

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 10 April 2025

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 10 April 2025 at 21:00 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/5bsuykt5>
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)

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Greg DiBiase, Prudence Malinki

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal (apologies, proxy to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts), Osvaldo Novoa (apologies, proxy to Thomas Rickert), Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii (apologies, proxy to Julf Helsingius), Bruna Martins dos Santos (apologies, proxy to Manju Chen), Julf Helsingius, Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Peter Akinremi, Manju Chen

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests: none

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) (apologies)

John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO)

[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 13 February 2025 were posted on 03 March 2025

[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 12 March 2025 were posted on 01 April 2025

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, requested an update on the work with NCSG and Transfers Policy Review for the Human Rights Checklist in AOB.

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](#).

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that the transfer policy will soon be going to the Board after the Council voted to send the TPR recommendations. The Council will also be reviewing the backlog of WHOIS procedure implementation advisory group.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- [GNSO Review of the GAC Communiqué](#)
- [Recommendations Report](#) for the Transfer Policy Review PDP

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Vice-Chair, moved to the vote.

All Councilors present voted in favor.

[Vote Results](#)

Action Items:

1. On behalf of the GNSO Council Chair, the GNSO Secretariat communicates the GNSO Council Review of ICANN82 GAC Communiqué Issues of Importance to the ICANN Board. [COMPLETED]
2. On behalf of the GNSO Council, the GNSO Secretariat requests that the GNSO Liaison to the GAC also informs the GAC of the communication between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. [COMPLETED]
3. On behalf of the GNSO Council, the GNSO Secretariat to transmit the report to the ICANN Board and communicate the outcomes from the GNSO Council's decision as appropriate. [COMPLETED]

Item 4: COUNCIL VOTE - Confirmation of EPDP on Temporary Specification Team's Intent to Modify RAA Requirements Related to Billing Contact

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, introduced the topic, which has been discussed over multiple Council meetings. Motion written in the direction that the majority of Councilors wanted to move in. While this may not be a perfect solution, a vote is needed after five months of discussion.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, read the [resolved clauses](#) and asked for statements or comments.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, put on record that the BC had additional discussions and dataset for billing contact is not used in enforcement of abuse cases. This is different from billing information for domains. Some BC members have decided to revise its stance although it remains a concern for precedence.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, stated that IPC would be voting no and read the following statement from the IPC: “The IPC appreciates opposing viewpoints and research that was done on this topic. While the topic of billing data collection may have been discussed during the PDP, no decision was reached or recorded and we’re simply not comfortable with characterizing this omission as a drafting error and thus effectively having Council amend a section of the RAA. Thank you again for the discussion and vote.”

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, moved to a vote.

IPC members Susan Payne and Damon Ashcraft voted against the motion. All remaining Councilors voted in favor of the motion.

[Vote Results](#)

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, thanked Councilors for the hard work on this that was a novel issue that was supplemented by well thought out input.

Action Items: The GNSO Council requests GNSO Support Staff to inform the ICANN org Global Domain Services Team of this motion.

Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Aspirational Statement Review

Here, the Council will discuss the [draft aspirational statement](#) and determine next steps.

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

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Sam Demetriou, RySG, gave background on the aspirational statement with the goals to (i) reinforce the Council’s role as manager of PDP and (ii) help socialize the unique role of GNSO councilors with its Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. In contrast, the aspirational statement is not designed to limit the actions of Councilors, nor is it meant to be binding or a voting directive.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, explained her edits to the documents given the past iterations were unable to reach Council agreement. She noted that she incorporated the “aspirational” part as discussed at the SPS, to advance good progress on being effective PDP managers.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, queried for additional clarity regarding what the aspirational statement will help Council achieve when some groups have directed voting.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, replied that the aspirational statement was not meant to change a) the way individual stakeholder groups or constituencies direct or do not direct their Councilors to vote, and b) it does not take the place of any supplemental statements that a group would want to submit in conjunction with any specific vote. Such as the IPC just did with its vote this meeting. This statement is meant to be a description of the way the Council operates for anyone curious to know about the GNSO Council operates as descriptive rather than prescriptive. This should not change or influence stakeholders.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted paragraph three the “strive” to support recommendations, which allows for circumstances that Councilors could be instructed to vote otherwise.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, stated that he likes the statement and emphasized it is aspirational and it should be adopted. It is okay that Council will not always achieve this, but it is an important goal to have.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted support in the chat. Stated that this work is complete and will be voted on in the May meeting.

Action Items: GNSO Council leadership to add to the Council May meeting agenda for a vote. [added on Council Meeting Agenda planning google doc]

Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Han Script Single Character gTLDs (Recommendation 3.17)

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Policy Team Supporting the GNSO)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, introduced the topic.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, shared a detailed background with the following [slides](#).

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, queried when the majority of public comments opposed moving forward, if they opposed moving forward on the basis of the risk of confusion.

Susan Payne, IPC, responded that yes, that was the general tenor of the comments. It is all very complex and it needed more work, was the high-level summary of comments.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, added that there were concerns about Chinese linguistic laws and regulations, the complexities of Chinese character ideographs and end user confusion. He then proceeded with the [slides](#).

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, concluded that there are advantages and disadvantages for both GGP and EWG. From the staff perspective the GGP seems to be more appropriate. However, it may be helpful for the Council to find an alternative of perhaps finding an expert party of the replacement of the CJK and sending it back to the IRT as it was envisioned.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, queried if this is a dependency for the next round.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, confirmed it is not a dependency for the next round.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, asked what the status is if a solution is not found. Would the default be to not proceed with single character Han script TLDs?

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, answered that from the staff's perspective that it will not impact the next round. Second, eventually it cannot be left out in the open, the Council will have to make some decision, but it is open to deliberation on what that decision may look like.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted the third option from the conclusion where a different CJK is identified for this issue and queried who would identify that.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, answered in the context that she knows. The language generation panels are convened to come up with RZ-LGR for Han Script, not to help with policy or implementation. It is correct what you see on slide 8, but the individuals who are experts will still be the CJK. It will not be the vehicle of the CJK GP, but the experts from that group will still be the people performing this work.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, added that the parties that would be in a good position to identify the specifics would be ICANN staff like Sarmad and his team that support UA and IDNs for ICANN. Also community experts like Jen Chung and Michael Bauland would be good to identify the experts to perform this work.

Manju Chen, NCSG, asked how the alternative party would work. Does the IRT have the authority and what mechanism are they following to conduct this work and what is the procedure? Is the Council still considering the GGP or EWG? Is it going to be under the IRT or does it need a name for the alternative party?

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, responded practically that relying on staff and community experts to identify the experts. The decision on who that party might be would then be formally communicated back to the IRT and continue with the CJK GPs and continue with the new party. For governance they would report to implementations.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, echoed Manju's point about the structure and governance of the group and she added concerns about what the specific ask of this group would be. It would complete the work in 3.17, but in reading that it seems the work has been done. The panels did the work of conducting an assessment. What is the specific ask of this new group? She added that if the ask is to make assessments about semantic ambiguities, is that really something under the purview of what ICANN should be doing, when there are mechanisms baked into new gTLD processes based on string similarities etc.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, responded that the background of what has occurred already is that the implementation was not completed. Public comment came in and disagreed with the outcome and one of the co-chairs of the Chinese generation panel stated that the existing work was not fit for purpose. The work under 3.17 was not completed under the RZ-LGR. The recommendation 3.17 discussed the CJK panels providing guidelines and no additional work was undertaken.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, noted from the chat question from Justine Chew: "is the default position: until such time that we have such guidance for Han single characters, applications for such strings will not be accepted?"

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, noted in chat that Latin Script Diacritics is doing something similar on AGB and should not be treated as rejected, but put on hold and that could be the same for this situation as well.

Additional discussion of how we get things done and guidelines on how we need to implement this. This is not further policy development. We need a lightweight mechanism to address this implementation guidance and then move on.

Justine Chew, ALAC, agreed in the chat.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, asked if Council necessarily has to be involved in managing this process? If Council goes with the two options, it will be whether or not Council needs control and that will drive the outcome of the process. If it is not policy development we will not need to control the process..

Susan Payne, IPC, raised the issue that has not been discussed that the IDNs-EPDP does not work because they tasked the right people with the wrong title. Is there a role here to send this back to IDNs-EPDP to amend recommendation and come up with a different solution? Given that they only recently wrapped up can we send this back to that group and ask them to look at this again?

Justine Chew, ALAC, spoke from the perspective of IDNs-EPDP former vice-chair to provide additional context. She stated that IDNs-EPDP came out with a recommendation and requested CJK GP to develop the guidelines. The CJK GP stated that they did not need to produce guidelines, given that the RZ-LGR is sufficient. Then public comment came back and said this is wrong and that explains the issue Council has now.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, offered a specific name of an expert party for the ICANN Bylaws. Expert Advisory Panels under Section 13 of the Bylaws. Section 13.1 “The purpose of seeking external expert advice is to allow the policy-development process within ICANN to take advantage of existing expertise that resides in the public or private sector but outside of ICANN. In those cases where there are relevant public bodies with expertise, or where access to private expertise could be helpful, the Board and constituent bodies should be encouraged to seek advice from such expert bodies or individuals.” This could be where it could be officially housed for a governance structure and then it can funnel into the IRT to perform the work and final implementation. He noted that this is new information and if Council wants to look at that specific mechanism, staff can do additional research on this.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, raised **Manju Chen’s, NCSG**, question in the chat about the difference between the EWG and 13.1.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, responded Expert Advisory Panel is in the bylaws and EWG is a made up mechanism that has been used one time and was convened at the request of the then-CEO of ICANN.

Susan Payne, IPC, stated that the EWG may then have been a bit of a red-herring in the discussion of EWG or GGP.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, in the chat: “Better a documented process than a non-documented one.”

Justine Chew, ALAC, in the chat “So the options are (1) GGP, (2) EAP or (3) decline to act on public comment.”

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, added a 4th option where staff and community can identify the experts to develop the guidelines.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, added that as a result we should take back this discussion and refine these options. Council and leadership to refine options and have Councilors discuss with constituencies.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, requested a chart for differences between options discussed today.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, advocated for an email ahead of time as well would be helpful to take this to respective groups given the complexity of the issue.

Steve Chan, ICANN Org, asked in the chat for a clarification on Justine's chat. "I just wanted to follow up on this point: (3) decline to act on public comment. Can you please clarify what this means?"

Justine Chew, ALAC, responded in the chat: "@Steve, firstly I was merely listing the options as I heard them during the discussion and in chat. Secondly, specifically to your question on "(3) decline to act on public comment" - means exactly what it says. Perhaps Councilors would still require "expert advice" of some sort to arrive at this option, so perhaps consider option (3) as being not mutually exclusive to (1) or (2)."

Action Items: GNSO Council leadership and staff to refine the options and create a comparison chart for the Council to consider.

Item 7: COUNCIL UPDATE: Registration Data Request Service

- 7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Sebastien Ducos, Chair of RDRS Standing Committee)
- 7.2 - Council Discussion
- 7.3 - Next Steps

Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, presented the following [slides](#).

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, advised Councilors to take note of the open question whether the report should be published for public comment or should it come to Council first prior to that. He added that Farzaneh noted in the chat that public comment is always a good idea.

Action Items: Leadership, with assistance from GNSO Support Staff, to follow up with the Council regarding the question of if the RDRS Findings Report should have a public comment period.

Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION: Next Steps for Whois Implementation Advisory Group

- 8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)
- 8.2 - Council Discussion
- 8.3 - Next Steps

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, shared the [slides](#) as a recap from the GNSO prep webinar on the WHOIS Implementation Advisory Group.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, stated that given the options on slide 4 and reconsidering the procedure is whether the procedure should actually exist. Given that, RySG would need full opinion, but her initial reaction to the second bullet point to defer until RDRS has been in effect for a specific period of time, then ICANN org could go through and see if there is a WHOIS exceptions procedure. This might be a good way to approach this and then she could consult with contracted parties to see if there is a need for WHOIS exceptions to continue to exist.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, recalled needing to ask ICANN for permission to be compliant with requirements for local privacy law. There was also some expert opinion needed for why you could not follow ICANN requirements. He thought this was absurd, and asked: can we just do away with this? He thinks the new specification is a good strawman to work on to keep some flexibility that does not speak to who the controller or processor is, but ICANN cannot force anyone to be in breach of your local laws. This could be a lot of community resources for this exercise that should be stopped if it can.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked Thomas what new policies superseded this that had given contracted parties flexibility?

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, the outcome of EPDP Phase 1 the data protection policy

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, agreed with Thomas that even the name of the group is antiquated and the stakeholder group needs to discuss it because NCSG is for the privacy of the domain name registrant and some of the issues that arise from publishing private sensitive data. She personally believed that with the reg data policy some of these issues have been solved in some ways. She will check further with her group.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that leadership would follow up with an email and asked Councilors to consult with their respective groups.

Action Items: Support Staff to send a follow-up message to Council, outlining potential next steps for Councilors to socialize with their groups.

Item 9: Any Other Business

9.1 - Update on ICANN83 Planning and [GNSO Draft Schedule](#)

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, went through the ICANN83 planning and scheduling. She reminded Councilors that the 8th of April was an email for funded travelers. She emphasized that the deadline for air travel is the 15th of April. Attached in that email the funded traveler email is the registration link.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, asked if the first Council meeting is with the GAC?

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, answered yes, because there is no workshop there are no weekend meetings.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, discussed how in Seattle, Council could have benefited with more time beforehand to meet with the GAC, but he would defer to leadership.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, agrees, leadership will figure out a way to address that.

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, proposed GNSO Council Webinar on 20th of May, but was concerned for further developments before then.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, would like a better solution and proposed meeting in person beforehand.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, noted the off-topic sentiment that GAC felt Council was not answering their questions and requests. She proposed that Council has to be clear and direct that their requests will be considered carefully and consider the interest and comments from diverse communities and then respond to them. She added that just because they are dissatisfied does not mean that Council is not doing its work. When it comes to thorny issues of DNS abuse or accuracy, it does not mean that Council can come to a quick conclusion. Council should think about how to tell the GAC how Council works and the work that the small teams are doing on these topics.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, agreed with that and noted in the chat that Council needs to have agenda and topics earlier. He added that leadership and GAC have a meeting in the last week of April to get feedback before Council meets.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, noted ample time to arrive at the agenda with the GAC before each public meeting. There is a major job with Seb to build the bridge, it is not like the issues brought by the GAC catches Council by surprise, there is time for some communication between both parties. But going to the GAC saying the same thing over and over again makes the process look tired.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, replied that Seb along with leadership and staff will work on that.

Action Items: GNSO Council leadership and staff to work with the GAC to develop ICANN83 topics early, and not later than 20 May.

9.2 - [WSIS+20](#) and internet governance discussions

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, updated Council on developments from WSIS+20 informal group and requested Councilor support on three points. 1) She shared that members of the informal group met with the GAC during ICAN82, it was a constructive exchange and she would share meeting notes shortly pending confirmation from their informal group. 2) The team has been working on a WSIS+20 mapping document that aligns key areas of GNSO work with WSIS action lines as it is structured through 11 or 18 action lines and is intended to support the Council's engagement in WSIS+20 and its related Internet governance discussions. The informal team believes it would be valuable not just internally, but as a resource to the GAC, ccNSO, IGLC and others as they prepare their contributions that they are considering in the WSIS+20 review process. The GAC in particular has expressed interest in using it for their preparations and they are also preparing a second webinar for their work after their first on Internet governance. She stated that she reported back at the Council meeting in Seattle and would appreciate the Council's review of the draft sent to the mailing list so it can be shared more broadly. 3) She requested that the Council appoints a new represented from their informal group to the SOAC informal ICANN discussion group, because the group has been active since September 2024 and regretfully Brun who previously represented Council has stepped down. She would like to ensure a continued GNSO presence and she will leave it to leadership and GNSO to decide how to coordinate in that space. In sum the aim was to both share the updates and better understand how Council is engaging with the broader WSIS+20 efforts.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, clarified if they were seeking input on the mapping exercise?

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, replied yes. The sooner the better so that it can be shared with the two informal groups, next week would be nice, or by the 21st of April.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked if the 18th of April would work?

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, answered yes.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked staff if there is a formal mechanism for picking the volunteer. He confirmed it was an email to call for volunteers.

Action Items: Farzaneh Badii to volunteer for the WSIS+20 group on the GNSO Council list and staff to inform the group's administrative support.

Update: The Informal IG group have decided to send in Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans (appointee) name and Farzaneh Badii (alternate).

9.3 - Latin Diacritics PDP Working Group - Review of [Project Plan](#)

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, updated the Council on the project plan. She also updated the proposal from ICANN82 with the provisional AGB language that there are recommendations pending without implementing a phased approach is "in the bin" and the PDP is looking for other options. This timeframe could be deemed an aggressive PDP and project plan, but the plan is realistic. Initial report made public comment around February 2026 with Final Report around November 2026. Council final recommendations December 2026-January 2027.

Action Items: Support staff to inform the LD PDP WG that the Project Plan has been approved by the GNSO Council by non-objection. [COMPLETED]

9.4 - Standing Committee on Continuous Improvements - Review of Project Plan | [Slides](#)

[SCCI CIP Small Team Assignment form](#)

[SCCI Policy & Implementation PSR Small Team Assignment form](#)

[SCCI PDP3.0 Small Team Assignment form](#)

Julie Hedlund, ICANN org, shared the following [slides](#).

Action Items: Support staff to inform SCCI that the Project Plan and the accompanying assignment forms have been approved by the GNSO Council by non-objection. [COMPLETED]

9.5 - Council review of Assignment Forms for [DNS Abuse](#) and [Accuracy](#) Small Teams

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted one question from GAC whether GAC members could join DNS Abuse small team. He stated that there was a provision where non-Councilors can join teams, but the limitation in the Small Team report notes that they would normally bring expertise. That is something for Council consideration as to whether we want to open this up to outside members or open to observers.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, replied that along with Vivek Goyal they were asked by BC membership and leadership for those outside the Council to join.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, answered from his perspective as Chair that it should be kept to Councilors unless there is some type of important knowledge gap. If one party is let in, given the topic, other parties will want to join and that will hamper efficiency. But ultimately the small team can decide.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, in the chat: "+1 Greg. That could really proliferate. And, the GAC already has their own small team, the PSWG, that gets lots of attention so it isn't like GAC's voice isn't being heard. Maybe we schedule frequent interactions between the DNS Abuse ST and the PSWG?"

Manju Chen, NCSG, agreed with the opinion that NCSG would like to keep the Small Team as only Councilors. Given that meetings are recorded, observers could simply listen to the recordings. She queried if small teams decide on their own membership or if they still have to go back to Council?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, replied that this would be a decision at Council

Sam Demetriou, RySG, agreed with issues raised. She stated that given that this has broad interest, then Council would lose the point of a small team. She advocated engaging in consultations and getting input rather than direct participation by other groups. Queried for feedback from RySG on content of assignment forms if these could be a Google doc for comments and suggestions.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that a Google doc would be more efficient and he would resend it in a Google doc form.

Action Items: Recirculate the assignment forms to the Council as Google docs, to better facilitate the collection of Councilor input. [COMPLETED]

9.6 - Transfer Policy Review HRIA Update

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, added that the NCSG will have a meeting with the TPR chair and the work is moving forward.

Meeting Adjourned 23:02 UTC.