

---

## ICANN Transcription

### Joint ccNSO & GNSO Councils

**Wednesday, 20 October 2021 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/MgNyCg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

**KIMBERLY CARLSON:** Thank you, everyone, and welcome to the joint ccNSO and GNSO Council teleconference on the 20th of October at 19:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call and attendance will be taken based on those on Zoom. As a reminder, this call is being recorded and is governed under ICANN's expected standards of behavior. The recording will be posted on each group's corresponding public Wiki. Please mute your phones and microphones when not speaking to avoid background noise and echoing.

We will be monitoring the chat for questions and there'll be an opportunity to verbally ask a question or comment. Please raise your hand in Zoom and you will be placed in the speaker queue.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

With that, thank you again for joining and I'll turn the call over to Alejandra Reynoso.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Kim, and welcome, everybody. I would like to just remind everyone that is just joining to please put either Council or Councilor on your nametag so it's easier for us to see you. It is so good to be here. Our last meeting was in March and we've been missing you. So it's nice to be together again.

And for me, it is a little bit extra special since it's my first joint meeting as chair of ccNSO. So please, have patience with me. I'm still learning. Philippe, do you want to say any opening remarks?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Alejandra. And I guess we all are. So thanks for this. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone, to my fellow councilors and to the ccNSO councilors. It's always a pleasure, and I'll hand it back to you to help us go through the agenda, for which I thank Maarten and Sebastien for their good work again. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Philippe. So let's review our topics. So we have ICANN's prioritization framework, we have also our respective Councils' prioritization work, we have something on the CSC effectiveness review, and also the coordination between IDN EPDP and ccPDP4, followed by any other business. Is there

---

anyone who would like to add any other business right now just to keep it in mind? If not, I'll ask later again.

Seeing no hands up right now, I think we should move forward. And I have a question to ask if it's okay with everybody. Since we don't have any other slides on the agenda, would it be okay if we stopped sharing it so we can see each other on the gallery and have this opportunity to see each other's faces rather than this huge slide? If there is no objection, I'd like to propose that. And for everyone to be able to follow of course the agenda, we will ask maybe Kim to put the summary in the chat. I see a plus. Thank you. So let's do that. So nice to see you all.

Okay, let's start with the first topic, ICANN's prioritization framework. For this, I'm handing it to Giovanni. Please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Hi Alejandra. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. So I'm the chair of the ICANN ccNSO strategic and operating plan committee. And since quite some months, we have been involved together with the ICANN CFO and his team into the process of, let's say, prioritizing different kinds of activities and work that ICANN has had.

So planning at ICANN is one of the 15 operating initiatives in the operating plan for fiscal year 21 and 22. Part of this initiative is to deliver a sort of draft prioritization framework to improve the overall ICANN planning process.

---

The SOPC has organized an open session with ICANN on this subject, and the session is going to be next Tuesday. And it's on the ICANN schedule for next week.

The planning department is leading this operating initiative and we understand that they have already consulted different members of the community, different constituencies.

There are several items that have still to be discovered and on which the ICANN planning department is still looking for input from the different communities. So next week, the ICANN planning department will go through a presentation and will ask those who are attending the overall session to express their views on four elements of the overall prioritization framework.

Those four elements are the scope, which means the scope of the activities to be prioritized, the frequency, so how often, this prioritization exercise should be conducted. The participants, so who are the participants who should be involved in this exercise, and the technique, so what are the best techniques to help us the community and ICANN and the planning department to privatize the work that has to be done?

So that said, I think it's quite important for all the community, any member of the community to participate in this exercise. And let's say that we would like, as the ccNSO Council and as well as the chair of the ccNSO SOPC, to have an informal chat with the GNSO Council about if you had the chance to think about the scope, what do you think about the scope of this prioritization framework, the frequency, the four elements on which the

---

consultation will be held next week. So scope, frequency, participants and also the techniques.

But there is also another element that has come to our attention, because whenever you're prioritizing, you collect input from different parts of the community, you may end up having conflicting views on what is given priority number one by one group in the community and might be given the lowest priority from another let's say constituency. And this is something that we had some months ago and also last year, these different views from the GNSO and the ccNSO, the two let's say groups that are looking after the ICANN strategic initiatives and operating plans. And at some point, we could see that there is a difference in opinions and views about the way we believe ICANN should prioritize things.

So that said, I'm opening the floor for a discussion for, again, an informal talk about if you had the chance to speak about these kinds of elements already with the ICANN planning department, what do you think about those elements, what do you think about in case there's going to be a conflict from the input that ICANN Planning is receiving from the community, how should this conflict be sorted out?

I'm shutting up now and I open the floor for a talk. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Giovanni. Yes, Philippe.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Alejandra. Thanks, Giovanni. Let me just start and hopefully some of my fellow councilors will follow suit. So as Giovanni alluded to, we're perfectly aware of the SOPC and we do have some collaboration with Council's standing committee on operation and budget, SCBO.

And there's a significant difference between the two things, being that it's under Council with a limited remit. So for that reason, we haven't tasked that committee with coming up with an input on behalf of the GNSO to that prioritization framework.

So it may at least at this point be difficult to reflect a common view on behalf of the GNSO since it's very much to the stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO, and they've started that already with other topics, a variety of views at this point.

We do recognize the difficulty that you raised, Giovanni, in terms of what happens if groups—including within one single SO—reflect or express diverging views in terms of what comes first. We came up against that difficulty in our own prioritization with regards to our own activities within this. And I understand that we'll come on to that on point two.

But there we are. Our respective committees have different remits, hence the fact that our own has not been tasked with this. I see that John has his hand up, so I'll hand it over to you, John, to follow up. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Philippe, and thanks, Giovanni. As the chair of the standing committee on budget and operations in the GNSO, we've

---

always appreciated working with SOPC on these budget issues. And just to echo what Philippe was saying, the diversity of the GNSO structure and of the Council makes it more appropriate for prioritization to occur on an SG and C level. We all recognize that and that there are differences. But what I really found useful from the work with you and the ccNSO is not so much on the differences but on where we did align on issues of priority, and the fact that it was a really good exercise, just like what ICANN Planning department is doing, to even understand some of the terminology that ICANN uses as describing what is within its priorities. That itself can be somewhat of a challenge.

So we will definitely look forward to working with you all in the future on these prioritization issues. It will be probably done more broadly from the individual components of the GNSO Council. But we will probably do another, smaller prioritization poll like you have done—and that was great leadership—to help find issues where we are aligned and where we do find priorities.

And then it's also, as Philippe illustrated, sometimes also to see what the two councils find as being different or less important. So we do appreciate your efforts in that regard. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, John. I see Stephen has his hand up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Alejandra. Thank you, John. Thank you, Philippe. If I understand your comments, it does not sound like there's going to be complete harmonization of GNSO viewpoint with regards to

---

ICANN budget planning priorities. Is that a correct assessment?  
Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I'll answer that question. At least with respect to the SCBO, it's a little early to make that determination, and then I think that our comments have typically been focused on not so much a decision or unanimity on what the priorities ought to be, but on priorities that the Council finds within its remit, which is limited. So we tend to focus our comments on the budget on making sure there's adequate funding for the development of policy. And it doesn't go much beyond that. So I think there might be some prioritization-type comments that come in, but it would likely not be from the GNSO Council, except as it would apply to issues relating to policy development. I'll let Philippe or any other member of leadership comment more on that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, John. Appreciate it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Philippe, do you want to address that?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Yes. I was just going to say what John just said. The comments that the SCBO generally provides are focused on the policy side of things and should this be broadened. Anyway, this would have to come from the SGs and Cs on the need to do that. And I think



---

it's a bit early to answer that question, whether that ask would come. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you as well.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Philippe. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Hi everyone. This is just an observation. I've kind of watched the ICANN stuff going from a bit of a distance, and to me, prioritizing at the ICANN level will show whether the strategy of the organization is actually coherent or whether it is just a bundle of different strategies that suit the different SOs and ACs, because I think I mentioned in our own internal prioritization, if you don't have an agreed strategic outlook and what your priorities are, then prioritization as work comes along is pretty tricky. Is that something that you've seen playing out in the discussions so far? That's the question to those of you who've been following more closely, might be Philippe and Giovanni, might be other people.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, I think I'll hand it over to Giovanni first.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank you, Alejandra, and thank you, Jordan. Thank you as well to Philippe and the others. Indeed, I agree with Jordan that

---

it's a sort of testbed for ICANN. I fully agree and understand that it's very challenging for ICANN planning department to introduce such a step in the overall strategic and operating plan framework.

It's as big challenge because it introduces an extra layer of complexity in a process that is already quite complex and has very tight timelines for the approval and for moving from one step to the next. So they're introducing or they want to introduce this step and as a matter of fact, one of the elements that they're currently seeking input from the community is indeed the frequency, how often the ICANN Planning department should seek the input of the community when it comes to the prioritization.

So just wondering if overall, there is anybody in the GNSO Council that has any specific view on this framework that ICANN is proposing in terms of the prioritization and about the elements on which they're looking for input from the community?

Again, I believe that next week's session that is going to be, again, on the 26th, is going to be quite important. We are really looking forward to having not only SOPC members attending it but as many community members as possible, because there will be some polls and from the polls, ICANN planning department may have a better idea about how the community may respond to this effort that is indeed at the end an effort that ICANN is asking the community to make, because we are those who are going to be called to express our views in, again, timeframes that might be very tight.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Giovanni. Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Alejandra. I'm not sure I'll be answering Jordan's question totally, but I think we would all agree that that's a bit of a test for the community. The challenge here, I think, is twofold, at least from GNSO's perspective. The first reason is something that everyone has experienced recently, resources, and the ability to provide inputs in a reasonable amount of time on such items. That's the first thing, but we all have that difficulty.

But the second one is really to sort of balance activities that are not policy development-related, which I think it's fair to say remains the priority within the GNSO. Again, we'll come on to that on item number two, but it's the challenge and the exercise that has just been started is much broader than this. And to sort of balance between those two higher-level priorities is really, in terms of limited resources, a challenge.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, everyone. Definitely, prioritization is something that we should look inward as well as outward. And I will stress one more time the invitation of Giovanni to please join the session next Tuesday. I think it'll be very beneficial for both groups. And with this, I would like to go to our next topic, that is on the ccNSO and GNSO Council prioritization, unless Giovanni wants to say something else.

---

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Alejandra. I just saw a comment by Jeffrey about one of the possible options for the prioritization. And indeed, one of the elements of the overall framework is about the way the ICANN Planning department is going to conduct this prioritization work, if it is going to be done in what Jeffrey's calling silos, by constituency, or if there is going to be a sort of committee or group made of representatives of different constituencies who's going to be tasked to do this kind of prioritization.

So this is indeed one option. And personally, I would be more in favor of having a group of people coming from different constituencies come in to do it rather than do it by constituency, which could be an extra challenge for the planning department.

So again, session is next Tuesday. Please participate if you can, and we'll be in touch on this subject. So thank you again, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Giovanni. And with this, we're moving now to prioritization of Council's work and for this, I will lend the microphone to Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Alejandra. Hi everyone. My job here is to give a briefing on the approach that the ccNSO is taking, which I'd suggest is nascent. We have had for a long time a triage committee that I'm the chair of that has dealt with incoming requests from the Org as the year goes on. And what we're in the process of doing right now is changing and expanding the scope

---

of that group to provide prioritization work planning place for the ccNSO.

So instead of the staff just popping out a workplan for the Council once a year, we'll actually have a group of Council members who can work effectively with the staff to do that work.

And one of the discussions that we're going to need to have on the Council—and this'll be news to some of our Council members because we're discussing it next week—is what the method that we use to do that is. So we've been exploring one that we use, PACE is the acronym, and that's just a two-dimensional prioritization tool that you do the impact of whatever it is on one axis and the amount of effort required on another axis.

What that tool steers you towards is small pieces of work that have a big impact. And it steers you away from big, heavy, effortful pieces of work that have a low impact.

Now, assuming you can come up with some shared definitions of what big effort is, that seems to be easy, like a big working group over four years is different to a task one person can do. The benefits arising can be a little harder to quantify.

And sometimes, in this community, we need to do things that are a lot of effort and that might have limited practical payoff. The ccPDP on retirement policy might be an example, because we don't have an enormous flow of ccTLD retirements coming through the ICANN system, but there has to be a policy to deal with that problem.

---

So that's an example of the tension and it highlights the need for there to be a clear strategy, because if you know what you're aiming to do, this PACE methodology that we're exploring can help you on the margins and help you with new things that come in, but it can't answer the more fundamental questions. So I think one of the recommendations we'll be coming back to the Council with is alongside that PACE methodology, we need to do something a little bit beyond our one- or two-year workplans to set some more strategic goals for the ccNSO.

And another question that will be wrapped up in all that of course is our rules and ICANN's bylaws will require a fair amount of work of us. And should we prioritize that mandated work, or should we prioritize the discretionary work that actually advances the goals of the ccNSO, like organizing excellent meetings, like doing the PDP work that helps flesh out the minimal but important global policy frameworks that we need in our environment?

So it's kind of nascent, and I'm super keen to learn from the approach that the GNSO is taking, recognizing that you're a much bigger and more complicated organization with a lot more policy work happening than we have. So that's my introduction, Alejandra. Back to you?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. So now [we] would like to know, how did you prioritize your work in the GNSO, if possible. Yes, Philippe.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Alejandra. Thanks, Jordan. I'm sure we could spend two, three hours on this particular topic. We don't want to do that, certainly. I'll just give you a brief outlook on how we approached this over the years and the last few months.

The first initiative that we took was essentially on the process side of things and making sure that PDPs and working groups are just as efficient and effective, as the saying goes, as possible. And that led to what we call PDP 3.0. So that's one the process side of things regardless of the particular specific items.

And I think Jordan's question was more on how we sort out the various items that we have under our remit. And we've come a long way with an [appalling] complex spreadsheet that was really difficult to manage and to sort of professionalize the approach in terms of making sure that the project management of the PDPs is as efficient as possible. so staff put in place a project management tool that we review on a regular basis at each and every Council meeting. Sometimes briefly and sometimes extensively, to make sure that everyone's onboard.

I know that a lot of us councilors do share those elements with their respective SGs and Cs to make sure that the various items that are on our table are perfectly known. So that's what we have in play, so that makes it possible for us to have a view on what's coming next, what people should be prepared for in terms of resources to be committed to particular working groups, for example.

On the use of PACE, we didn't use that, but that reminds me of an exercise that we did two years ago, I think. And it was much more

---

basic, if you like, than that sort of complex tool. We basically came up with a list of items that we had to do over the following—I forget, but that must have been 12 to 24 months or something, and reached out to the SGs and Cs requesting them to sort them out and identify their respective priorities in that list. And that wasn't as fancy as the two-dimensional thing that you describe, but basically, we came up with the problem, the results and the difficulties, exactly what you described, Jordan. I.e. our membership came up with not conflicting but various views on what should come first. And it was quite difficult to decide eventually.

So in practice, I think we came up with three or four items that we put on the top of our list, and unsurprisingly enough, those were policy development-related.

Just as a takeaway in terms of prioritization, we'd been very pragmatic and we took that on various perspectives in the last two to three years. I think it's fair to say that none of them has been perfect, especially in the light of the shortness of resources over the last few months. So certainly, if councilors would like to chime in, there would be a lot to say on prioritization. But I hope this is helpful. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Philippe. As you say, this is a very complex and long topic. Maybe it would be a good idea to arrange for a joint session with people who are in charge of doing the prioritization work on your side with the triage group, so to compare notes and maybe see if there are some re cs that could



---

be made there. I also would like to ask, what are these tools that you use? If there's a specific software, if it's free, if you're paying for it. Just out of curiosity. Yes, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. We're not using any tools per se, like the one you refer to. And for that reason, I think we would be interested in learning a bit more on what that might bring and whether that might be a useful thing to use for us as well, and there's always the tradeoff between the overhead of a new tool and that being effective eventually. But certainly happy to take that forward with some exchange on this particular item.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Thank you, Philippe. Jordan, I don't know if you want to say something else.

JORDAN CARTER:

To the extent we can work together to help make the ICANN systems simpler by a common prioritization approach, if we can reach that, that would be awesome. But even just some more intensive exchange of views I think would be helpful. It'll help us uncover things we're just making assumptions about, ideas we might be sitting on. So I think organizing something like that, maybe after the ICANN sessions but before Christmas, would be worth doing. Thanks.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Excellent. Thank you. And I see Cheryl. Hi Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just wanted to point out that the planning department, Xavier's group, have certainly explored—and I thought put out—a whitepaper, unless I'm fantasizing about having read something—that did explore at least four different types of tools with some preferencing on a couple. And I think that if either of the supporting organizations were interested, looking at that whitepaper and/or having a discussion with them and getting some feedback and information on those various tools—one of which of course Jordan has already mentioned—but [inaudible] doing prioritization [inaudible] couple of different models.

But I once earned my daily bread in this area, so I can't possibly resist putting in my comments. Apologies. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And indeed, we would be very much interested in such whitepaper, because as Jordan is mentioning, the triage committee is exploring some collaborative tools to be able to have a more, let's say, open tool to carry on with the work. So if you could share that with us, we will be very happy.

Any other comment on this topic? I don't see any hands up. And definitely, we will arrange a meeting after ICANN and before Christmas if possible. So that will be noted. Thank you very much.

---

With this then, let's move forward to the fourth topic of the agenda, the CSC effectiveness review. I know that the review had its first meeting very recently, but still, it'd be very nice if we could have an update, if it could be maybe Maarten or Donna.

MAARTEN SIMON:

Hello Alejandra and hi all. We had our first meeting this week on Monday, and there is a framework that we can use that was used the last time the review was done. And we are now looking if we can simply copy it or have to make a few changes to it. But we agreed on a way of working, so that's the second thing, is we will, as the group did before, have interviews with the CSC and with the PTI Board to be able to fill in our framework and assess if CSC is effective.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Excellent. Thank you. I don't know if there are any questions. Yes, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Alejandra, and thanks, Maarten, for this. I appreciate that the topic of the CSC is a bit dry, but hopefully some of the councilors will chime in as well. I just want to thank you on behalf of the GNSO for accommodating the comments that we provided on the template, belatedly. So thanks for this. And glad to hear that the second review is going well. Just as a side note, I heard that by that time, we'll be able to come back to face-to-face meetings for the interviews, because it was so easier to do that in face-to-face meetings last time and so much more efficient. So all

---

the best for this for those onboard, including our members. Glad that the experience of the first CSC effectiveness review is useful. I understand that it was charter-based and very straightforward. So hopefully, that's going to be the same this time. We're looking forward to more progress on this important topic.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Philippe, and I'm picking up also on Jeffrey's comment in the chat that the CSC group must be doing something really well since we don't spend too much time talking about them. And as an ex-member of the CSC, I can tell you, yes, they do an excellent job. So I think that this work will go smoothly, and hopefully without surprises. Thank you again. If there are no more comments or hands raised, then we can move along.

So now we have our fifth topic on the agenda, the coordination between the IDN EPDP and the ccPDP variant management subgroup. For this, I would like to start by saying that Anil Kumar Jain from NIXI has been appointed by the ccNSO Council as the alternate of the ccNSO appointed liaison to the GNSO IDN EPDP effort, and it will be starting today. So just to let you know.

And for all of the people present, I think it would be very nice if we could be on the same page here on what we are doing, so if we could have a brief summary on what the IDN EPDP is about and then I will ask one of our councilors to tell us what the ccPDP is all about. That will be great. So, would you like to start or should we start?

---

AI-CHIN LU:

Thank you, Alejandra. Let me give you a brief about the ccPDP 4. As we all know, the result of the ccPDP 4 is about [inaudible] the IDN ccTLD fast track process and the ccPDP 2. The ccPDP 4 working group had the kickoff meeting in August of 2020 and its goal is to report on and recommend a policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. The working group is to review and update the criteria, procedures and the documentation of the deselection process for string selection.

Under the ccPDP 4 working group, there are two subgroups: the VM subgroup and the DS subgroup. The VM subgroup set up in February of 2021 is focusing on variant management to coordinate GNSO efforts via liaison. The subgroup adopted the definition of variant and is developing recommendation based on ICANN recommendation and the SubPro. It'll also prepare a recommendation to the ccPDP 4 working group for its consideration.

Deselection subgroup set up last month is focusing on the deselection of IDN ccTLD strings. The subgroup is tasked to define the trigger events that will cause the start of the IDN ccTLD retirement process. The deselection subgroup expects to meet biweekly alternating with the variant management subgroup meeting. And the ccPDP 4 working group meetings will be deferred until one of the subgroups has completed its work.

Yeah, I believe after a few months, an additional subgroup on confusing similarity is foreseen. Currently, I think everything is steadily making progress, and we hope we can propose initial policy recommendation at the end of this year. I think this is all my report. Thank you.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Ai-Chin. Thank you for such a good summary. Can we have a very brief summary on the IDN EPDP as well?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes. Hi everyone.

DONNA AUSTIN: Tatiana, sorry.

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry, Donna, yeah, I just wanted to say that you go first.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry. I wasn't sure that people knew that I was in the room. [Seb had] asked me to join just for this update, which will be reasonably brief. My name is Donna Austin and I have recently taken over as the chair of the GNSO's IDN EPDP. Some of you may be aware that Edmon Chung was the original chair, but given that Edmon is now stepping up to the Board next week, we had to find a new chair. So I'm it.

The primary purpose of the GNSO's effort is to deal with the variant management of gTLDs, and this primarily relates to 2012 IDNs that submitted applications to the new gTLD program. Variants didn't have a policy at that time, so that's something that we will work through.

---

As most of you will know, quite a lot of work has been done by the label generation rules groups, and that is important to our work. One thing I am conscious of and I haven't had an opportunity to have a conversation with counterparts in the ccPDP, but I'm very pleased to hear that we now have a formal liaison with Anil. And I think we had Dennis Tan which is our liaison to the CCs' work.

There are specific things that the Board has asked us to coordinate on and ensure that we have some kind of consistency in our approach. So that's something that I would appreciate having a conversation with the two groups at some point, just to make sure that we're on a consistent path. So sorry to interrupt, Tatiana, but yeah, thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

No, Donna, actually it was great. Sorry, Alejandra, that you interrupted me because I really wanted that before we cover some coordination issues from the GNSO perspective, I actually wanted to ask you to intervene on what IDN EPDP is actually all about. So you saved me from a lot of trouble, because you basically covered a lot of what I wanted to say even in terms of coordination.

So just from the Council leadership perspective, I want to note a couple of things. So we do understand that both of the groups have members which participate in both ccNSO and GNSO policy development process, both IDN EPDP and ccNSO ccPDP 4—which is quite a long name for the PDP, if you ask me—and this is extremely helpful for our coordination that we have members which interact with both groups.

---

So as Donna mentioned, we did appoint Dennis Tan to serve as GNSO's liaison to the ccPDP 4, and we do understand that he even has a vice chair position in the subteam for the variant management, if I'm not mistaken. And we also understand that you approved Anil Kumar as an alternate. And he's also an active participant in the EPDP and we're very pleased how coordination goes here and how we interact.

So we do believe that coordination between these two groups remains very important for us to ensure that to the greatest possible extent, the consistent outcomes are achieved with respect to what is important for us, to the definition of TLDs and the management of variant labels.

So we do recognize that our IDN EPDP will perhaps very likely go into a more granular sort of nuance, detail than ccPDP 4. And correct me if I'm wrong, but we think that it might happen. But still, it is very important that however deeply we go into details, that we have consistent outcomes and also consistent with the ICANN Board direction on this topic. So this is from me. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Tatiana. Anil, anything that you would like to add at the moment?

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, and thank you, everybody for nominating me as the liaison between GNSO and ccNSO for this PDP work. I think Ai-Chin, Donna had already covered most of the things which we are doing, and I can only tell you that I'm attending both PDP work



---

and I'll be very happy to share the information of both the groups to each one of them so that the consistency and the synchronization between two PDP groups will be maintained. And in case there are any issues, those can be reported to the concerned Council. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Anil. Regarding the coordination point that was raised, are there any particular points or differences that you would like to be recognized or to be addressed?

ANIL JAIN: At this moment, I don't think that there is any coordination point which is recognized, because IDN EPDP of GNSO has just started. You can say that we started with definitions of root zone LGR understanding and we have [inaudible] and because we are only initially discussing the charter which has been defined. So right now, I don't think there is any point of difference or any point which can be raised at this particular joint meeting. In future, if anything is there, I would love to inform, and I hope that there should not be any point of difference between these two PDP subgroups because synchronization will be maintained. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Anil. I have a question for the GNSO. It is our understanding that it was requested a possible deferral on the IDN guidelines. Is that correct? And if so, what was the need to defer it?

TATIANA TROPINA:

Alejandra, if I may cover this, I would like to respond. So first of all, I would like to say that we indeed understand where this question is coming from, and we think that that was a bit of luck of coordination. We probably should have coordinated this with you. We regret that we have not collaborated on this earlier. And by having this meeting and by trying to establish some sort of communication, collaboration, we would like to provide the opportunity to make this communication much easier and smoother in the future to make neither of us surprised. Not for IDNs EPDP, not for guidelines, not for ccPDP 4.

So yes, we did request this, and I want to say that the IDN guidelines represent a contractual requirement for contracted parties within GNSO. And there is a bit of a difference between what we have in terms of policies and contracts here in GNSO and what you have in the ccNSO. So we just operate in a very different environment and of course, the GNSO is very curious what thoughts you as ccNSO have about the current version and any potential concerns you might have about them being deferred while the work of the ccPDP 4 and IDN EPDPs continue.

So we sent a letter to the Board August the 18th, so a few weeks ago, and some concerns that this letter included are first of all, the Registries Stakeholder Group expressed concern that the IDN EPDP and the operational track will approach these issues from a different perspective and develop kind of contradicting results. So that was a huge concern.

---

Another concern that the team which is developing the IDN EPDP charter also recognized that these overlapping issues involve indeed policy considerations in addition to operational aspects. So this is all better suited for discussion in a policy development process rather than this operational process. And also importantly, the Council has considered the Registries Stakeholder Group analysis on the security and stability impact of this deferral of the operational track and the adoption of the IDN 4.0. and actually, none of the new requirements were identified as having an effect on security and stability.

So as I said, it perhaps could have been a bit better coordination, maybe even a lot better coordination, but hopefully this is something for us to consider in the future. And also, I would like to say that if anybody from my fellow councilors, especially from Registries Stakeholder Group wants to jump in, this would be very much appreciated because of course, I'm speaking more on a high level here. But those of you who have concerned and outlined them, please feel free to chime in.

And I also see that Jeff has his hand up. So Alejandra, if you don't mind, I will hand it over to Jeff.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Sure. Go ahead.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks, Tatiana. And I agree with Tatiana. I think the way you described it is right. So I wasn't going to necessarily add to that, but I guess my question is, what do you or members of the ccNSO

---

believe is the impact of our deferral? Is it having a negative impact on what you're doing, is there something that we should be aware of that we just didn't think of, or is it just that you were surprised? But either way, I think it's good to get some more details that we just didn't know or not aware of.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Good question, Jeffrey. Well, in my personal view, it was just curiosity as in why this was happening. But I do expect any other fellow councilors if they want to say anything else or even from the ccPDP4 working group if they have any other comment on that. But to me, it was just curiosity on why this was happening and if it was happening.

And of course, if we find any other impacts, we will let you know. Thank you, Jeffrey. Yes, Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, Alejandra, thank you very much. And I hope that indeed I did answer the question why it happened, because as I said, we operate in a different environment and we thought at least one of the groups in the GNSO community felt very strongly about it and we didn't find significant effects on security and stability, so we thought that it wouldn't be that much damaging. But I also wanted to say I am leaving the GNSO Council, I am term limited, but I'm sure the new leadership and Philippe and the fellow councilors and stakeholder groups would be happy to hear and appreciate if you convey any concerns that ccPDP 4 or the ccNSO Council,

---

ccNSO community will find in relation to these requests in the future. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Tatiana. And as Jeffrey has put in the chat, you're coming with us so you're not going anywhere far away. Okay, thank you so much for the explanations. I think they are very good. And with this, I would like to also tell you that the questionnaire that was asked from the GNSO EPDP that was asked to the ccNSO, we referred this to the ccNSO ccPDP working group on the variant management subgroup specially to address them. So they'll be having a better look at it and responding, I'm guessing shortly after maybe the middle of November. So you can be assured that we've received it and we are having a look at it.

Are there any other comments regarding this topic? I don't see any hands up, and I see that we have barely two minutes left on this call, and I would like to move on to any other business. Does anyone have any other business?

Apparently not, and we don't have any either. So with this, I would like to thank all of you for joining us in this call. It was so very nice to see you. I like this format, I hope you liked it too, not—to see each other's faces as much as possible. hopefully, we will soon be able to be in the same place in this planet. But until then, it's very good to see you even on camera.

Thank you so much for this, and the meeting is adjourned. Anything else, Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART      Not at all. Wise words. Speak to you soon, and thanks very much, Alejandra. Bye all.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:    Thank you. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**