EN

ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council Meeting

Thursday, 18 April 2024 at 21:00 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.

The audio is also available at:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/TpwrZ0C2_zedjebclDfxkIF2ThIic343zSLeOHKa6dyUS0HEK022unD1nuW Xeqtz_FerKFL1QCPhEuSW.Gb5VcETTDtsyrUp0

Zoom Recording: https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/pNzOb50IRhU01eMSlNtJOH_3vppmsiidy6-4Qk5yyjkURfb769C2_CaaR7_j6G_o.BcYhF_QcQLFI16O4?startTime=1713474063000

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

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): **– Non-Voting** – Anne Aikman Scalese
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Antonia Chu, Greg DiBiase, Prudence Malinki
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Kurt Pritz (tentative proxy to Nacho Amadoz in case of connectivity issues), Jennifer Chung
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Mark Datysgeld , Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Stephanie Perrin, Bruna Martins dos Santos (arrived late and absent for first vote), Wisdom Donkor, Tomslin Samme-Nlar , Peter Akinremi, Manju Chen
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :
Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

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.

Jeff Neuman: GNSO liaison to the GAC
Everton Rodrigues: ccNSO observer (apologies)

Guests:
Lars Hoffmann - ICANN org
Sarmad Hussain - ICANN org

ICANN Staff:
David Olive - Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional (apologies)
Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management
Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations
Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)
Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support
Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
John Emery - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Specialist (GNSO)
Devan Reed - Secretariat Operations Coordinator

TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on Thursday, the 18th of April 2024. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Antonia Chu? I thought I saw Antonia on. She might be having some connectivity issues. We'll go ahead and work on that. Nacho Amadoz.
NACHO AMADOZ:	Present. Thank you, Terri.
TERRI AGNEW:	You are welcome. Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Kurt Pritz?

KURT PRITZ: I'm here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Greg DiBiase?

GREG DIBIASE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Prudence Malinki?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Desiree Miloshevic?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Mark Datysgeld?

MARK DATYSGELD: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Present, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Wisdom Donkor?

WISDOM DONKOR: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Stephanie Perrin?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Peter Akinremi?

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Tomslin Samme-Nlar?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Manju Chen?

MANJU CHEN: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Bruna Martins dos Santos. I don't see where Bruna has joined. We'll go ahead and try to connect with her. Farzaneh Badiei. I don't see where Farzaneh has joined either. Paul McGrady?

PAUL MCGRADY: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Anne Aikman Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Jeffrey Neuman?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Everton Rodrigues. I don't see where Everton is on. However, Antonia Chu, I think your connection is now there. Do you want to confirm?

ANTONIA CHU: Yes. I'm here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Wonderful. You are welcome. Guests joining us today will be Lars Hoffmann and Sarmad Hussain, both from ICANN Org. Joining us from staff, we have Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Berry Cobb, Devan Reed, and myself, Terri Agnew. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being

EN

recorded? A reminder that we're in the Zoom webinar room. Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once you've set your chat to everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning you do not have access to microphones nor the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to the GNSO chair, Greg DiBiase, please begin.

GREG DIBIASE: Hi, thank you so much. Welcome everyone to our April council meeting. We have a pretty packed agenda today. I will start with asking if there are any updates to statements of interest. Seeing no one, I'll ask if anyone would like to amend the agenda that Terri has helpfully put into the chat. I'm going to make one note on the agenda is that we had a string similarity slash Latin diacritics scheduled for 20 minutes given the chat so far on email. I want to make sure we have enough time for that. So if we do go over that, we may defer review of items on the action decision radar as it is not time sensitive yet still important. Okay, and then I'll also note that the minutes of the previous council meeting have been posted on March 2nd and are available. Okay, so let's go right in to the consent agenda. And I think I have Tomslin helping me out with this item.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Greg, and I will be helping out to this. We have three items on the consent agenda. First being the review of the GAC

communique. The second is the council small team guidance document. And finally the confirmation of the SPIRT charter drafting team and leadership.

Before we go to the vote, just like to check with members if anyone would like to remove any of these items from the consent agenda. All right, see no hands. Terri, if you could help with the vote then.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And before we begin, I just want to note really quick, I want to take a quick look. We are still missing Farzaneh and Bruna, and notices have been sent out to both of them to join. So with that, we'll go ahead and proceed with the vote. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion to please say aye?

GREG DIBIASE: Terri, I see Jeff's hand. Maybe you had a comment before we vote.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, maybe I'm misremembering or maybe I just misread, but were we supposed to add the description of the liaison to that consent agenda or was that just something staff could act on? I'm sorry, I can't remember. I don't know why I thought it was going to be on the consent agenda.

EN

GREG DIBIASE: I cannot remember either. Are we doing it in May? Oh. May. [inaudible] we have it for the May meeting, sorry.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay, sorry then, go on, sorry.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay, back to the consent agenda vote. Again, I'm just taking a quick, just in case they snuck in on me, a quick view really quick. I do not see Bruna or Farzaneh on so they will be missing this vote. So 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: With no abstention, no objections, the motion passes. Back to you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Terri. I think that passes then, I'll hand it over back to Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Tomslin. Damon, I see your hand in the queue.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, just a quick point of order. I see it in the chat, but I think, Terri, you were calling out, asking about Farzani and her attendance. I don't know if her attendance would be required. I think Bruna is absent, but even, I forget who, someone else noted in the chat that there hasn't been an actual proxy placed for Farzani, so I just wanted to clear that up. I don't think it's relevant that she's not here.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. And that is [inaudible] Bruna is missing for the vote. That was it. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Damon. Okay, moving on to item four, which was going to be a vote, but we're going to change it to a council discussion on the deferral of a policy status report request for the expiration policies, the ERRP and the EDDP, which are the policy surrounding what happens when domain names expire.

In previous sessions, we had looked at a report from Contractual Compliance about what they're seeing in the effectiveness of the policy. There seemed to be general consensus that while we think it's important to review this policy, there may be other more pressing agenda items and policy work for us to focus on. So we had sent a motion to defer the policy status report. We received two comments in the interim, I believe. Tomslin noted the NCSG would be more comfortable with two years and we noted that. And then I think Susan and Damon of the IPC raised that some of their

membership raised some concerns and they'd like to defer this vote until next week and possibly look at this item a little closer because some of their members identified some issues that may be worth talking about now. So if Damon or Susan want to quickly elaborate on the reason for the deferral, the floor is yours.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure, Greg, thank you very much and also thank you so much for granting the deferral, we really appreciate it. I believe you had mentioned deferring it until next week. I thought it was next month.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry. Next month, excuse me.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm too busy for next week. But no, basically, I mean, the IPC, we have several concerns about this and they stem from the fact that lots of times when domain names expire, they remain with the registrar and then what happens is they go into an auction process and that can cause lots of issues. We wanted to drill down into that a little bit more. I mean, some of the things that our members were concerned about was just we really didn't have any real data about number of domain names that are recaptured or re-registered or anything like that. Also had some concerns this might be anti-competitive as well because, you know, if one register holds it, it never really goes on to another registrar. Other concerns involved, you know, bad faith registration. There are courts, including those in the Ninth Circuit, where a lot of registrars are based and there's a lot of case law in this area that say that

first registration kind of counts for everything. So those re-registrations, even if they arguably might violate someone's rights, you know, wouldn't necessarily be subject to cyber-squatting. So those are kind of the main concerns. And again, we just wanted more time kind of to explore that and flesh it out. We really appreciate you very graciously deferring this vote until next month.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. I guess my follow-up question, Damon, would be, so the IPC is still considering whether it makes sense to defer. And if you think it does not, then you would ask for discussion on, you know, issuing a PSR or possibly a study on one of the issues you identified. AM I understanding that correctly?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Correct. We're not exactly sure as far as what our next move will be. We discussed this on a membership call on Monday and the general thought that just sort of a five--year deferral didn't make sense. And we wanted more time to look at it. And then I think we'll come back next month with some more concrete plans in place or more concrete proposal.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. I see Tomslin's hand and then Peter's. Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think I'll defer to Peter since [inaudible].

EN

GREG DIBIASE: Peter.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yeah, thank you so much, Tomslin. So on our members call, we discussed about the deferral policy status report. And I sent an email on the list for looking at it to be deferred to two years, because we also have some concerns with regards to ICANN Compliance report, because this is directly with registrants and we don't know what's the volume of this case, you know, how these things happens and we need to [inaudible]. So what causes it? And, you know, we know that the council is actually tasked with a lot of work and there are no big concerns that really call for policy work, but we'll still want the situations whereby we can look at these and try to figure out what is actually the cause so that we can determine whether policy work is needed because there are concerns with the registrant themselves and the feelings and experience that registrants are actually having with regards these two policies that we're talking about. So NCSG would like to look at these and also reduce the deferral period for this policy. So we're proposing two years. At the same time, before the two years that we need to look at it, we need to really drill down into these and understand what are the issues which we get this policy and the confusions around this matter. So back to Tomslin if Tomslin wants to add anything.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, thanks. You spoke all the points that I was going to make. Thanks.

EN

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Well, appreciate that feedback. If possible over the interim between next meeting, your groups could work on kind of synthesizing what direction you're proposing if it's something other than a vote. We'll consider it and go from there. Any other comments or concerns or questions on the expiration policy?

Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to our simplest discussion item, diacritics and Latin script and singular and plurals. So in terms of backgrounds, we had a motion submitted by Paul to adopt the supplemental recommendations that had been developed by the SubPro small team. Before that vote, we are having this discussion for two reasons.

First, one of the topics, topic 24 on strength similarity, we've, I guess, received notice or indication from the board that they are still not comfortable with that recommendation and perhaps in plain language could reject that topic 24 supplemental recommendation. In an effort to possibly avoid that scenario, staff has put together a proposal on a possible idea on how to amend this that would capture the original intent of the SubPro recommendations while possibly mollifying some of the board concerns. So we'll hear from staff on a summary of that.

And then the second reason we're having this discussion now is staff had also been exploring a way to address the open issue surrounding Latin diacritics and they wanted to present a possible solution that could involve amending this topic 24 recommendation to address that issue without having to do the more heavyweight policy recommendation from the beginning. So

hopefully I got both of those two right. I'm sure staff presenters will correct me. After we hear, I think, both summaries, then I think we can discuss what we'd like to do. Should we send the supplemental recommendations, accept the motion as is, which send all supplemental recommendations to the board, or should we amend the motion to send all of them except the recommendations on topic 24 so we can give these proposals, one or either of these, one or either or both more consideration. So hopefully I have that right. Who is going first? Latin diacritics or string similarity? Steve, over to you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. I was going to start with the Latin diacritics one first. So on the Latin diacritics issue, I just thought it might be helpful to do a tiny bit of background and to talk about how we got here. So way back during the council's wrap up at ICANN 78, the council debated the best approach to try to find a potential, to try to address a potential issue where the registry operator for an existing ASCII gTLD also wants to serve as the RO for the diacritic version of gTLD.

the issues that those parties might run into is that the Latin script rules incorporated into the RZLGR, those two strings might not be found to be variants of each other. So you wouldn't be able to take advantage of the variant rules. And then if they are not variants, you might be able to apply, or actually you would be able to apply for the diacritic version, the Latin diacritic version, but they might be found to be visually similar, in which case you would not be able to proceed if it's in respect of an existing gTLD.

So that's essentially how we got to here, which is that the staff team, the Org team, we saw that the council was trying to look for a potential avenue to be able to address this issue. That's where we are. Org is considered potential mechanisms to create a solution to address this issue. And we have a few options, but that said, we've been paying attention to the chatter on the council list. So I want to make clear that a key assumption for us in examining these procedural options was essentially that the council is looking for an efficient and pragmatic solution to address this issue. So at least from some discussion, at least from the staff side, we're not clear that that's exactly the right focus necessarily, but nevertheless, that's the way that we looked at this analysis, is trying to find an effective and pragmatic way to try to find a solution if that's something that the council wants to do. So if we want to go into those details a little bit later about how we got to this point, I've invited Sarmad, he's obviously quite the expert on Latin generation rules or label generation rules, but I would just like to get through the recommendations that we have based on the circumstances that we looked at the issue from.

So in that context that these strings are not variants and that the council is looking for a pragmatic solution, we already shared what we thought were the best approach is to try to address the issue in that context. So exactly what we shared on the list, which is to try to amend the recommendations related to string similarity, because as I noted, these are not considered variants at this stage.

So under the bylaws, like I shared on the email list, there's two options. One is using the section 16 process, which essentially

says the approved GNSO council policies may be modified or amended by the GNSO Council anytime prior to the final approval by the ICANN board. So this discussion should sound relatively familiar because I think we all went through this relatively similar discussion in the context of the non-adopted recommendations. But the basic procedure for a section 16 process is that the council proposes amendments to the recommendations. It consults with the reconvened SubPro PDP in this case. There would be a public comment period and then the council would consider and they would need to adopt those amended recommendations by a super majority. So in this case, the process requires quite a bit of procedural vigor.

The challenge in going this direction is in the event that the council were to approve the relevant supplemental recommendations, so those for topic 24, and they were to be adopted by the board, then this option would no longer be available. That means that the final approval by the board would have taken a place.

The other option for amending recommendations in this case would be using the supplemental recommendation process, which the council has already used for a number of other recommendations. In the process, you all have already seen it, it doesn't require as much of the procedural rigor as section 16 does, but it does not preclude it. So if the council want to go down that path, they could add in additional procedural steps to for due diligence or for whatever reason they might want to do.

The potential challenge here is that, I think Greg already spoke to that, is just that the council would have to pull back those specific supplemental recommendations for consideration during this

EN

meeting in order to allow additional work on the supplemental recommendations.

So just addressing, I guess, some of the other comments on the list, we did not consider the possible solution or the output from either the section 16 or supplemental recommendation process. We didn't think that was in scope. We were just looking at a mechanism to try to address the issue if the council wants to in a pragmatic and an efficient way.

But that said, we on the Org side, and I'm sure many of the councilors also, are aware of basically an analogous situation that is managed under the ccTLD fast track process, which was also affirmed by the ccPDP 4 process or policy development process.

So that process in the ccTLD world, in summary, it allows an ID and ccTLD that is requested and is confusingly similar to a two-character ASCII ccTLD. They can both be delegated provided they are managed by the same entity, and the operator must explain the measures they will take to avoid user confusion. So, for example, that could mean enforcing same entity requirements for registrants under the two TLDs, the ASCII and the Latin diacritic version.

So in the gTLD context, that could mean that the council could maybe place additional limitations and say that the ASCII and Latin diacritic strings, they need to essentially be equivalent other than for the presence of diacritic marks. So I say that with a very, very probably obvious caveat that we're on the org side, not trying to determine the outcome of the process. Just, again, reacting to the comments on the council list about concerns about how

complex the recommendations might look and how long and difficult and duration the process might be to try to address this issue.

We did look at other mechanisms, and I'll stop in a moment and say that the PDP and the EPDP would clearly be options. But from our understanding of the task at hand, the council is looking for something that was more lightweight than spinning up a full PDP or EPDP, hence the recommendation that we had for something a little more lightweight.

And then the other mechanism that crossed our mind was the GNSO guidance process. But I think in this case, it's a little bit open to interpretation whether or not it's appropriate to use the GNSO guidance process. So the expectation is that there wouldn't necessarily be consensus policies developed through this mechanism or contractual changes, but we're still not quite clear that this is the right mechanism to address this issue. So with that, I'll stop there. And I see a hand from Tomslin. But Greg, I'm sure you're going to manage the queue.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, let's start with Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Greg. And thanks for that clarification, Steve. Because when we had the NCSG membership meeting early this week, a couple of concerns which you've addressed came up. And one was that complexity because members did mention about what if in some languages, the diacritic might mean something else

EN

completely different. So it might not be that simple to just have the small team look into it and make a simple recommendation. So they wanted to understand a bit more how the LGR panel came about this so that they determine whether it's a simple matter or it's more complex than it looks.

And also there was general support that it should take a, because of a possibly complexity of the issue, it should take a process like section 16, which engages the community much better than a small team plus. Those were the concerns that NTSG members had, thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. And just to confirm regarding the question on how the LGR rules came to be, is that something Sarmad who's on the call can help with, or should we go through the questions first? Sarmad, I see your hand.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sure. So I'll just give you a very quick, I guess run through on how the LGR, Root Zone LGR procedure works. So the design document for Root Zone LGR, which is called the Root Zone LGR procedure, asks the community or the generation panel, which represents that script community to identify variant labels. The variant labels, the procedure suggests are by definition what code points or code point sequences are considered, quote unquote, same, by that script community. And the definition of same is left to the script community. So different script communities can come up with their own definitions. So for example, in Chinese script,

EN

you can have simplified Chinese and traditional Chinese characters, which are visually quite distinct, but they're still considered, quote unquote, same by the Chinese community because they carry the same meaning.

Similarly, the problem was also opposed to the Latin generation panel. And they also had to define what would, quote unquote, same mean for Latin script. There are obviously non-visual code points which are same. So for example, F letter and F with a hook, which is, you know, if you write F in italics, it actually is written with a hook. So those are obviously same, even though they're visually distinct. But the Latin LGR or the panel determined that E and E with an accent are not, quote unquote, same.

The LGR procedure also says that when we're looking at visual similarity, the variants should be defined as those things, those pair of code points, for example, which are obvious cases of visually sameness, visual sameness. Things which are not obvious, maybe things which may actually be picked up by string similarity process rather than variants.

So based on those design principles, the Latin generation panel, script generation panel, decided that E and E with an accent are not, do not fit into the definition of, quote unquote, same as an obvious case. And one reason, for example, is that you can actually write E in a French word and you can also have another French word, same spellings, but E with an accent and French readers actually could easily differentiate between those two words as, put those two strings as two different words. So there were reasons why Latin generation panel considered E and E with an accent not qualifying as a variant. They obviously, based on

the next step, which is string similarity review, the string similarity review panel may find them confusingly similar, but they're certainly not defined as the same or variant labels by the generation panel. And let me stop here and I hope I was able to explain this and happy to answer any questions.

GREG DIBIASE: Really helpful, thank you. Mark, you're next in the queue.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. So I'll touch on two different subjects. So, first is that Latin script is used in so many languages that that's the thing. There is no one way to look at this. The panel reached this conclusion and broadly speaking, yes, they're not variants. They cannot be stated to be variants. But the problem is this process was developed to look into other types of languages, not one that other types of scripts, not one that is applied for pretty much, you know, most languages have transliterations in Latin.

Then it's this snowball that you cannot say that they're variants for sure. But at the same time, in some languages, that is the case. So, in some languages, the script is a variant and in others, it's not. It's very circumstantial. And the LGR is not really meant to accommodate that. That's not the way it was developed. It's for languages that there are way more clean cut than that. When you're dealing with languages that use the Latin script, it's much less clean cut.

So, that's why we are here. There is no one answer to this. And there will never be because it's just too widely used under too

many circumstances. So, to look for, let's say, a definitive answer is impossible. It will always favor one community and take away from the other. That's the problem here. The solution they arrived at favors some communities and takes away from others. And as long as the rules are set in stone, that will be the case. There is no way of being fair to all communities if you are working under very set rules because each language makes use of this alphabet, the code points of the script, in very different ways. That's where the problem stems from.

So, the real solution would be to have some flexibility for applications. That's pretty much it. Not put them in a box immediately and make good sense calls based on the application. So, as long as they're not automatic fails, that would be fair enough. And my second point being, of the cases that we know. Next round there might be different cases. But of the cases that we know, this would be same entity applications. The people who have manifested interest in this, it's pretty much the GeoTLD community. And it's the same entity situation.

So, by default right now, I'm not saying that this might change, but by default right now, we are operating pretty much under the same situation that the ccTLDs are, which is the same entities wants to have control over strings that to the region, to the relevant linguistic community are variants in that case. Because you can't, again, have this broad thing because it will never work. Like it will never work for Latin in specific. So, we're talking about same entity here.

And that does make things a bit easier. We're not considering the universe. We're considering this one type of case. So, how do we

streamline our discussion to be around this one reality? That's the reality we're in, instead of trying to boil the ocean. Just some thoughts and not trying to take the discussion one way or another. I just want to clarify this better so that we can have a constructive discussion. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Mark. And just real quickly, before going to Susan, Paul said something in the chat. I'd like if staff can, maybe it's too simple a question, but if staff is able to chime in efficiently, I'd like that. Is the idea that we would give a pass to an applicant applying for a diacritic version so long as they were already the registrar operator for the already delegated string? That was kind of my understanding, but Steve or someone from staff, can you confirm that?

STEVE CHAN: This is Steve. I can go first and someone might want to weigh in. I'd answer that we're not necessarily prescribing a specific solution on how to manage this. What we looked at was a mechanism. And our mechanism, if you try to keep it a simple solution, then perhaps you can actually leverage the section 16 or supplemental recommendation process. So, we're not specifically saying you should or must do it in this specific fashion that's described. We were looking at from a procedural standpoint of what might be possible. So, I hope that helps. Thanks.

EN

GREG DIBIASE:	Right. But there was a substantive part too. So, a substantive suggestion of what a modification could look like?

STEVE CHAN:	Sure. Thanks, Greg. So, I shared that input mostly because of the input that was shared on the council just to try to get a sense of what it could look like. Clearly not trying to describe what the council must do or even should do, but just trying to give a sense of what it could like, which was based on the way that it's actually implemented for ccTLDs, which found itself in an analogous situation.

GREG DIBIASE:	Right. So, Paul's example is one possibility of a new supplemental recommendation. Okay. Susan, thank you for waiting.

SUSAN PAYNE:	No, no problem at all. Thanks very much. And my comments are purely on the procedural aspect, not about the merits of addressing this issue at all. But I'm really struggling to understand procedurally how we can make new policy relating to diacritics by, apologies for the terminology, by shoehorning it in to the existing supplemental recommendation relating to a totally different issue, which is singulars and plurals. Because if we look at that supplemental recommendation process, which is in annex A of the bylaws, it comes about because of a situation where the board determines that some particular policy recommendation isn't in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN. And then they set out this process of consultation and discussion. And at the end

of that consultation and discussion between the board and the council, the council meets to either affirm or modify its recommendation and send it back to the board. And that's what the supplemental recommendation is. But it's not a vehicle to create new policy.

And so, you know, the supplemental recommendation or recommendations that we've been talking about in relation to singulars and plurals, they come out of original PDP recommendations about singulars and plurals. There's a whole separate recommendation or a couple of recommendations about string similarity and the fact that it's a visual test and so on and so forth. And those have already been sent to the board and the board has adopted them. So, I just don't see how either this process or the section 16 one, which is in the operating procedures PDP manual, but is again about policies being modified or amended at any time prior to final approval by the ICANN board.

And again, the string similarity recommendations, the base standard on string similarity has been approved by the board. What we have is this just outlier solely about singulars and plurals that we're still working on. And procedurally, I just think this is a really dangerous thing to be doing, to be within council trying to just suddenly off the cuff, create new policy on something completely different to the issue that the board has not adopted. And I'm sorry to say that because I can understand why it might seem pragmatically a great way forward, but I just don't see that we can do it this way.

EN

GREG DIBIASE: Those are great points, Susan. Thank you. Manju, you're next.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Greg. First of all, I'd like to plus one to Susan, but my question is actually quite simple. We asked for a study. I don't remember if we asked. I think we agreed to ask, but did we really ask for that study from staff about this issue? And if we didn't, then okay, sorry, we should have. But if we did, I thought we will have the study at hand for us to help us to consider this issue while we're talking about this, but we don't have it now. We don't have any documents whatsoever, or even slides. Is that going to happen or is it not going to happen, the study? Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: So I think, and staff, please correct me, we were drafting a request, or Mark specifically was drafting a study proposal with staff. Staff said, "We think we might have an idea that could resolve this expeditiously because everyone is anxious to address this issue." And then we have not done an official study yet. But based on this conversation, that can be our next step is like, all right, no. Seriously, no, we need to start the study. Steve, is that right from your perspective?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. So this is Steve. The way that we had interpreted it from, I think the conversation had evolved a bit. So that's sort of where we end up with trying to look at it from the procedural perspective of how this issue could be addressed, like I mentioned, in an efficient and pragmatic way. So when we're

framing it that way, we realized maybe official request from the council to the Org was maybe a bit of an overkill.

That said, all the things that I just talked about today, we can write it up and send to the council if that's what they wish. We're happy to do so. Yeah, I'll just stop there. I was going to maybe address the comments from Susan, but I'll leave that aside for now. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Manju, I see your hand. Is that in response if asked whether we answer your question or not?

MANJU CHEN: Yes, yes, please. I thought Sarmad's explanation of the LGR thing was really helpful, but it was hard to digest by just people talking about it. It's just so much easier when we can see in text. And I feel like some of us probably will really need them in text to explain the whole rationale of everything. And then it just makes it so much easier to understand the issue and to discuss this at the same ground of the whole knowledge that we all share about this issue. So I really prefer to have some kind of documents, some kind of text to explain the whole thing because now we're just, I don't know, everybody's talking, but it's hard to digest all the issues without a formal document explaining the issue throughout. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Manju. And I'm seeing a lot of support for that opinion in the chat. That seems at least to me like the obvious next step of to do the study as soon as humanly possible. Kurt, you're next in the queue.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks. I have three points that have maybe been touched on already. The first one, Sarmad's brief explanation reminded me of how much I didn't know about diacritics and variants and IDNs and seemed to amplify for me the need for some written explanation of why the Latin LGR decided that there were no variants among the diacritics, which effectively, I think, excluded them from simultaneous delegation. So I'm just demonstrating my ignorance here, but I'd want to understand why the Latin LGR made the decisions they did. And Sarmad did touch on them. And like Manju said, I had some trouble digesting them.

So it just reflects the complexity of the issue, which leads to my second point, that is the IDN PDP debated, you know, same entity, how that should be implemented for quite some time. And it is a complex issue. And again, I'll demonstrate my ignorance. But for example, you know, if there's two different TLDs, can there be, you know, two different registrants, one in each TLD, or does the same registrant, you know, or does one name has to have to be registered at the second level in both TLDs? How does that work? I don't know if there can be mixing of diacritics or how the heck that can work.

So I think the Latin LGR made its decisions for what they thought were stability and security reasons. And I think it's a complex

policy issue to not upset those conclusions while allowing the delegation of, you know, competing diacritics. So I don't think it's a quick discussion.

And then thirdly, another way of going about Susan's point is that we many, many years ago, we wrote a charter about what the new gTLD SubPro group would discuss. And then the group discussed and raised new issues for five years. And those issues were examined. And now we're in a multi-year implementation process and finalizing the policy. So it seems that complex issues can't be inserted into that process, that a new process should really be started, which is, I think Susan really said it better than I did. But that's not to say [that there's a way of the policy development taking them into account needs,] but I don't think we can stop policy, ongoing policy developments, individual requests. We might get a great request from somebody about a new TLD that would really benefit the whole world, so would we stop the whole round. I don't think we should. So for me, I think we should finish our work here and then investigate this issue with some alacrity, starting with that study. Thanks a lot.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Kurt. And I'm just noting a theme that it seems that revising using the supplemental recommendations does not seem like the right path. A study is definitely needed. So I would propose taking what Mark has already delivered to leadership and making sure we have a formal study we can vote on by next meeting. Steve.

EN

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. This is Steve. I just actually just want to quickly mention that staff had put together, I think it was a framing doc, and I'll have to go back and look at exactly what it looks like on the diacritics issue. And then there was also a presentation from Seb, I want to say about five months ago, that was also I think, helping to explain the issue quite a bit more clearly than we've done verbally on this call. So maybe we'll take an action item to share those two studies that we've already done, and maybe some more is needed. But I think it'll help set a firm basis for what further work is needed. So we'll make sure to circulate that. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you. Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thanks, everyone. Again, I'm not going to try to steer the discussion itself. But let me give more background info, because this is likely frustrating. Sebastien had made the presentation before leaving, we had Ariel come up with a pre study, then Sebastien delegated to me that I present something more substantial on the Quebec case in particular. I delivered that in January to leadership. Somehow it was deemed not interesting to be distributed to the council. It wasn't. And now here we are with the idea that we need a study. It just seems like a lot of wasted time for no reason, because we had those things ready by the start of the year between the things that Sebastien, Ariel and I did. So when we are complaining that this is dragging things down, well, why? Right? Like it's of our own making, isn't it? So we have enough resources as it is, we have three different lines of study

and presentations on this. The one thing that we don't have is intervention from the Latin rule generation panel. Nobody has talked to them, they haven't talked to us, we need to talk to them. And there's no clear path for that right now. Because it's an ad hoc panel. [They're often] around ICANN still, you can see, but that's the one piece that's missing. Everything else has been done and it's somewhere, it's just not properly organized or socialized.

So how do we move forward with the things that we do have, without getting back again to let's do another study and take another three months and do another thing? How do we get together the things we do have, so that we can head towards an actual consensus or lack of consensus or deferral, this is not an issue for council, whatever it is, but that we don't keep just coming back to this initial point. This is kind of pointless. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. Thanks, Mark. And to just address your question on what you shared, I think that was specific to Quebec, when I think study would need to be broader. So that is the consideration we made before hearing that ICANN staff had a proposal for moving forward. I guess my related question is, I mean, we're talking about studies, if we all agree this is an issue, should we just vote to request an issues report using these various studies that have been created by everybody already? Kurt, is that an old hand or a new hand?

KURT PRITZ: It's an old hand, but I was trying to type a point. So I'll just make the point. Yeah, I think we were looking for a study because we were trying to think of ways to arrive at a solution more quickly the shortcut processes in some way. And those are the proposals I think that Steve made. But if we request an issues report, we don't need a study for that. We can say this issue of diacritics came up, what are the issues associated with that? And then we can decide whether we wanted to launch a targeted PDP, which from what I'm hearing from everybody else, that seems that's the best way to go. And well, I don't want to get to the solutioning space, so I won't. But I don't think that would doom .Quebec to waiting for the next round necessarily. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Kurt. Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Greg. I know I put this in chat and several others, including Justine has said it as well in chat, but I do want to put this on record. Several councilors have talked about how Sarmad's explanation made things a little clearer, but wanted more information. I just want to make it really crystal clear that the council is not looking to undo the work of the Latin GP or the Latin LGR. I think that would be a very incorrect way and out of our scope to do that. However, that being said, I think having the materials in a visual form could assist councilors to understand the background information a little more, to supplement Sarmad's explanation.

I'm not really going to comment or try to summarize what I think about the procedural issues. I do definitely agree with councilors who have mentioned that this really does look like this is going to be new policy. I really agree also with the call for an issues report. In general, I just want to put on record that we're not looking to undo the Latin LGR's work. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. I'm going to stop the queue at Desiree because we have other stuff to discuss. I think we're coalescing on a supplementary recommendation is not the path and we should just move forward with an issues report. But I'll go to Peter.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Thanks so much. My question is to Sarmad and Steve. Since the critique issue started, has there been any pilot study conducted technically to see how this evolve before we started talking about policy conversation? Just wanted to know.

GREG DIBIASE: Sarmad.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So I'm not sure what you mean by the technical study, but we've obviously taken Latin LGR. It went through extensive testing. Each script LGR actually goes through very extensive testing and test labels are also published along with the detailed document on the reasons some decisions were made in addition to the actual XML

normative definition. And those are all available. I'll put the link in the chat where you can actually find all these detailed documents and testing, which is done.

I also want to add that LGR process or the design process actually has very detailed specification on how to update root zone LGR as well. So it's not something which is closed. If community decides that some definitions need to be updated, LGR actually can be re-invoked and they can go through the process. They may not come to the conclusion, which is perhaps being desired, but it's a very open process and community can actually re-engage and review those decisions to the extent that the root zone LGR remains stable. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thanks, Greg. And just very briefly, I feel that the people that do know that this issue really lies with the LGR, it's good to hear that this process can be updated, but if the councilors do not want to reopen the LGR, we also agree we don't see it fit in the supplemental recommendation. There has to be a third process. And I think this has been a valuable discussion, especially what Steve has presented in terms of mechanisms, but maybe even those three mechanisms he presented are not the answer.

So it would be good to really weigh in some of these mechanisms, re-invoking LGR and what's less painful or finding a new way where to address this. And finally, my recommendation is that we

have this topic also as a discussion point with the ccTLDs as they did have a successful IDN and variants ccTLD fast track response. So that's just an idea. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Lawrence, I'll give you the last word, but please try to make it brief because we need to move on to the next topic.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. [inaudible] I do support the idea of an issues report. But one [inaudible] thing that there are also concerns in some quarters that—with regards to how this can to a large extent increase the nature of DNS abuse that we currently have to deal with or see. I would like to have us consider this topic when an issues report is put together, [inaudible] that we already have a lot of [inaudible] to deal with. And if this in any way will increase the index [inaudible] what we currently have [inaudible] the outcomes from the issues report. [inaudible] Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Lawrence. And I think that can be an element of an issues report of what work is involved. And then I'll also quickly note before moving on the sentiment in the chat that we should be clear that this will not delay the next round if an issue report goes further.

Okay. Moving on to the related topic of topic 24 and the proposal to modify the current supplement recommendation on string similarity in a way that may give a path to the board to accept this

recommendation. And I think we have Lars for an explanation on the thinking here.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thanks, Greg. Hi, everyone. Yeah, I think Steve circulated a message on the list as well. Greg, as you said at the outset, I think there have been some discussions with the caucus, especially on the supplemental language that's been agreed on by the small team plus. So the caucus has asked staff to try to think through ways how potentially some of the concerns the board still has around the current language of [inaudible] implementation could be addressed.

So we came up with a possible way to achieve essentially what the recommendations I think is trying to achieve itself whilst addressing the concerns of the board, as I said. And I think how this would work. And you see that maybe in the document is to think about this as singular and plural, having it removed completely from the string similarity assessment. So string similarity would remain a pure visual assessment and determination.

I think there are concerns from the community, and I think this was shared by others as well, about the consistency of some of the results from last time. And we certainly are looking into that already from a staff perspective, and we'll be working with that with the IRT. But the singular and plural issue we think could be dealt with separately without the need of a very big review of all the strings, whether or not they are singular and plurals.

The example I think that circulated, we discussed in the caucus as well as that if all the strings were in the same language, if there's only one language in the world, then it would be very straightforward. But there's no language attached to a string. And from an end user perspective, even if a registry declares that the string is in a certain language, for an end user, that's certainly not clear when they actually go to the website. So we would have to make a review that would require to assess essentially every string against every other string and check whether these two strings are words that are singular and plurals of the same word in any language. And as I think was pointed out earlier in the chat, maybe Justine, there are several hundred Latin scripts alone. So I think one concern is the time and also the resource that would be required to do that work.

So a possible solution that we thought about, and this is very at a very high level, essentially would mean that there would be a possibility for an applicant or a third party to raise their hand or otherwise get in touch, because we don't want to make this a formal objection process, which comes to the whole string of costs and other issues. But essentially, inform ICANN, look, there's two strings out there, they're singular and plurals of one another in this particular language. So then ICANN would only have to look at a dictionary. We think those actually could be predetermined before the round, at least of some of the most common use languages around. And if indeed, those two strings are singular and plural, they would go into contention. If they're not, they do not. And obviously, both strings, regardless of that, it would still go through the string similarity check anyway.

And it would put obviously an onus on the community. We believe, however, that it would be relatively long window from reveal day probably until the string contention sets are finalized, which will certainly be several weeks or months. So that would give anybody opportunity to compare any string that are in the same script against one another. And if they believe that they are singular and plural, they could raise the issue with ICANN. It would, however, obviously allow for singular and plural strings of the same word in the same language to be delegated if nobody raises an objection. And I use objection in a very small O, raises the hand, pings ICANN.

So we think it would be a very quick, cost efficient way. And yes, it would, as I said, put some of the onus on the community, but it would probably address the board concern. And in the end, maybe get the council whether would like to with regard to the policy, or certainly a small team. I'm going to end here. Any questions, please feel free to ask. And I'll do my best to answer. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Lars. Yeah, and I guess before we move on to questions, noting that the diacritics did take a little longer, I think the issue that we're thinking about is whether we want to hold back the recommendation to further evaluate this proposal, not decide, yay or nay, whether this this proposal makes sense to us. So I'll stop there. See if there's questions for Lars. And if not, I'd appreciate input. Oh, Lars, is that your hand?

LARS HOFFMANN: I just want to add that obviously, there will be, I suspect timing concerns, maybe. We think that if a solution would be found that would be akin to what we just talked about, it would essentially be, I think, a very quick turnaround to turn that into AGB language. So I think if there's a supplemental recommendation that's developed in that respect, that goes to the board over the Northern Hemisphere summer, and is then considered by the board in September, that will probably work out well and wouldn't have any impact on the timeline. I just wanted to add that. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Important point. So yeah, any questions for Lars, or perhaps even more importantly, thoughts on whether we can hold back the topic 24 supplemental recommendations while we look at this proposal a little closer? Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: And thanks so much, Greg, and many thanks, Lars. Lars very kindly reviewed this with the SubPro co-chairs and with Susan and me as IRT co-liaisons. We asked a lot of questions. I honestly think that given that we know that the board caucus would not recommend the existing supplemental recommendation, we should take this back and seriously consider it. And I appreciate the time that's been spent by staff and also by the board caucus reps in trying to develop something that they will be able to recommend. You know, just for the record, I have previously said, well, listen, this is important to the community, we need to send it on to the board. But I think if we send it on the board, and it gets rejected, it just causes delay. And we don't want any more delay.

So I think if we can address this proposal from staff quickly, we should keep it out. And of course, I'm non-voting. But I think it's better to go ahead and try to explore it further. And just a couple of meetings, perhaps via amending the assignment to the small team plus, because that would also include wider members of the community and the small team plus, and there would be more understanding in relation to all of this, if we do it that way. So I think the council should proceed with your amended motion. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks. So yeah, on the primary question, I'm kind of bothered by the small team making supplemental recommendations and the staff and board going, we see where you're going. And we don't like this. What about this? I think for me, it'd be okay to not vote on this now and take into consideration what's been proposed. But I worry about taking expedient steps like this. So I'm kind of 50/50. But I think I'd be for pulling back the motion and considering this, but I want us to be on our guard about where things like this could go.

On Lars's proposal, which I thank the staff for, I have two points. One is the reason that singular plural wasn't checked in the last round was for this very same concern that with all the different languages, it gets really complicated really fast to say, if you put

EN

an S on it is Anglo centric. And there's so many other things that can happen.

But what happened in reality was none of that. But instead, many sets of singular and plurals that were delegated that could result in user confusion, which goes to the second point—so it just didn't happen in the first round at all. So I don't see it being complex in the second round, too.

And to me, then having an objection process opens the door to delegating singular and plurals, as the proposal clearly states. And what's our guiding principle here? Our guiding principle is from 2011 or whatever, user confusion should be avoided. [Delegating strings that cause user confusion should be delegated.] And what we're saying in this process is strings resulting in user confusion can be delegated, if nobody objects.

And I understand the possibility of complexity, but I don't think it's complex. And I think the work can be done to take the if somebody objects thing out, and I think it'd be okay. And as the proposal points out, it's a really objective test, looking at dictionary. But I think our prime objective here is to avoid user confusion. We're trying to promote stability and security with DNS, and having a process that might allow that sort of flies in the face of that. Thanks a lot. Thanks, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Kurt. Paul.

EN

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Lars, thanks for presenting. I've not been involved in any of the discussions on this. So I heard about where this was going, I think, on Tuesday or Wednesday, when it went to the list. And just before I got a briefing from one of the liaisons, which I thought was nice.

Because I've not been involved, I've not had a chance to talk to Becky and Alan about whether or not this proposal is—that they've run this past the board caucus. Lars, do you know that this has been pre blessed by the board caucus, and if we do this, everything's just fine?

LARS HOFFMANN: Well, obviously, I can't foreshadow that. But what I can tell you is that yes, the board caucus asked us to look at it, we presented to the board caucus, and they had no concerns that came up during the discussion and asked us, in fact, then to share it with the IRT co-chairs and the PDP co-chairs to see if it could be sent to the council. So that's what I can tell you. I hope that's helpful.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, that is. And then you've already addressed the issue of timing. I mean, we were all told that we had to work at a breakneck pace to get the small team plus work done, which we did. And now there's another new step in it. Again, if you're if you're telling us that taking two or three months to reconvene the small team plus and go through all the process that we did and it won't be a problem, then great.

I do question, though, whether or not we do need to convene the small team plus. The reason why the work went to the small team in the first place and then it eventually evolved into a small team plus was there was a lot of work and it was not the kind of thing with the giant scorecard and all the stuff the board rejected that the council could do sort of by itself. In this particular instance, we're talking about one supplemental recommendation change.

And so I do wonder whether or not it's something that council—council doesn't have an obligation to use a small team and it doesn't have an obligation to use a small team plus. There may be good reasons to do that. But council's not bound by that structure. And if this is something that there's general consensus on the Council that it's a good idea. You know, we may or may not want to spin up the small team plus and have to figure out how to put the small team plus back together, get it get a new assignment, go out and have a bunch of meetings, then do another community consultation and all the other steps that we took before. So I think that's something that we don't need to decide today. But council does need to decide that.

And I don't disagree, Jeff, that there should be some kind of community input on this, but the GNSO council is an elected group. So there is community input. But again, we don't have to decide that today. I'm just thinking about what two, three, four months of going back and re spinning up the small team plus does to the timeline.

And then lastly, Jeff said an important thing in the chat, which is there's no reason in terms of sending through what we have now—It's not like when we send it through, the board

automatically adopts it, right. So there's no reason why we can't send through what we have now and then decide what if anything we want to do with this new proposal, and then just have whatever we come up with through whichever mechanism supersede what's already been sent through. If we decide to do that.

If we don't decide to do anything with this proposal, then all we've done is lost time on getting the board to reject the supplemental recommendation that we had planned to send through. So I apologize that I'm talking so much and so indefinitely about it. I'm not really expressing an opinion on whether or not what staff has come up with is good or solves the problem. I just have not had enough time on the last day or two to sort of fully digest it. But I do think we should as a council consider whether or not going back to a small team plus model is the most efficient way to get this done. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Paul. And we're really running behind on time. I think my proposal would be to amend the motion to hold this one back. But that does not mean that we won't vote on it next time as written. But let's take one meeting to consider these questions. Like what a small team would look like, the other questions that people have brought up. But if ultimately we decide, yeah, actually we want to send what we already sent, then we can do so in the next meeting. So I didn't get a clear sense if you would object to that. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, thanks, Greg. And thanks, Paul, for those comments with which I'm going to respectfully disagree. I think that it's not all that complicated. [I was not aware that one could decide that the small team plus would have been disbanded.] And I certainly appreciate all the work that you've done on that. But without Council's final action on the assignment for the small team plus, I don't see where it's disbanded and I don't see where assigning it to the small team plus would take three to four months of work.

Now, there are some questions that need to be resolved regarding how you publish the protest that's been lodged, other issues. Certainly no guarantee that the small team plus will recommend it exactly in that form to Council. It bears further discussion. Questions were raised when Lars first talked with us about it. But to delay this another month doesn't really make sense.

It makes more sense to go ahead and amend the small team plus. The list still exists. As a matter of fact, Greg instructed us not to discuss this on the list until after this meeting and the list still exists and the other community members are on that list. So I don't really see why you would be projecting this as something that would take three to four months to consider further. And I think Council should proceed with holding back the string similarity. Don't approve that. Send everything else to the board. And amend the small team plus assignment. If Paul does not want to chair that, I will ante up. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Well, I think we can table conversations about the method by which we look at this. But maybe I propose going on to the

vote, and I guess I will propose my amendment. I think Paul would consider it friendly or—friendly or not. Staff, can you help me with the next procedure here?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, yeah, no, it's certainly a friendly amendment. And Anne, I never said disbanded, and I never said I didn't want to chair it, I don't know where you're coming from today. But friendly amendment. And let's think through how we can get this done as quickly as possible so that we don't cause a delay. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Greg. I'm just seeking clarification on what it is that you're referring to when you say amendment. Maybe Steve wants to address because I've suggested something so I just wanted to make sure it's covered. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: The amendment to remove topic 24 from the supplemental recommendations that we're sending to the board. And then I believe you added to that amendment—and I'm so sorry but I can't recall what it was other than I didn't object to it. Steve.

EN

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. I was going to raise my hand in a second. So this is Steve. The version that Greg sent received a couple of comments, one was from Justine and one I think was from Anne. So I can talk through the changes and obviously, I guess Greg as the proposed amender can determine whether or not he wants to accept these, and then suggest them to Paul who then in turn has to consider whether or not he considers them friendly.

But the nature of the two changes are the addition—the first thing that's been added is whereas clause 15, it just talks about how we got to this point. So I was trying to read and predict in the future that the council is going to go with this direction. So that's essentially just saying that the council elected to take out [the supplemental recommendations] related to topic 24. And then there was a suggestion from Justine.

And then the second changes in the resolved clause. And that's from Anne, it was just a request to be specific about what is being considered for adoption in the cycle which just lists out the topics and amends topic 24. So I don't believe it's anything substantive, and it's just trying to address the comments that came in from two councilors. Or one liaison to be specific.

GREG DIBIASE: So I consider the amendments to my amendment friendly, and then I am asking Paul to consider the amended amendments friendly.

PAUL MCGRADY: All friendly.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Great. And then I think Paul is the presenter of the motion. You need to read the resolved clause before we take a vote.

PAUL MCGRADY: All right. Thanks, Greg. Paul McGrady for the record. The resolved clause is the GNSO council approves the supplemental recommendations for the non adopted SubPro recommendations regarding the following topics. Topic nine, registry voluntary commitments slash public interest commitments. Topic 17, applicant support. Topic 18, terms and conditions. Topic 32, limited challenge slash appeal mechanism. And instructs the GNSO secretariat to transmit the supplemental recommendations to the ICANN board. I think that's it.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. Can we proceed to a vote?

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And this is Terri. Just to make sure everything is crossed. Paul and Jen because Jen seconded it, you both agree to this friendly amendment, correct?

JENNIFER CHUNG: This is Jen. Correct.

PAUL MCGRADY: This is Paul. Correct.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. We'll go ahead and take the vote. This will be a roll call vote. Here we go, folks.

GREG DIBIASE: Justine, did you want to say something before?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, please. Just to make sure that we are crossing the T's and dotting the I's. And Steve can probably clarify this. I kind of remembered that we had six outstanding topics and I'm counting that there's only four that we're voting to push on to the board. So I just wanted to make sure that we have our bases covered.

GREG DIBIASE: Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks, Justine. And Paul might want to weigh in as well. So the other topic that is omitted is related to registrant protections. So that one was omitted because the small team plus was informed by staff that the current implementation for the continuing operation instrument would essentially go away and that the burden for being able to accommodate the EBERO would be a shared function of the program and not specific to each individual applicant. So there in the explainer document, there's

actually a footnote that talks about why that one is not included. So feel free to take a look at that. And the other quick thing while I have the mic is just to note that obviously we're looking at a Google Doc version of the motion and we'll be sure to actually amend the wiki version for completeness. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I don't know whether it's worth adding another whereas clause just to make that clear. But it's up to the proposals and the seconder of the motion. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Paul, do you have a preference or do you think this works as is?

PAUL MCGRADY: I think it works as is because all this resolved clause does is talk about the ones that we are sending forward. So for example, it doesn't mention topic 24, which we're not. Right. So but again, if others feel differently, I'm fine adding it if folks want to. But I don't think we need it. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. From a technical perspective, again, this is not a big issue. But in 14 on the whereas clauses, I don't think you should remove topic 24 because that was shared with the council on April 1 2024.

Even though it's fine the way that the resolved clause is, but I think just so we don't lose history, it shouldn't be crossed out there. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: That makes sense. Okay. So I will propose an amendment to effectuate what Jeff said. And then ask Paul. Maybe Paul can amend it himself.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes, I would like to amend 14 to put topic 24 back in, please. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Got it. Great. Thanks, Jeff and Paul. All right. Any other hands before we vote? Let's vote.

TERRI AGNEW: And again, to cover all bases, Jen, you agree to that latest as well as a seconder.

JENNIFER CHUNG: This is Jen. Yes, I do agree. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Wonderful. Let's do it, folks. Here we go. We have a roll call vote. Mark Datysgeld.

MARK DATYSGELD: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Desiree Milosevic.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Manju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Peter Akinremi.

PETER AKINREMI TAIWO: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Jennifer Chung.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Damon Ashcraft.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Wisdom Donkor.

WISDOM DONKOR: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Prudence Malinki.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Bruna Martins Dos Santos.

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZ: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Nacho Amadoz.

NACHO AMADOZ: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. One moment, please. For the Contracted Parties House, we have seven in favor, zero votes against, zero abstention, and zero absent. For the Non-Contracted Parties House, we have 13 in favor, zero votes against, zero absent, and zero abstention. The motion passes with the Contracted Parties House at 100%, and the Non-Contracted Parties House at 100%. Greg, back to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, and thanks all. I'm going to move right along, because as I mentioned, we're short on time. Our next topic is the letter regarding our favorite recommendation, recommendation seven of the CCWG on auction proceeds. In a March 2nd letter, the board noted it had been considering whether there are further ways to meet the community's broader intention with recommendation seven if the phrase, quote, "from the independent project applications panel" is removed from recommendation seven.

We discussed this at, I believe, the wrap-up at ICANN 79, and requested that councilors go back and discuss with their respective stakeholder groups and see if there was support or concerns. So, I am asking today to see if there are support or concerns, and if there is a unified position, if everyone supports, if there is a volunteer to help draft a response. I will open the floor. Hopefully I didn't go too fast. Okay. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Sure, thanks. I will volunteer to draft a response, which will look a whole lot like the public comment that Susan drafted, and I would simply add that I recommend that council agree to the board's suggestion to delete the limitation in recommendation seven so that it is broader and covers all decision points in the grant-making process. So, I would be happy, if you want to give me a time frame, to draft something short, essentially just plagiarizing Susan's text as modified by [Jen.]

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. I think the deadline we had was May 3rd, to make sure we have time to submit by May 17th. And to be clear, you would be supporting the proposal by the board to remove this text.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, to remove the language from recommendation seven, but certainly not to support the broader bylaws amendment.

GREG DIBIASE: Right. So, I don't think we need to comment on the bylaws. I think that's a separate issue. We've already submitted our public comment on that. This would be addressed to that letter specifically, maybe referencing our prior public comment. Does that make sense?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Sure. Yeah.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. I guess I'll just chime in that the registrars also supported deletion of this language. Are there any other comments here? If not, I can ask people that if concerns are raised, to raise them on list, and then we'll all have an opportunity to review what Anne drafts as our proposed letter back to the board. Any issues or concerns with that? All right. Moving on.

We're going to skip the poor action decision radar again. We will get to it at some point, I hope. And we're moving on to an update on the status of privacy proxy accreditation services. As you may recall, we discussed in ICANN 79 the final recommendations regarding privacy and proxy services accreditation implementation, otherwise known as PPSAI. It's in the unique situation in that it's a significant gap between when the policies were adopted and when work is planned to resume again, and there may or may not be new legislation or other factors that may make these not fit for purpose.

So in deciding on a way forward, staff met with a couple of councilor volunteers from our last meeting to get an idea of their

approach. And I think Paul will summarize what that approach was.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Greg. Paul McCready here again. I am one of two liaisons to this. Stephanie is the other one. So we'll skip a lot of the history. The bottom line is that ICANN Org has been working on an implementation plan, and they're planning to meet and reengage with the IRT at ICANN 80. The staff intends to send out a call for volunteers prior to ICANN 80 so that new volunteers can join this IRT because it's been a while. The Org is planning to proceed with an open plus representative model. It's similar to the model being used for the SubPro IRT, which seems to be functioning, in order to allow for efficient progression of work, but also allows for interested parties to follow along.

We met, as Greg mentioned, with Stephanie, me, and Greg, met with ICANN Org, with Karen Lentz and Dennis Chang. And as I mentioned, they're about to reengage with the IRT here pretty quickly. But they will be asking the IRT three threshold questions. Those are, arethere any policy questions or items that the IRT already wants to bring to council for guidance? Question number two, on the implementation model, can an implementation model without a formal accreditation program remain consistent with the policy recommendations? And three, on the disclosure frameworks for intellectual property and law enforcement, two questions. Are there specific areas to visit under new law or policy for the IRT to review? And can these frameworks be aligned with existing work on RDRS, registration data policy, and all the other

stuff that's out there, and remain consistent with policy recommendations?

And that's where we were. So Stephanie and I will keep our eyes and ears open on this one. I don't think that there's any particular thing to do. This is more of an FYI this month. And Greg, I don't know if you want to ask Stephanie if she has anything to add. But that's the news. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: I have a couple things to add, but I'll ask Stephanie if she has anything first.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I would just add that I strenuously believe—and I was after all on the original group, and I appreciate Paul doesn't want to go in the history and I don't want to either, but the problems are policy problems. And if staff does not believe we have policy issues that need to be revisited, I certainly do. So I'm not quite sure from a procedural point of view, what happens if staff comes back and says, "No, we have no policy issues to bring back to the GNSO council." But as Paul says, we'll be watching closely. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Stephanie. And yeah, I think your point is what is intended by these questions. I guess my comment, and I want to be clear about this, is we're kind of in a weird space. This isn't a traditional IRT, right? The IRT is implementing settled policy. This threshold question kind of feels like a different stage to me, right?

It's an IRT scoping session, IRT issue identification. So I just wanted to be clear on that, that I think it's recognized that this is not like the standard IRT process but rather there is an interesting situation in which we may have to look at things closer.

And then I also have a comment, some feedback from the Registrar Stakeholder Group that they would like to kind of see what the IRT proposal is in writing and have a chance to comment before this goes out to the broader community. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes, thanks. And this may be a given, based on Paul's explanation that the plans are to sort of re-engage the IRT and to put out a call, but I just wanted to sort of put it on the record and hopefully others agree that for the last couple of ICANN meetings, there have been kind of informal discussions with a group of interested kind of former IRT members or whoever's available. But they've been kind of very last-minute. They've been in a sign-up room. There's not been a recording. I think the time for that to be the process should end.

There's a lot of interest in this. I think there needs to be transparency on the discussions on this. So I hope it's the intent anyway. But I think for the future, if there's going to be a meeting at an ICANN meeting or any other place, it's got to be on the schedule and recorded. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Susan. Agree with you completely. And I think that is the intent going forward, that we're beyond the informal brainstorming

meeting stage and we need to have a formal mechanism, albeit a slightly creative interpretation of an IRT phase. But I think there should be structure, like the SubPro IRT. But like I said, at least I heard from the registrars, they'd like to see this kind of the actual written out proposal in writing and have a chance to comment. Okay. Any other comments or questions on PPSAI and the potential path forward there?

Okay. Great. We have made it to any other business. And our first item is an update from Damon, a description of the IPC's RFR decision. Damon, would you like to give Council an update?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Basically, the update, Greg, is that we did get a decision from the board on the RFR and it was dismissed. And that was troublesome. I think we weren't entirely shocked by that decision, but it was troublesome because in the decision that was rendered, one of the issues that they raised is they said you really didn't have—basically the exact wording was that we didn't sufficiently allege that the requester has been adversely affected by the challenged action.

And what they were basically stating by that is they said, hey, you challenged this thing and you really haven't shown how it's hurt you yet. And we have some pretty significant issues with that because we're one of the parties to the GNSO. You know, if a constituency group can't raise something like this related to accountability mechanisms, we're not sure really who else could in this instance.

And then also, I mean, this decision seems to imply that you'd only raise one of these if it's already been implemented. So any decision like this one to do something in the future really wouldn't qualify for an RFR. So that was troublesome to us.

So in the past, the council has sent a letter in support of not necessarily the IPC's position, but in support of the general cause. So that's basically sort of where we're at right now, is we would like to get council's sort of support for our—we haven't made a final decision as to what our next steps are going to be on this. But wanted to sort of bring this update to council and ask for council's general opinion on the issue, then also to support us as, or not support us, but support the general cause as we go forward.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Damon. And just speaking of my personal capacity, I was also a little taken aback reading the decision. There's this timing element of an RFR, right? So I didn't understand how you could be adversely affected by this change if you have to file this within 15 days when the grant program application window is even open yet, right? So no one could have, it was impossible to file an application and be harmed.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: So, yeah, it's kind of the old argument. If you have to pass it to find out what's in it, it was raised by Nancy Pelosi years ago in relation to a law, to Obamacare. But in any event, it's ...

EN

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. And is that something you can send out to council for the reference, the decision?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, absolutely. Go ahead and let me do that. I need to find it and then I will go ahead. I have it up on my screen. I don't have the exact link in front of me, but I will go ahead and I'll send that out to the list here in just a second.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Okay, thank you, Damon. Any other questions or comments for Damon before we move on to the next AOB? Okay, next we have an update on ICANN 80 planning. Terri, did you want to take the mic?

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, Greg. I actually dropped all the information in Zoom chat. So, folks, please read that. Greg, back to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, very efficient. Great. Okay, the next item, 10.3, replacement of council representative to the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group, the CIP-CCG. So we want to thank Damon Ashcraft for volunteering to replace Manju as the council rep to the CIP-CCG. If there are no objections, council will proceed with Damon and thank him for his willingness to serve in this capacity. Manju, are you going to object to this replacement?

MANJU CHEN: No. I was just going to clarify. I'm going to stay as an alternate too. So whenever Damon needs me. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: So then I revise my statement to thank Damon for his willingness to serve and to thank Manju for her willingness to continue to serve. Great. Next is just an update on upcoming sessions for the registration data request service, known as RDRS on—Oh, actually, Caitlin, are you giving this update?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Greg. I can give a quick update. As you can see, there are two dates that are highlighted on the agenda. The first date, ICANN Org is going to be hosting a prep week webinar, specifically dedicated to the RDRS or the registration data request system. And during that webinar, there'll be a presentation on updated metrics, the quarterly survey results, as well as the enhancements to the system that the standing committee has been discussing. And separately, at ICANN 80, during the Monday, the RDRS standing committee will be meeting in person. And they'll also be discussing metrics as well as enhancements to the system that the various groups have requested and observers are welcome to attend this session.

So the proposed agenda for that session will be announced closer to the date of the session. But we did want to highlight these sessions to see if a separate update to the council would be something that the group would be interested in or if these

sessions would be enough in terms of hearing about the work of the RDRS and the metrics associated with it.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Caitlin. Any questions for Caitlin? Okay. That is the end of our agenda. Does anyone have any other business they'd like to raise? I see Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: It might be the same one that Manju wants to raise, but I just wanted to note Jeff's comment on the chat that we might need to comment on the reason why Manju has decided to stop participating in -- well, not stop, but stop leading the CIP CCJ, which is related to timing of the meeting or rather flexibility of the timing of the meeting.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Tomslin. That is a real shame. Manju, would you like to comment?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I was actually not going to talk about the same topic. I was going to say as a liaison to the IDN EPDP that the initial report of phase two has released for public comments. So people, if you are going to submit for public comments, be reminded that it's now open. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Manju. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Yeah, thanks, Greg. I have good news that I'm quite pleased with, which is that as you all know, we've added a couple of staff members already in Saweon and Feodora. We actually just added John Emery, so you might have caught that name in the beginning and wondered who John Emery is. It is now his third day, and he represents the completion of your new GNSO support team. So just wanted to let you all know. You'll see his name, and we're very happy to have our team fully complemented now. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Awesome. Welcome to the team, John.

JOHN EMERY: Thanks, everyone. Excited to work with all of you.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Okay. If there are no other comments, I will draw this meeting to a close and thank everyone for a busy and productive meeting. Thanks, all.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. I'll go ahead and stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care, everyone, and we'll see you at the next meeting. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]