Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 16 May 2024

Agenda and Documents

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 16 May 2024 at 05:00 UTC: https://tinyurl.com/4dthynkr

22:00 Los Angeles (Wednesday); 01:00 Washington DC; 06:00 London; 07:00 Paris; 08:00 Moscow; 15:00 Melbourne

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, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Mark Datysgeld (joined late, after votes) , Osvaldo Novoa (absent), Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft (apologies, proxy to Susan Payne), 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

Jeff Neuman: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Everton Rodrigues: ccNSO observer (absent)

Guests: None

ICANN Staff:

David Olive - Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Director, ICANN Regional (apologies)

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management (apologies)

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 Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Specialist (GNSO)

Devan Reed - Secretariat 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 06 March 2024 were posted on 23 March 2024.

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting on 18 April 2024 were posted on 03 May 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 Liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee - Job Description
- Council Response to Board Letter on CCWG Auction Proceeds Recommendation 7

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

Vote results

GNSO Liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee - Job Description

Action Items:

1. GNSO Council directs staff to post the GNSO liaison to the GAC role description on the Council activities procedures page. [request sent to webadmin, in progress]
2. The GNSO Council directs staff to notify the GAC leadership of the revised description of the GNSO Liaison to the GAC role. [completed]
3. Staff to circulate the timeline for next steps in the selection process.

Council Response to Board Letter on CCWG Auction Proceeds Recommendation 7

Action Items:

The GNSO Council requests the GNSO Secretariat to inform the Board of its acceptance of the Board's suggestion for CCWG-AP Recommendation 7.

Item 4: COUNCIL VOTE - Request for Preliminary Issue Report for Diacritics in Latin Script

4.1 - Introduction of [Motion](#) (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Council Vote (Voting threshold: simple majority)

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, explained that this is something the Council has been discussing for a while. The issue was initially raised by ".quebec" but have subsequently determined that there may be other use cases that may deal with the issue, so a broader solution may be needed. The Council looked into an option of developing a supplemental recommendation related to the non adopted SubPro recommendations on string similarity. But ultimately, counselors expressed procedural concerns with that option. So that route didn't seem viable. There was a rough consensus that the Council request an issue report to determine whether a PDP is needed, to consolidate information on this topic to make an informed decision on how to go about this issue.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, shared that a friendly amendment in the form of a whereas clause was shared by Kurt Pritz, RySG. He went on to query whether there was a formal amendment to this motion.

Susan Payne, IPC, agreed there is no need to revise the motion. Queried whether it was needed prior to the vote or afterwards to revise the request for the issues report. Further noted the phrasing of the term "confusingly similar" raised by Manju Chen, NCSG and her constituency in the request for the issues report. Susan proposed the term "visually confusingly similar" as that was the test applied in the 2012 round and affirmed by the SubPro. Ultimately, perhaps that ought to be a footnote the first time that term is used to link to what SubPro affirmed to mean visually confusingly similar.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that there is no need to revise the motion, just to pass that information along to staff developing the issue report.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, proposed adding the word "visually" in front of "confusingly similar" in the whereas clause 3 to resolve some of the concerns that Manju Chen, NCSG raised.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, accepted that as a friendly amendment with support from Susan Payne, IPC, in the chat with Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Council Vice-Chair, as second. Instructed staff to make that change and will proceed with reading the [resolved clauses](#)and going to a vote.

Request for Preliminary Issue Report for Diacritics in Latin Script

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

[Vote results](#)

<u>Action Items:</u>
1. The GNSO Council directs staff to create the Preliminary Issue Report for Diacritics in Latin Script.
2. The GNSO Council requests that the GNSO Liaison to the GAC notifies the GAC Secretariat of this request.

Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Deferral of Policy Status Report Request - Expiration Policies

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

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, acknowledged that this was originally a vote, but has now become a Council discussion. Request for deferral of EDDP and ERRP, which contained a recommendation to be reviewed to see if it has been implemented as intended. Acknowledged that while this policy would benefit from review, there are more pressing matters currently and it was deferred. Original deferral was 5 years and with input from NCSG it was moved to a 2 year deferral. Susan Payne, IPC expressed some concerns surrounding the rationale for why a PSR was appropriate at this juncture.

Susan Payne, IPC, expressed a general feeling that doing a policy status report doesn't necessarily mean more work needs to be done. But at the same time it is a step to flesh out whether the policy is working as intended and whether there are any unintended consequences. There is a reservation about continuing to defer this given some IPC members pointed out some issues worth fleshing out.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, expressed an opinion as chair and manager that there is a fair amount on our plate, including the just-voted on the diacritics issue and the PPSAI work, WHOIS report, while this is not a registrar position, there is a concern about bandwidth. In talking with staff after reading Susan's email Caitlin Tubergen, having worked on the ERRP, Caitlin was invited to share some background that might be helpful with ERRP.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, offered some background as a member of the staff who supported the ERRP. When the ERRP was initially implemented it was required to give two notifications to registrants (no prescription as to when or how) if their names were going to expire. One of the goals of that policy

was to make it very clear to customers that their names were going to expire and make it consistent across all registrars that those notices were to be sent one month, and one week prior to expiration. The group did not set out to make it consistent what happens following the expiration of a name, and that was to recognize that registrars operate different types of business models, and so long as it is transparently communicated to the customer how those names will be treated after expiration.It is perfectly within the policy to allow registrars to transfer the name to a third party so long as they do send those notices prior to expiration. Some of the concerns expressed in the email regarding how some names are deleted and some are not. That is actually by design. It allows different registrars to operate their businesses based on different business types. So, in terms of suggesting a policy status report at this juncture that might not be the appropriate avenue to deal with those specific concerns. A PSR will likely confirm that one of the goals was to allow flexibility with registered businesses, but of course, to ensure there are safeguards prior to the expiration of the name. Ultimately, some of the concerns on how some names are deleted and some are not, allows registrars to operate based on different business types. The policy in terms of original goals of ERRP are being met. Suggesting a policy status report does not deal with those specific concerns.

Susan Payne, IPC, thanked Caitlin for the background and appreciated that there is a lot on the Council's plate. However, she raised that deferring this five years or even two years now, then does not have the PSR into the queue and is not figuring in staff planning. Given that we have the GNSO procedures the expectation that the operational policies will be reviewed from time to time, these policies are longstanding, this seems a matter of good practice, it has already been deferred and still not in the queue. If we push off even on making a decision on asking for a PSR, it doesn't even figure into decisions about resourcing.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, thanked Susan for her point and agreed that if it does go into the queue, then we can have the conversation about prioritization.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, inquired if the Council had considered a call for a public comment. She discussed the various business practices and that a call for public comment would be attempting to get some data on what is happening

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that the place to start is a policy status report and then we could consider public comment, but unsure of specific precedent on this.

Written in the chat: Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, Could we rework the motion to say that unless there are extenuating circumstances, the request for a PSR will automatically happen in 2 years?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that the idea then is when the deferral ends, then the PSR will happen to signal to staff to start on this. If at the next Council meeting we vote whether to defer and that deferral fails, the immediate next step on the consent agenda would be to vote for a PSR. My proposal would be to have this vote next meeting on the deferral for two years, if they vote against the deferral we will put it on the consent agenda to formally put the PSR into the staff's queue.

Susan Payne, IPC, Members feel the need to ask for a PSR now. With the understanding that constituents would be more likely to support asking for it now, not to begin later than six months. Just to ensure that the PSR is on the roadmap for some work to be done but with flexibility to allow staff to manage their workload. Had we been voting today I would vote no as that would be too far off.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, sought clarification from Susan on the IPC position on the vote on whether to defer.

Susan Payne, IPC, stated that had there been voting today she would have entered a no vote. If what comes back for a vote is to defer for two years, she would still likely have instructions to vote no given that two years is too far off.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, suggested that there be a vote on whether to defer the PSR. If the Council votes no, then the PSR goes into the staff queue, then the Council votes to start the PSR when feasible and perhaps could put something more definite around that.

Susan Payne, IPC, is asking Council not to vote to defer it, but instead to request a motion to request a PSR.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked Councilors to go back to constituents to get feedback to vote for deferral or a vote for the PSR in June based on feedback from constituencies.

Susan Payne, IPC, agrees

Action Items: Council leadership to provide a suggested path forward on the Council email list.

Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - GNSO Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement ("CCOICI") Pilot Survey Results

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Manju Chen, Chair of CCOICI) slide presentation

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Manju Chen, Chair of CCOICI, discussed [slide presentation](#) of CCOICI pilot survey to get a sense of the community whether to continue the CCOICI framework. The survey had 23 questions in total with 14 multiple choice, and 9 open-ended questions. The survey period was from 1 February 2024 to 5 March 2024 and there were eight responses from SGs and SCs in total to the survey. Highlighting the data from the survey results, most people agreed that the framework is clear and appropriate.

Questions with the highest score were 20 and 22 both have to do with the CCOICI statement of interest with 75% agreement with both. The lowest scores below 75 for example was question 24 with a 0 score whether to change the name CCOICI, and it lowered the average for all questions, essentially it is a good name. Question 18 on whether the task force methodologies are fit for purpose and it scored 56%. This issue was controversial at the time, we know that people were not happy with the result and that likely impacted how they answered the questions.

Highlighted the results and all [slides](#) are in the agenda and communicated that anyone interested could explore the results themselves. Page 16 of the slides contain the consolidated summary of the survey organized into five sets.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, queried what the membership structure was.

Manju Chen, Chair of CCOICI, responded that every SG and SC can appoint one member to the task force, it is not like the CCOICI which is limited to Councilors.
Major points to improve were: 1) establish a decision-making methodology for CCOICI 2) clarify the difference between task force and CCOICI and 3) CCOICI is in a pilot phase and if we need to continue this framework, the charter needs to be revised and formalized. [Slide](#) 19 highlights the next steps of the planning process and they welcomed any suggestions and comments from CCOICI members.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, inquired if the question before the Council today is whether or not everyone is on board with the CCOICI reviewing the Charter.

Manju Chen, Chair of CCOICI, responded that they assumed that would be decided in the next meeting and it was opened up for comments.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, stated support for going ahead as soon as possible, but raised concerns about how to get around the impasse about decision-making. What are the alternative options and how do we do better next time?

Kurt Pritz, RySG, echoes Stephanie's concern. CCOICI's failure to reach consensus was a significant failure out of a structural issue. Perhaps a second pilot is the solution given the difficulty of this problem, and suggested to meet those concerns and develop some ideas on the SOI again or some other problem.

Manju Chen, Chair of CCOICI, responded that CCOICI is not necessarily responsible for this issue, this is Council structure issue. Proposed another mechanism going on that is better placed to deal with this issue CIP-CCG (Continuous Improvement Program Cross-Community Coordination Group). The CCG intended to replace the organization review that has been going on beforehand by the group and our representative from the Council is Damon Ashcroft. Perhaps there is a larger conversation to review the GNSO structure and how it is working or not. But the CCOICI has a limited scope and objective only with assignments given from the Council. This is seen before with other policy issues, it is an issue, but perhaps not addressed in CCOICI.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, There were no objections from the GNSO Councilors for the CCOICI to revise its charter.

Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Intellectual Property Constituency Request for Reconsideration

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Susan Payne, GNSO Councilor for IPC)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Susan Payne, IPC, briefly wanted to highlight the background of this on how the IPC brought a request for reconsideration challenging the board resolution from last year concerning recommendation 7, auction proceeds. Specifically about the disapplication of accountability mechanisms like the RFR and IRP in the context of the grant program, that these could be done by terms and conditions rather than a bylaws change. The request for reconsideration in April received a summary dismissal from the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee. The IPC felt the reason for this dismissal for lack of standing was problematic in that the IPC did not identify a specific harm or adverse affect by the board decision. We at the IPC think that's wrong and there are legal concepts of foreseeability or not having to wait for harm before challenging something.

This is not a challenge of the auction grant decision, but of the Board's decision on how it is going to change the bylaws. This is not a moot point, there has been significant pushback from GNSO on this even though the Board has decided it has not been implemented. Highlighting that constituencies and

stakeholder groups will have a difficulty in challenging ICANN, reached out to other stakeholder groups to gauge interest with IPC bringing RFR and no one had the finances to do it.

Discussed the Empowered Community IRP, a higher level than individual constituency and that is funded by ICANN, not easy, it is complex, and involves an initial mediation phase. Looking for support for the GNSO to explore the possibility of taking that Empowered Community IRP process. Asks Council leadership to take forward this topic not a decision for an Empowered Community IRP, but support for the idea to be taken up and explored further by our leadership team.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, spoke in personal capacity the argument that IPC didn't have standing because they weren't harmed because they didn't submit an application. But the application window was not even open yet, so it seemed like an impossibility. Denied standing because there wasn't actual harm raised concerns worth looking into and will defer to Councilors for further steps.

Anne Aikman-Scalese, NCA, was concerned about the standing issue and the summary dismissal with no possibility to object to this kind of action.Highlighted that they proceeded to include contract language alternative to that which was adopted in Hamburg. Stated that we should not let rest with summary dismissal, because it is fundamental to the multi-stakeholder model on how final recommendations are adopted and not just thrown out after they are adopted. All constituencies and stakeholder groups should be concerned about the issue of standing and should find a way to support this effort.
Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Vice-Chair, raised a question regarding the next steps if there was support to proceed.

Susan Payne, IPC, stated that particular next timing and next steps are not clear. In a regular IRP there is a timing that runs for 120 days from when claimant in question becomes aware of being materially affected by the decision. In the context of the Empowered Community process there is a question about how they could be in a position to bring an IRP if they are not aware of the decision. A useful next step for Council leadership is to look into this more as the IPC did have legal advisors with RFR and would be willing to talk to Council leadership as they were aware of the procedural process. From her own attempt to read the procedure for Empowered Community IRP is not clear in bylaws, as it is not quite the same as normal IRP, basically look into it rather than launching a community IRP.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that it is worthwhile to figure out the rules for a community IRP.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, noted that reading through the RFR a majority of write up was about standing rather than the violation itself. RFR was put together recognizing that it is a close issue, even if the Board came down on the side that they did. Cited that the IPC or other stakeholder groups would not undertake a

request of reconsideration lightly, it is a significant step. Stated agreement with many that the efficacy of the RFR if this relatively lightweight mechanism cannot be employed to bring issues to the board and proposed that maybe the answer is an Empowered Community IRP. Ultimately questioned if the RFR as a tool can be effective.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, stated based on experience that once you get into IRP process ICANN gets its outside Council and and it becomes a litigation rather than a discussion. The only effective way to deal with this is to have a discussion of accountability mechanisms outside of IRP, otherwise it becomes years of litigation. Take this outside accountability mechanism and have a conversation with the ICANN board to not get thrown over to legal.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked Jeffrey if an IRP initiated by an Empowered Community could lead to a different result? Questioned how to make this discussion happened.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, stated that once anything is in IRP it becomes a different legal issue and would strongly suggest to handle this through discussions rather than accountability mechanisms. IRPs could theoretically be different with Empowered Community IRP, but will probably not be.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, replied that leadership will take a closer look at this and further feedback from Councilors is encouraged to maintain the conversation.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, noted that a discussion would be nice, but with the rejection claiming no standing, if mediation is required, that could perhaps have an impact and we should definitely not drop this.

Thomas Rickert, ISPCP, cited that an outside counsel would likely be needed in this process and that would be challenging for the community within GNSO. Parallel to whether or not to proceed, suggested reaching out to law firms to volunteer on this matter but not ask for an up front retainer. Proposes to show that we are taking preparatory steps to make this happen if need be to incentivize amicable solutions from ICANN outside accountability mechanisms.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, stated that exploring empowered community IRP is fine, but it is the deepest crevice of ICANN as it has not been used previously. In discussions with the board we encouraged them not to come up with a legal resolution for IPC request for reconsideration, but instead to engage in a dialogue. While the board kind of did that, they left the language for the application process for the grant. However, they did reach a formalistic resolution that the IPC did not have standing. Queried whether it

might be helpful to have a letter from the Council stating that we requested for a non-legal reasoning, and the standing argument is precisely that. Stated that everyone thinks they have standing. Encouraged the board to withdraw that part of the decision to let the IPC carry on as the substance of the manner. Ultimately, stated support for IPC.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that he would raise the issue during the informal discussion with ICANN board members.

Action Items:
1. GNSO Council leadership to raise in the 20 May informal meeting with the Board
2. GNSO Council leadership to consider options for how to proceed and share with the Council by 30 May

Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Review of Action Decision Radar

8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Tomslin Samme-NIar, GNSO Vice-Chair)

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

Tomslin Samme-NIar, GNSO Vice-Chair, highlighted the 2023-2024 Action/Decision Radar ADR to share with Council what is on the horizon for the next 12 months. It is critical not to understand given how much we have discussed prioritization in the last two meetings. Today we will 1) make some determinations for Council action items if they do not have a clear or obvious action for us. 2) Discuss implications of expected Council actions. 3) Determine whether we have enough resources for additional work. Today we agreed to do an initial request on Latin diacritics and could lead to a potential PDP and what the resource requirements would be for that. Slides begin on Page 24.

0-1 month ADR pgs. 25-26
1. The issue report on IDN Latin Diacritics was unplanned work previously not on the ADR and ownership sits with Council and ICANN org. As it shifts to ICANN org it will shift lower on ADR.
2. EPDP on Temporary Specification on gTLD registration Data – Phase 1 (Urgent requests) awaiting decision from Board. The Board has expressed concerns with Phase 1 Rec. 18 and they have committed to providing us in writing those concerns and the Council will review that when it comes through.
3. Expiration policy (ERRP/EDDP) was discussed today whether to defer or request policy review.
4. Efficacy of CCOICI was discussed today

1-3 month period ADR pgs. 27-31:

- ICANN holistic review pilot, ownership with ICANN Org. Council to monitor for initiation of ICANN and direct SSC to select representatives
- Planning for ICANN80
- Response to GAC advice at ICANN80
- SSC launch EOI for GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC, ownership of that is with us and assigning to SSC, but will have to confirm.
- SPIRIT ownership Drafting Team/Council. Council as a decision point will approve that charter
- FY26-30: GNSO and Council need to review 5 year strategic plan and determine comment when released
- Delivery of PDP on Transfer Policy Review Initial Report for public comment
- Registration Data Accuracy, check in during ICANN80. Council will have to deliberate the extension that have been provided on those as part of the project list in Puerto Rico

3-6 months period ADR pgs. 32-35:
- EPDP on IDNs Phase 2 ownership with the Council. The Initial Report is currently out for public comment and Council needs to consider the final report.
- Community Consultation on Operational Design Phase: Council to consider a final report published for public comment of two phased review of ODP
- Review and develop response to RPMs PDP Phase 2 Charter deferred and will sit with council consideration of RPMs for deferral. Decision point Council to consider the Charter of a review of UDRP and confirm a start date for this PDP. (Might conflict with RFR as well)
- Consider next steps regarding DNS abuse for gTLDs. Consider what data may need to be collected, pending in that period.
- Council will also have to consider annual report from the GNSO Liaison to the GAC
- Select a new GNSO Council char

6-9 months period ADR pgs. 36-40:
- ICANN Lifecycle of Reviews Project sits with ICANN Org. Council will have to comment on this into a draft revision of specific reviews
- ICANN81 GAC advice
- Selection of the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community
- Reset ADR for 2024-2025 Council Year
- Continuous improvement program cross-community group. Consider comments on that framework around November 2024
- ATRT#4 Council will have to ask SSC to select candidates
- Finally FY26 operating plan and budget will determine if comment is needed as well

Out of Range pgs. 41-44:
- ATRT 3 Implementation

- Security Stability and Resiliency Review #2 once the recommendations are implemented Council will help to monitor for appropriate next steps
- Evolution of multi-stakeholder model, in monitoring mode if there is anything that would come up for Council

Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Vice-Chair, That is how our ADR looks for next 12 months.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, queried if the IRT for IGOs if staff is starting to implement that already?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, replied that once the IRT starts, the Council will appoint a liaison and that will potentially be on the ADR

Action Items:
None

Item 9: GNSO Council Aspirational Statement

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

9.2 - Council Discussion

9.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, raised the SPS idea that we had to develop an aspirational non-binding [statement](#)that Counsilors would not seek to undo bottom up consensus building. A lot of edits were added that made the statement so unwieldy, but the consolidated draft has been sent out. Councilors please look at the revised draft. If you have detailed edits, we may designate this as an idea that was well-intentioned but might not work out, otherwise if we can get it to a place of agreement then we can bring it to a vote in the next couple of meetings.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, stated that in the context of what the board is doing with no standing decision, anything that makes our accountability mechanisms look wobbly and should not proceed.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, was somewhat unclear on the comment, but suggested that Stephanie and everyone add comments to the draft.

Action Items: GNSO Council leadership to resend the latest version to Council and request final comments by 30 May.

Item 10: Any Other Business

10.1 - Update on ICANN80 planning and [GNSO Draft schedule](#) & Prep week schedule

Terri Agnew, ICANN Org, highlighted that the ICANN80 Prep week [schedule](#) is out now and the main schedule will be available starting on 20 May. Tuesday's GNSO Informal Council Session is a closed session. This meeting is for GNSO Councilors and leaders of Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies only. Tomslin has kindly offered to sponsor the GNSO Council dinner, an email was sent to GNSO Councilors only with information and a response is needed. Funded travelers hotel confirmations are still in the works, please be patient and they will be sent out 1-2 weeks prior to travel via email.

Action Items: None.

10.2 - ccNSO & GAC Liaison updates (every three months)

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that we will skip this.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, requested an email for GAC liaison with an exact timeline and when the steps are going to take place.

Action Items: GNSO Council leadership directs staff to provide a timeline for the GAC Liaison selection process (see Item 3 above).

10.3 - SPS Action Item Updates: Recommendation Reports and GNSO Liaisons to WGs

Steve Chan, ICANN org, suggested going to 10.7 due to time constraints

Action Items: None; this item was deferred.

10.7 - [Informal meeting with ICANN Board](#) on Monday, 20 May at 13:00 UTC
Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, highlighted the upcoming meeting with two members of ICANN board:
1. Update on GNSO approved final recs and next steps IDNS EPDP phase 1 and GNSO applicant process where is the board on those recs
2. Next steps for proposed bylaws amendment. GNSO commented last proposed bylaw was inappropriately broad, whether the board will propose new bylaw more closely with REC 7
3. IPC RFR and dismissal based on lack of standing
4. Urgent requests for EPDP on the Temp Spec for gTLD Registration Data

5. Request board liaison(s) for Transfer Policy Review PDP

Susan Payne, IPC, suggested to flag that IGO collective issue is still very much sitting and waiting for implementation in number 1.

Anne Aikman-Scalese, NCA, suggested altering the order of discussion as reflected above.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, cited Jennifer Chung, RySG, saying something similar in the chat and agreed to the alteration. Requested any other topics in the interim be sent to leadership. Noted the webinar is strongly encouraged for all Council members.

10.4 - [Call for Volunteers](#) - Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Implementation Review Team (PPSAI)

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, highlighted that a call for volunteers will be out this week, this is critical to get restarted. This is not a traditional IRT, instead the group will be considering preliminary questions on the status of the work and whether the IRT can proceed with recommendations as written or if part or all needs to go back to Council. IRT liaison will bring back conclusions to consider.

Action Items: None.

10.5 - Transfer Policy Working Group Letter from Chair

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted the letter from Roger Carney as chair of Transfer Policy Working Group. There has been a consistent representation from registrars and registries, however other stakeholder participation has dropped off. He stressed to Councilors that this work is in a critical stage and being able to flag issues of concern for constituencies while the work is going on, rather than in public comment is really important. Also, he will raise with the Board that they need to appoint a liaison to the transfer policy

Action Items: GNSO Councilors to convey the message to their groups concerning the importance of participation in the TPR PDP Working Group.

10.6 - Pre-ICANN80 GNSO Policy Webinar on Tuesday, 21 May at 21:00 UTC - Note: GNSO Councilor Attendance is mandatory

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted the date and time and that Attendance is Mandatory!

Action Items: Staff to resend the invite to the GNSO Council.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, noted that 10.3 was skipped and will be deferred to the next meeting.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, adjourned the meeting at 05:57 UTC

The next GNSO Council meeting will take place at ICANN80 in Kigali on Wednesday 12 June at 11:45 UTC.