC liaison. You'll probably see me for the July meeting and I'm not sure about the August meeting.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, Justine. Welcome, Greg. Thank you for putting your hand up for this. Very much appreciated. It's incredibly valuable to us as a Council to have a liaison from the ALAC. I'm not going to start saying thank you to Justine quite yet because hopefully she will be with us for at least another month. Greg, you have very big shoes to fill and I'm sure you can do so. But when she finally leaves us, we will miss Justine tremendously. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Justine, thank you very much. You've done a great job. It's been great working with you. Greg, looking forward to working with you as well.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you. Obviously, we are not losing Justine entirely from ICANN, she is just going on to bigger and better things.

Our next AOB item, we like to take an opportunity at every in-person ICANN meeting to give the wider community a chance to have a say. Usually Council meetings are just for councilors, and whilst we can have observers, basically, no one else gets the opportunity to take the mic. And so when we have these face-to-face meetings, we like to give a short amount of time to the wider community in case there is anyone who would like to raise something themselves rather than having to usually rely on going via their councilor.

I don't even know where the mic is. It's over there. The mic is over there. If anyone would like to queue up at the mic and raise anything with Council, this is your opportunity.

TERRI AGNEW

Virtual participants, you now have the ability to raise your hand in Zoom.

PAUL MCGRADY

Hello. On the prioritization exercises, I think that the GAC liaison also needs to do that because our work track gets thrown off when the GAC gets intense about something. So if the GAC liaison is not doing that, you don't have the full picture. Thank you. I love you all.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Paul, for the really good suggestion. I think that's very, very good. Because Seb is our liaison to the GAC, so it makes sense that he would also take a look at that. Thanks. Seb, did you want to respond? You were holding the mic.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

No, I didn't want to respond. I agree but I didn't want to respond specifically. I did have the opportunity of speaking with GAC members yesterday during a French wine tasting evening. And they came up with talking about that, about a new concept, which is we decide priorities that they may or may not agree, but the fact that we're doing work doesn't mean having discussions about other work. And they wanted to make sure that we understand that what they were talking about this week wasn't about us reshuffling our lives but only being open to talk about things that we may work on in the future.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for that update, Seb. We have someone—well, I'll allow him to introduce himself and tell us whether he's a cat or a dog. Thanks.

PHIL CORWIN

I'm a primate. Hi. This is Phil Corwin. It's good to be back at ICANN meetings. I served on this Council about a decade ago before I had a beard and before all my hair was white. I just want to say I think the prioritization system from my personal view—and I'm

unaffiliated right now, not with any constituency, but I did want to make Council members and others aware, if they haven't seen it, that I published an article this past weekend on my personal views on the importance of UDRP reform and I hope that people can agree with it and disagree with it. But I think as you consider UDRP prioritization, there might be something useful in there. Other than that, it's great to be back at an ICANN meeting. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Phil. It's lovely to see you as well. Okay. I don't have anyone else at the mic at the moment but I do have two councilors with their hands up. A reminder again for everyone in the room, this is your chance if you have something you want to share with us. But in the meantime, I'll go to Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE

Thanks. Maybe I should talk slowly so people will come to the mic. I just want to second what Sam noted in the chat that ALAC liaison—I don't know how many liaisons we have—should also fill out this test run by check, TRVC.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Anne. All our liaisons, we have liaisons from ALAC, we have ccNSO liaison. I think that's it.

SUSAN PAYNE

I'm going to be controversial here and maybe people can share their views, but please don't take this the wrong way. But Sebastien is the GNSO liaison to the GAC, so he is someone who liaises on our behalf to go and get input and feedback from the GAC. I think the ccNSO liaison and the ALAC liaison are a slightly different role. I think it would be extraordinarily useful to have input from both of those folks in the discussion that we have, and I wouldn't prevent that at all. This is a GNSO work prioritization exercise.

Again, I'm saying this just in a kind of personal capacity. I think it may be a bit controversial, but I think perhaps there's a bit of a distinction. For example, our ccNSO liaison, I'm not sure really why we would need them to be filling out a kind of scoring exercise about GNSO work, but something for you all to think about. Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Because Phil took the time to come out up here and get us started with the mic or after to at least... Not fully get us started, but I wanted to go ahead and share that article that Phil talked about, but also say that it's an example of why I want the vibe check. Because UDRP reform isn't one of the reasons that I come to ICANN, right? But as somebody who is trying to represent the non-contracted people. I want to know how much of a priority that is within the community so I can take it into consideration in my own role in this thing. That was very helpful. Phil sent that to me earlier

this week to take a look at. And this is the kind of insight I want from the community.

SUSAN PAYNE

All right, again, I don't have anyone on the mic but I do have Steve.

STEVE CHAN

Just Steve? Just kidding. Thanks, Susan. This is Steve. Just Steve. Sorry. Just a quick response about whether or not the ccNSO liaison and the ALAC liaison would participate. I don't think this has to make your decision, but the way that the operating procedures are written, it says that the liaisons, for all intents and purposes, they get to behave like a councilor, essentially. Other than voting and motions, other than that they participate as a—I can't remember the precise wording, but yeah. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks. I have Sam in the queue and I'm just noting that I've been corrected by Steve and I should take that on board. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Susan. It was just to clarify the suggestion in chat. Obviously, respecting that... The ccNSO liaison, for example, might not have a lot of desire to weigh in on things like the complexity or the resources aspect of it, but I think it could just be interesting to hear about their perception on the importance to ICANN's mission of a given topic and things like that. But to your point, as another

set of input into this conversation and honestly only if they want to. If they don't want to fill out one of the scorecards, that's also totally fine. I think this was another suggestion in the chat. We could look at the aggregate with, the aggregate without, and we can figure out how we want to do it.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for that. I forgot myself that this was the vibe check. We have a new person at the mic. Again, I'm going to let him introduce himself.

GREG SHATAN

Hi. This is Greg Shatan, currently chair of NARALO in At-Large, but looking forward to joining you in the capacity of ALAC liaison in the near future. Of course, I have a bit of a pass here as well, which I hope I will be able to use to be useful to both communities. And, of course, I can't resist an open microphone.

I just wanted to say on this point—and maybe this is the distinction between the ccNSO and the ALAC or the At-Large—is that At-Large as a community is very interested in gTLD policy. And I think that it will be useful from that perspective as well. I also expect I'll be sitting here and thinking a lot of things about the prioritization. I think it's, again, be useful to participate in the process. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, Greg. Okay. I'm not seeing anyone else at the mic and I don't think we have anyone on the queue. I think maybe

we can move on to our next agenda item which is at the start of our meeting, we... You have an AOB? Okay. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADI

I just wanted to say that since we were talking about which topics are important for the community, at NCSG we are working on the topic of remedy for the domain name registrant, and we are mapping the loopholes that are out there to seek remedy in case of their access to the domain name is suspended or something like that, what is available there, and kind of come up with points of conversations and talk to other community members and groups to see where we want to go and how we want to address the remedy mechanisms that are not out there. Now, while we are coming up with policy and mitigation mechanisms, that could very well affect domain name registrant. We will have these sessions in the future ICANN meetings and hopefully we can see how we can bring the topic to the Council.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Farzi. I know that it's a big topic and I think other parts of the community have been very supportive of that as well. I think others have indicated that it's important. One more thing I wanted to point out—and I don't know how many tourists we had at the ADC PDP sessions—I guess one of the not really a recommendation anymore or charter question where there will be items for me to bring back to Council, and I believe that might be one of them. I'm

just basically saying a lot of words to agree it is a more important thing.

SUSAN PAYNE

I would echo that. Thank you very much for flagging that to us. Okay. Then we are on to our final item. At the start of the meeting, you will recall that we moved our Consent Agenda item to the end of the meeting. Am I passing this to Vivek who was the... Indeed, I'm going to pass to Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. Should I just read out the Consent Agenda then? Here we go.

Consent Agenda. Motion to commemorate Arinola Akinyemi. Proposed by me seconded by all members of the GNSO Council. The Council has been informed of Arinola Akinyemi's passing. We wish to recognize Arinola's significant contribution to the GNSO and the ICANN multistakeholder model, as well as her professionalism, her dedication to digital inclusion, and her mentorship and friendship to many. She will be greatly missed.

Whereas, Arinola joined the GNSO Business Constituency as a member representative in 2015, representing the African region and has since distinguished herself as a committed volunteer across numerous roles within the GNSO and the broader ICANN community. As a BC rep, Arinola brought her deep expertise in ICT, her passion for digital inclusion and empowerment, and her

consistent dedication to the interest of commercial users and small businesses, particularly those from underrepresented regions in Africa. Arinola made significant contributions to ICANN governance and was well respected and active community participant.

During her tenure, Arinola participated in: Chair, GNSO Standing Selection Committee, two-terms; Vice-Chair, GNSO Standing Selection Committee, 2021; Chair, Credentials Committee, 2020-2021; GNSO appointed Fellowship Program mentor, ICANN78, 79, and 80; BC Small Seat delegate to the 2025 ICANN Nominating Committee; BC alternate on the Transfer Policy Review Working Group; Member, Universal Acceptance Steering Group Communications Subcommittee; and Member of the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group.

Arinola was a well-respected and much appreciated member, not only of the GNSO and the Business Constituency but of the broader ICANN community. She was a friend and dedicated mentor to many. Especially to Fellows and newcomers from the African region who could trace their early understanding of the ICANN through her patient guidance and encouragement.

Arinola was also an active and influential member of the ICT community within Africa and Nigeria more broadly. As CEO of DigiSphere Limited and Omar Ventures Limited and as founder and president of the DigiSphere Center for Digital Creativity, she championed ICT driven development and digital empowerment on the continent. Her external leadership roles included Vice-Chair

West Africa of the Africa ICT Alliance, AfICTA, and National Treasurer of the Information Technology Association of Nigeria, ITAN.

Arinola's passing is a great loss to the many people across the ICANN community who had the pleasure of working and interacting with her. And for her many friends at ICANN, the loss is deeply felt. In addition to her accomplishments and devotion, Arinola endeared herself to those in the community through her warmth, her willingness to support others and her generosity in giving of her time, particularly in mentoring new participants and helping bridge the gap between the African Internet community and the global ICANN process. Her work is missed but she is missed far more.

Resolved. The GNSO Council wishes to recognize the significant contributions Arinola Akinyemi made to the GNSO Business Constituency, the GNSO Council's structures she served, and the wider ICANN community during her tenure and the meaningful impact she had during this time. Arinola's presence, warmth, professionalism, and commitment to digital inclusion and the ICANN multistakeholder model will be dearly missed. On behalf of the current and previous GNSO Council represented today, we offer our deepest and heartfelt sympathies to our family and friends at this most difficult time.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Motion to commemorate Alan Barrett. Proposed by Vivek Goyal, seconded by all members of the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council has been informed of Alan Barrett's passing as announced by ICANN on the 28th of May 2026. We wish to recognize Alan's extraordinary and long-standing contribution to the ICANN multistakeholder model and to the global Internet community, as well as his deep technical expertise, his wisdom, his integrity, and his steadfast commitment to the mission of a stable and secure Internet. He will be greatly missed.

Whereas, Alan Barrett's connection to the Internet and to ICANN span more than three decades. He was involved in setting up the first Internet connection for South African universities in the early 1990s and is credited with creating the co.za zone. In 1993, he was co-founder of TICSAs, South Africa's first commercial Internet service provider, later known as Internet Africa and UUNet South Africa. His commitment to building the Internet, particularly across the African continent, defined his professional life.

Alan was instrumental in the formation of AFRINIC, the Regional Internet Registry for Africa, co-authoring the 1997 proposal to create AFRINIC, serving on the steering committee tasked with bringing it all into existence and being elected to the first AFRINIC board in 2004, where he served until 2009. In 2015, he was appointed as CEO of AFRINIC, a role he held until 2019. His role in founding and shaping AFRINIC represents one of the most enduring

contributions any individual has made to the African Internet ecosystem.

Alan served as an appointee of the AFRINIC board to the NRO Number Council/Address Supporting Organization Address Council (NRO NC/ASO AC) from 2004 to 2014. During the critical IANA stewardship transition period from 2015 to 2016, he served in the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) as an appointee of the NRO, a pivotal contribution during one of the most consequential moments in ICANN's history. Alan Barrett was appointed by the ASO Address Council to serve on the ICANN Board of Directors in Seat 9, beginning at the Annual General Meeting in 2021, representing the AFRINIC region. He was reappointed for his second term in 2024.

During his term on the ICANN Board, Alan served on many Board committees and caucuses and liaison roles. Board Technical Committee, 2021 to 2026, Board Audit Committee, 2021 to 2026, Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee, 2021 to 2023, Organizational Effectiveness Committee, 2021 to 2026, Board Strategic Planning Committee, 2023 to 2026. Grant Program Caucus. Co-chair, Board Caucus for the New Generic Top-Level Domains Program 2026 Round. Liaison to community groups dealing with internationalized domain names, IDNs. Liaison to community groups dealing with closed generic gTLDs. Liaison to the IANA Naming Function Review.

Alan brought to the ICANN Board a rare combination of deep technical expertise, rooted in decades of hands-on Internet infrastructure work and a principled measured approach to governance.

As ICANN Board Chair Tripti Sinha reflect upon his passing, Alan contributed wisdom, integrity, and a steadfast commitment to ICANN's mission in all discussions. His perspective as a representative of the African region ensured that the interests of an often underrepresented part of the global Internet community were heard at the highest level of ICANN's structure.

Alan was a familiar, well-respected, and much appreciated presence across the entire ICANN community, not only within the Board and the ASO, but to those in the GNSO and across all Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees who had the opportunity to engage with him. He was known for his thoughtfulness, his position, his genuine commitment to the multistakeholder model.

Alan passed away on 28th of May 2026, following a diagnosis of late-stage cancer. His passing is a profound loss to the global Internet community. For those who worked alongside him, whether in the earliest days of African Internet infrastructure, on the AFRINIC board, in the ICG, or across many years of ICANN meetings, the loss is deeply personal. In addition to his remarkable record of service, Alan endeared himself to his colleagues through his understated manner, his intellectual honesty, and his

willingness to engage carefully and constructively with even the most difficult questions of Internet governance. His work leaves a lasting mark, but he is missed far more than his work.

Resolved. The GNSO Council wishes to recognize the extraordinary contributions Alan Barrett made to the ICANN Community, to the ICANN Board, and to the global Internet, spanning more than three decades of dedicated service to building, governing, and protecting the Internet for all. Alan's presence, integrity, technical leadership, and steadfast commitment to a stable, secure, and open Internet will be dearly missed by all who have the privilege of working with him.

On behalf of the current and previous GNSO Councils represented today, we offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to his wife, Kerry, his family, and his many friends around the world at this most difficult time.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you. We'll go ahead and take the vote now. There will just be one option. Would all those in favor of the motion please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS

Aye.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you. The motion passes.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks very much. I would also just like to note for people that there is a sort of community session this evening at 6:00 p.m. on Arinola. I believe that information has already been shared on our mailing list but I just wanted to remind all that that is the case.

I think with that and with a slightly sad end to our meeting, that is the end of our agenda. I think we can close the meeting at this point and say thank you, everyone. We do have one more meeting as a GNSO Council, which is tomorrow morning. It's the Wrap-Up session. I know how much you will love that, so we'll see you then.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]