Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 8 August 2024

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 08 August 2024 at 21:00 UTC: https://tinyurl.com/3wxk2kd2
14:00 Los Angeles; 17:00 Washington DC; 22:00 London; 23:00 Paris; 00:00 Moscow (Friday); 07:00 Melbourne (Friday)

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Anne Aikman Scalese (apologies sent)
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Greg DiBiase, Prudence Malinki
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz (apologies, Proxy to Kurt Pritz), Kurt Pritz, 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 (sent proxy but joined entire call), Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Stephanie Perrin, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Wisdom Donkor, Tomslin Samme-Nlar , Peter Akinremi, Manju Chen
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Justine Chew: ALAC Liaison
Jeff Neuman: GNSO liaison to the GAC
Everton Rodrigues: ccNSO observer

Guests: Roger Carney, Transfer Policy Review Team Working Group Chair

ICANN Staff:
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 Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator

Zoom Recording

Transcript

Item 1: Administrative Matters
1.1 - Roll Call
1.2 - Updates to Statements of Interest
1.3 - Review / Amend Agenda
1.4 - Note the status of minutes for the previous Council meetings per the GNSO Operating Procedures:
Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting on 12 June 2024 were posted on 01 July 2024.
Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting on 18 July 2024 were posted on 02 August 2024

Item 2: Opening Remarks / Review of Projects & Action List

2.1 - Review focus areas and provide updates on specific key themes / topics, to include review of Projects List and Action Item List.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- GNSO Review of the GAC Communiqué

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

Vote Results

Action Items:

1. The GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Secretariat, on behalf of the GNSO Chair, communicate the GNSO Council Review of ICANN80 GAC Communiqué Advice and Issues of Importance to the ICANN Board.
2. The GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Liaison to the GAC also informs the GAC of the communication between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board.

Item 4: COUNCIL VOTE - GNSO Liaison to the GAC Replacement

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)

4.2 - Council Vote (Voting threshold: Simple Majority)

4.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that the Council was replacing its long-time liaison, Jeff Neuman. The standing selection committee has recommended Sebastien Ducos as GNSO liaison to the GAC. Read resolved clauses, and moved to a voice vote.

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

Vote Results

Action Items:

1. The GNSO Council directs the GNSO Secretariat to inform the candidates and the GAC leadership of the GNSO Council's decision. [COMPLETED]
2. On behalf of the GNSO Council the GNSO Secretariat thanks Jeff Neuman for his four years of service as the GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC. [COMPLETED]

Item 5: COUNCIL VOTE - Adoption of the SPIRT Charter

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Anne Aikman-Scalese, GNSO Council Liaison)

5.2 - Council Vote (Voting threshold: Simple Majority)

5.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that Anne Aikman-Scalese was traveling and Saewon Lee from staff would give an update.

Saewon Lee, ICANN Org, updated the Council with an introduction and substantive updates since June that the final Charter had been circulated to the Council. First substantive change for SPIRT Charter was its consistency with the Predictability Framework, which will undergo further changes through its public comment period in May 2025. Disclaimer added that the Predictability Framework will govern if a conflict with the Charter arises. Second change was an emphasis that SPIRT cannot refer an issue to itself but is in a position to classify an issue when requested by the Council. Finally, language within the Charter was updated that SPIRT does not develop policy and is only supportive of the Council in support of the Board and the Org. Drafting team may possibly need to reconvene post May 2025 if potential changes in predictability framework require amendments to the Charter after the approval by the Board of the Applicant Guidebook in December 2025.

Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted the NCSG concern since the membership of the SPIRT is not subject to conflict of interest, but only on interest and expertise of the candidates. There are not enough safeguards to avoid a situation where a single group from the community dominates the membership of the SPIRT, and we are asking that ICANN considers that in the volunteer selection process ensures that all stakeholders participate in the SPIRT membership.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted this for the record, but it did not impact the current vote.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, in the chat: "If it's an open group, there will be no selection."

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, read the resolved clauses, and moved to a voice vote.

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

Vote Results

Action Items:
1. The GNSO Council requests the GNSO Support Staff to communicate the result of the motion to the Drafting Team as well as the SubPro IRT. [COMPLETED]
2. On behalf of the GNSO Council the GNSO Secretariat thanks the Drafting Team members, Chair and Vice-Chair for their contribution and looks forward to the SPIRT's role in the Next Round New gTLD Program. [COMPLETED]

Item 6: COUNCIL VOTE - Accuracy Scoping Team

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)
6.2 - Council Vote (Voting threshold: Simple Majority)
6.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that this was initially scheduled for a vote, but ffter the motion was submitted Damon and Susan representing the IPC raised some concerns about voting on this prior to further discussion. We are deferring this vote to next meeting pending further discussion.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, sent his thanks for the deferral and noted his email about concerns that the next agenda item on accuracy should lead on the right track to discuss and move from there.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, questioned whether the vote was being deferred or canceled. Queried if there was a set of conditions necessary to bring it to a vote?

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, responded that it simply seemed premature at this point of time and preferred to discuss and move from there.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, agreed that the motion could be deferred or withdrawn based on today's discussion.

Lawrence Olawale Roberts, BC, added the BC position that rather than purging the first and second recommendations, it might be best to seek an alternative as to what direction the Council may want to go first. There might be some need to have parties within ICANN to help get the needed information for the working group work. Voiced support for IPC position to get some clarity on options to go back to constituencies for how to proceed.

Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Accuracy of Registration Data

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)
7.2 - Council Discussion
7.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, considered the Evaluation of Proposed Alternatives, Scoping Team Restart, and Advancing the Topic as outlined in Item 7 of agenda.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, expressed concern in restarting the scoping team given previous struggles in reaching consensus. Floated the idea of a Council small team looking into this issue rather than restarting the scoping team.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, shared his personal belief that the lessons from the DNS Abuse small team was useful for better scoping the problem and understanding the issues in a more informal way than the scoping team.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, noted GAC was somewhat frustrated with our perceived lack of progress at ICANN80 in Kigali and that a small team on this issue would demonstrate that would show progress on this.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, queried if absent any substantive change, does it make sense to continue on? Noted that if ICANN cannot ask for the data outside the bounds of data protection law it is not up to Council to solve these problems. Historical data also has issues being previously illegal or where does it actually get us and voluntary data is selective. Questioned the efficacy of ccTLD data since governments have the ability to gather data, but the private sector cannot, so why are we putting resources toward this?

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, in the chat: "Those are all good questions for a small team to look at Stephanie."

Susan Payne, IPC, agrees a small team could be helpful and cited Registrar discussion previously that they were not convinced any changes to the accuracy requirement would make a difference. While we can differ on statements, but then isn't it worth for us to see if there is a way to get that evidence one way or another? We can seek legal advice if we need to and that's something a small team could think about. A small team would be more facilitative of a discussion of options and surfacing of issues.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, agreed with Stephanie's highlight of why this is a difficult discussion and suggested looking for viable options other than reforming the scoping team. Proposed getting concrete propositions from stakeholder groups to jumpstart the small team discussion.

Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Vice-Chair, asked a question of the Contracted Parties, recalling the statement from their meeting that they will continue their efforts related to registration data. Are there some things specifically related to accuracy the Council could be told about to bring into this conversation?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, did not recall, but noted it would be a good question for the small team.

Thomas Rickert, ISPCP, suggested that those looking for more work on this to submit proposals. Additionally commented on timing and resource allocation of formalizing another small team to continue with this effort. Raised the crucial question as to whether we want to solve accuracy for accuracy's sake or tackling real problems? The desire to fix issues is where domains are used for bad purposes, so maybe we should wait for data to come out in the next few months with the contract amendment to then determine what steps might be effective. Proposed postponing a year or two to come up with more informed decisions for a potential way forward.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, summarized a new idea for a potential small team, but also waiting as we may have more data in the future with NIS2 or amendments as Thomas Rickert described. Consensus seems to be surrounding the efficacy of the small team, rather than restarting the scoping team.

Susan Payne, IPC, request to Thomas for clarification on the contract amendment about DNS abuse and not about accuracy. Queried as to whether the contract amendment was that more data on accuracy will become available or that we should not be wasting our time on this issue?

Thomas Rickert, ISPCP, clarified that we are not trying to get accurate data for its own sake. The problem arises when domain names have been registered for bad purposes then it is difficult for law enforcement to hold bad actors accountable. To help reduce the possibility of DNS abuse we could make non-responsive contracted parties have a sanction then they would ask their customers as to whether their registration data is accurate. First breach notice for a registry where there has been a lot of phishing, that will reduce the level of abuse and therefore the pressure to get the accuracy question resolved could be lower.

Susan Payne, IPC, responded that she understood the point and that it may have some beneficial impact, but given the definition of DNS abuse as per the contract amendment, she noted that isn't the whole of the issue with abuse in the wider sense. It does not solve the issue entirely, but it may perhaps improve the situation.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, suggested we redefine the problem because it is so difficult to understand accuracy to make sure that the registrant is reachable so they can be accountable for DNS abuse.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, noted that there are no clear answers here, and perhaps a small team could tackle this even if it is that there is not a solution.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, cited agreement with Damon and Thomas that there is both a big gap here and redoing the same thing won't get us anywhere. Suggested a small team to ideate and see if they could do something new, especially with NIS2 as a new data point. Stated it was probably worth doing in a few months even if it wraps up with no concrete conclusion.

Mark Datysgeld, BC, agreed with Kurt, that this has always been an issue and the idea of reframing the problem makes a lot of sense. Fundamentally the question is: Why do we want accuracy? It is because in case of an incident we want to be able to reach someone in some way, so it is more a cybersecurity question instead of a data question. This concept is a strong way forward.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, leadership will consider this and asked Councilors bring back the idea of a small team to their constituency groups.

Action Items: For the 19 September meeting the:
1. Leadership will consider the discussion and propose a path forward, potentially involving the formation of a small team and developing an amended motion for consideration at the September meeting.
2. Councilors are requested to discuss alternative options and approaches within their groups and provide feedback during the next meeting.

Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Small Team Plus on Singulars/Plurals
8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Paul McGrady, Small Team Plus)
8.2 - Council Discussion
8.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, one outstanding recommendation from SubPro for which a supplemental recommendation is being considered.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, summarized issue with singulars/plurals of the same word in the same language. The Board pushed back on the concept of different uses because that would delve into content, so the Small Team Plus came up with additional proposed changes and staff came up with a proposal to outsource this to the community so only those that were flagged by community members would have issues and others would proceed without issue. Stated that the Small Team Plus did not have a problem with the outsourcing, but there was strong support for an exception process that was for more than just .brands. They thoroughly considered the staff proposal with large agreement, but the struggle was reaching a consensus on an exception mechanism, whether it should be narrow or broad for the issue of singulars and plurals in the same language.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked assuming the runway is short, would the choice then be adopting a recommendation without full consent or not sending a supplemental recommendation?

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, replied that the Small Team Plus could either bring it to Council a supplemental recommendation that does not have the full support of the Small Team Plus, which could be voted up or down. Or we could vote on the previous supplemental recommendation that went through the entire Small Team Plus and community process in Puerto Rico, but the Board has signaled they would vote no on that. Or we could do nothing with the Board non-adopted the SubPro work, and it is dead on arrival.

Jeff Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, suggested best help from Council is to have someone not been involved in the discussions to date to help the group understand what is in and out of scope for the Small Team Plus. He gave the opinion that the biggest mistake was to only send the parts of the report and recommendations that had full consensus or consensus, and the Board did not get to see where there was a majority support but some opposition. Whatever happens with this Small Team we must let the Board know the discussions that took place, what kind of support each has. In the end the Board gets a flavor for how many

supported and objected to make informed decisions to balance it between banning singulars and plurals or doing nothing.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, queried if Jeff supported a vote on supplemental recommendation that did not have full consensus, but majority support?

Jeff Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, stated he would support giving the Small Team time to put together an accurate picture of what the recommendations were, and the different positions expressed in the group. For example, that did not happen with auction where there was a majority, but there was not consensus, and the Council decided to send nothing on that to the Board.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, stated her agreement with Jeff as a member of the Small Team, but with a few qualifications. 1) Discussed the distinction between full consensus and sufficient consensus to assess whether a step can be taken forward for consideration. 2) Agreed that we need some way to tell the Small Team Plus what is in and out of scope as there have been continuous attempts to introduce new things which are out of scope, such as abbreviations and acronyms not found in the dictionary. As Jeff stated, it is best to compile the consensus that SubPro had and not relitigate the substantive parts of that so that the present work can be kept narrow.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, queried about whether we can pursue more substantive work with new proposals, or if we need to come to a decision?

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, responded that it was not a new proposal, but looking back to Small Team Plus work so far to find out which parts enjoy sufficient consensus, in order to establish what should and should not be a part of the proposal going forward.

Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Vice-Chair, replied that Justine summarized well his position and advised to be careful with the procedural aspect of this with the Small Team staying on scope and following the assignment form with what comes out of the Small Team Plus back to Council.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, advised against any need for a third party to come and tell the Small Team Plus to stop discussing acronyms. Noted the question as to whether there is general consensus about putting singulars/plurals in the contention sets but not an exceptions process, citing that the SubPro work had an exception baked into it. However, given the time constraint, it might be best to tell the Small Team Plus that if you don't bring us back something with full consensus, then we will take the majority consensus to the Council that can vote it up or down, which could motivate consensus.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked Jeff Neumann if there is a vote that does not have consensus as long as the positions are documented that can go to the Board with the supplemental recommendation?

Jeff Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, concurred and stated that not sending something to the Board because it did not reach full consensus was a mistake with SubPro that should not be made again.

Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Vice-Chair, stated that the Council has traditionally voted on how the work is done rather than the substance of the work. If something comes that does not enjoy consensus from the Small Team the Council have to be forced to go into the substance and if we end up voting down or up something that is not ideal it concerns him that we might be getting a recommendation that does not get consensus.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, responded that he is not worried about this as it is not a PDP, it is a Small Team.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, replied that this is a Small Team working on amending or supplementing a recommendation that was made in a PDP.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, responded that this is not a pure PDP this is essentially a drafting team for an idea that Council chooses to adopt or not.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, is concerned the Small Team is confused that they should be doing editing and coming up with recommendations to the Council to move forward but not drafting.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, brought the conversation back to Paul's original questions. 1) How much runway do we have? Very little, the September meeting. Asked if people are okay with using Jeff's opinion to consider whether we vote and document where there was not consensus if consensus cannot be achieved.

Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Vice-Chair, supports the idea documenting for the Board, but does not support the idea of voting if consensus is not achieved.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, it depends on how cogent the recommendations are and what items have consensus and what does not. It is content dependent, but we must do something in September.

Susan Payne, IPC, agrees with Kurt to some extent, but it depends on what we get. But if the Small Team Plus has an outcome that has strong support but significant opposition and not consensus, it should still go to a vote for the Council. Then the Board gets it, and they can make their own mind up. Agrees with Jeff that we should have done that on SubPro recommendation because the Board did not have all the information.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, concludes that runway stops at the September meeting and that the Small Team Plus is tasked with documenting positions. Queried with Paul McGrady if we will consider whether or how we will vote based on recommendations brought forward?

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, replied yes.

Manju Chen, NCSG, suggested getting a document as soon as possible given the lead time before the September meeting. Urged the Small Team Plus to deliver text early without any placeholders.

Item 9: COUNCIL UPDATE - Transfer Policy Review PDP - Initial Report Format
9.1 - Introduction of Topic (Roger Carney, Transfer Policy Review WG Chair)
9.2 - Council Discussion
9.3 - Next Steps

Roger Carney, Transfer Policy Review WG Chair, gave an update on the PDP to review the Transfer Policy and determine if changes to the policy are needed to improve the ease, security, and efficacy of inter-registrar and inter-registrant transfers. He noted that the WG got the initial report out three weeks early and that went to public comment a week ago and the format of the long report had changed. The 47 recommendations were moved to the top for readability of the 150-page report. Additionally, he cited that each recommendation includes a policy impact rating with LOW, MEDIUM, and HIGH, as explained in the document. Those were the big changes to the report that were made and to make it Board friendly when that time arrives.

Roger Carney, Transfer Policy Review WG Chair, highlighted a section in the public comment asking about the structure and changes of the report for Councilors to inform their constituencies. Finally, there are two additional webinars in September during the open comment period for readers to come with questions.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, thanked Roger for the innovation and accessibility of the report.

Item 10: COUNCIL UPDATE - Intellectual Property Constituency Request for Reconsideration
10.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)
10.2 - Council Discussion
10.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, letter discussed on the Board rejection for RFR and wanted to allow groups to answer two questions: 1) Does your stakeholder group support this letter being sent? 2) Should we allow other SO's and AC's to join it?

Kurt Pritz, RySG, advised sending it from the Council, rather than workshopping it for others to join.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, shared Kurt's viewpoint, proposed sending it from GNSO Council only, and then we could encourage other SO's and AC's to send their own letters given that they share the concern.

Action Items:
1. By 12 August GNSO Council leadership will send a reminder of the draft letter and request GNSO Councilors to send comments, if any, by 19 August.

Item 11: Any Other Business
11.1 - Independent Review Process - Implementation Oversight Team
   ● Deadline for public comments: 16 September

Susan Payne, IPC, highlighted that this group has been working on the updated rules for the Independent Review Procedure since 2018. Most of the time has been spent on the most challenging issue, which is around the time limit for bringing an IRP and if there should be a limit after the Board decision where an IRP cannot proceed. She acknowledged that there is not full consensus on the proposal, but if Council were to consider a GNSO wide comment on these rules it might be hard to come to a unified view. She noted the improvements on the panel selection process to make the rules clearer and some implementation guidance on initiation of an IRP. For example, there should be one place on the ICANN website to find information about an IRP. She expressed it not being essential for the GNSO Council to comment, but it would be helpful.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked for volunteer to get Council comments on this and if someone feels there should be a place for Council comment, otherwise send it to the various stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Action items:
1. GNSO Councilors to consult with their groups and consider whether the GNSO Council specifically should comment by 16 September.

11.2 - ICANN's Draft Five Year Strategic Plan
   ● Deadline for public comments: 17 September

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that Council may wish to review Strategic Objective number 1 as it is relevant to us as it is an area of the report where the report thinks a lot of attention is warranted. Urged Councilors to see if we have comments on that part as a Council.

Action items:
1. GNSO Councilors to consult with their groups and consider whether the GNSO Council specifically should comment by 17 September.

11.3 - Continuous Improvement Program - Community Coordination Group (CIP-CCG) Phase 3 Update

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, updated Council that he has met with CCOICI that's designed to analyze continuous improvement. Suggestions that have gone through that group to be taken back to the CIP-CCG.

11.4 - Publication of Preliminary Issues Report on Latin Script Diacritics
● Deadline for public comments: 27 August

Action items:
1. GNSO Councilors to consult with their groups and consider whether the GNSO Council specifically should comment by 26 August.

11.5 - ICANN Board Seeks Input on Applicant Support Program Use of Auction Proceeds - blog post

Steve Chan, ICANN ORG, summarized that the Board is seeking input on whether a portion of auction proceeds from the 2012 round can be utilized for the applicant support program. Council may want to provide feedback, or perhaps the stakeholder and constituency groups to individually provide feedback.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, queried if Council should respond with a letter?

Lawrence Olawale Roberts, BC, added context, policy developed by Council says that applicant support is supposed to be self-funded by the round for which it occurs. The funding is supposed to come out of applications for future rounds, the Board is trying to walk around this by posing the question to the community, for funding the applicant support program using 2012 round auction proceeds. Because it touches on policy that emanates from GNSO Council, it might be worth it to give some kind of support from this unless there are contrary views. Otherwise, the process is on us for policy development, it would be worth it to send a letter of support to the Board.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, tasked Lawrence Olawale Roberts to draft an initial letter and circulate it.

Action items:
1. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts volunteered to draft a letter for GNSO Councilors to review by 25 August. [COMPLETED]
2. GNSO Councilors to review the draft for transmission to the ICANN Board by 19 August.

11.6 - Board Letter re: Urgent Request

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, introduced the topic and asked if there were concerns with the letter sent

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, stated that the RrSG had more completely formulated their thoughts in the [Letter](#) circulated 8 August. She emphasized a need of registrars to authenticate requestors and there is no system to do this and there are many law enforcement agencies so putting in a timeline is quite difficult.

Action Items:
1. GNSO Council leadership to re-circulate the draft letter and request comments if any by 15 August.

11.7 - Queries regarding IDN EPDP

Manju Chen, NCSG, highlighted the [query](#) she sent to Council based on request from the GDS to do something because it is procedurally unprecedented and the working group thinks it is a Council decision to make.

Action Items:
1. GNSO Councilors who wish to comment may do so on the list in response to the message from Manju Chen by 19 August.

End time 22:59 UTC