

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 12 March 2025

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 12 March 2025 at 20:15 UTC: [Event Time Announcer - GNSO Council Meeting](#) 13:15 Los Angeles; 16:15 Washington DC; 20:15 London; 21:15 Paris; 23:15 Moscow; 07:15 Melbourne (Friday)

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Anne Aikman Scalese

Contracted Parties House

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

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz(apology, Proxy to Samantha Demetriou), 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, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Peter Akinremi (in case of connectivity, proxy to Julf Helsingius), 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:

Roger Carney, Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group - Chair

ICANN Staff:

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 Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Sr. Coordinator (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 09 January 2025 were posted on 26 January 2025.

[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 13 February 2025 were posted on 03 March 2025

Manju Chen, NCSG, updated that she left her previous employment.

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 this was skipped as it was previously done during prep week.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, outlined the consent agenda and moved to a vote

Confirm the GNSO Standing Committee on Continuous Improvement (SCCI) Leadership Team

Acknowledgment of the appointment of Greg DiBiase to seat 13 on the ICANN Board.

[Vote Results](#)

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, thanked and congratulated Greg's appointment to the Board on behalf of the IPC.

Item 4: COUNCIL VOTE - Final Report from the Transfer Policy Review ("TPR") Policy Development Process ("PDP") Working Group

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Osvaldo Novoa, GNSO Council Liaison to the TPR PDP)

4.2 - Council Vote (voting threshold: supermajority)

4.3 - Next Steps

Osvaldo Novoa, GNSO Council Liaison to the TPR PDP, read the [resolved clauses](#).

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, gave a statement on behalf of the NCSG. The NCSG appreciates the consideration given to issues of importance to the non-commercial community by the transfer policy review, working group. Even though not all of their comments were fully accepted, they were satisfied that the recommendations included in the final report streamline and facilitate the transfer processes. They recognized that the security and integrity of the transfer policy remains a key issue for all stakeholders, including the NCSG. Although security begins with registry account protection, this rightfully remains outside the scope of transfer policy. The NCSG called on all stakeholders in the domain name management environment to strengthen cybersecurity, protection, both internally by applying robust cybersecurity practices and for their customers by offering services like multi-factor authentication, and for public facing actors like registrars, to publicize how they are enhancing their security practices, and

offering. So registrants can make informed decisions when selecting a registrar that meets their needs. She thanked the working group and the Council for their consideration.

[Vote Results](#)

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, thanked the TPR team that improved the security and interoperability of the DNS and gave the floor to Roger Carney.

Roger Carney, TPR WG Chair, thanked staff for their support throughout the PDP process.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, raised the human rights checklist given the new tool available Council is suggesting that Roger Carney and the NCPH members report back to Council after reviewing this checklist. Going forward it will be incorporated into the Latin Diacritics PDP, but Council would like to review the checklist for this TPR PDP as well.

Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Next Steps for Registration Data Accuracy

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

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, introduced the topic and sent out an accuracy framing assignment for the various groups of ICANN for what they believed and outlined their input in the [slides](#). He proceeded to open the floor for discussion.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, asked if commencing a small team and if Councilors had any other suggestions.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that it is open, but a small team would be the best way to synthesize the information available.

Susan Payne, IPC, outlined that in their meeting with the GAC and there is a perception that the Council is stalling and not treating this sufficiently and importantly and wants to be seen as taking this

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, GAC Board discussion this impression was answered by the Board in that the GNSO is waiting for the answers to the survey and they have not arrived on time. Council has assured them that we will look at this before the Prague meeting

Sam Demetriou, RySG, volunteered.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, proposed getting started immediately to outline the scope of the small team.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, suggested that we get this socialized from the small team prior to Prague to ease the communication as there was some frustration.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, suggested the Council be clear in its communication that accuracy is not the solution to the issue of cybercrime or abuse. It has nothing to do, there can be heavily validated and abused tlds. These developments are only a part of the puzzle.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, suggested Council cannot solve all cybercrime problems through ICANN and through accuracy.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that this speaks to question 2 if a PDP is suited for what the issue may be.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, in the chat, volunteered for the small team

Vivek Goyal, BC, there is not a solution to all cybercrime in the world, but it is the small solution to help fight this. Whatever Council can do, we should do it in our small capacity.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, will work to put out the call for volunteers and noted staff had started compiling information about this topic.

Action Items: GNSO Councilors directs staff to call for volunteers for a small team that looks into the registration data accuracy assignment input (and other relevant information) in more detail. Volunteers during the meeting were: Damon Ashcraft, Greg DiBiase and Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - EPDP Phase 1 on the Temporary Specification - Implementation

Question re: Billing Contact

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

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, introduced the topic and parsed down potential paths of an IRT making a determination of the policy without an explicit policy recommendation without the 2013 RAA. He stated the following options for discussion

1. A motion agreeing with the IRT determination but making it very clear that this will not serve as a precedent of superseding other contractual or policy obligations.
2. Acknowledgement that this work should be brought up in a subsequent PDP, but suggesting a compliance deferral until this work is started.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, opened the floor to try to get consensus on the best path forward.

Manju Chen, NCSG, stated concern with procedural issues, but could not pinpoint where this was discussed during the EPDP phase 1 and thanks to Farzaneh's research, overall NCSG supports the first option.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, commended Farzi for her work on research.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, is uncomfortable with the first issue, seeing where it is discussed and not where policy was reached. IPC is concerned procedurally Council is a manager of the process and this group did not reach a final determination. Some colleagues may disagree on that which could offer a compromise. Compliance said we can do this. No registrars will be impacted if we do number 2. In IPC meeting one of the members in the EPDP did not recall this conversation.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, registrar position agrees with option 1 as ideal, willing to compromise on option 2. This is just a procedural concern to have this motion to cite the IRT determination. If that is amenable and not relitigated. Registrar group would prefer option 1 but could compromise on option 2

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, is willing to do more research on this, but the conversation was with ICANN legal about changing the contract and those conversations happened and although it was many years ago but it was not just a discussion. NCSG is not going to compromise on this. If we can discuss it in a further PDP and say billing contact should not be collected and it cannot be relitigated.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, interjected that if there were to be a compliance deferral it could not be from the Council, but that would have to come from the Board. These options were reviewed with Council leadership and support staff, but the compliance deferrals come from the Board.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, discussed the findings from the ISPCP and the discussion there. He stated that there is specific language in the RAA 2013 with the escrow specification that requires billing contact data. Then there was the registration data policy that overrules what is in the RAA without the need to change it formally. What was omitted from the EPDP was to explicitly mention the billing contact data. If it had been, it would have said the billing contact data should neither be collected nor put in escrow. No registrar is looking at or using this data. It is a useless data element. Nonetheless the Council needs to look at both the procedural and substantive aspects. On the substantive element, Thomas disagreed with Damon's position that this is data that you cannot justify for processing in GDPR, as no one was using it and the fact that you do not find it in the registration data policy. There was no legal justification for it to be collected, therefore it was excluded. This was explicitly mentioned for others, but this but for billing contact was a drafting error. The consensus of the ISPCP was that we should not require the additional collection of this data due to the drafting error. Procedurally the Council should be pragmatic and come to an agreement. Therefore ISPCP is in favor of using option 1.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, concerned about procedure and was grateful for the links Farzi concluded, but felt it was not conclusive. There was not the same sense of that was conclusive. Questioned: What does the term in option 1 "IRT determination" mean? In what form did that come?

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, IRT thought it was a drafting error.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, universal consensus on IRT that this was a drafting error, can we proceed by saying this was a drafting error or not.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, queried one member raised from the EPDP was the case where the tld goes out of business, there could be relevant information out of this escrow with a subpoena.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, answered if one goes bankrupt it will be the gaining or succeeding registrar or registry stakeholder, but he was not aware of any case.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, stated it is not going to be option two, but we are going to agree to it before we do option 2. Personally she believed that option two was better procedurally.

Daman Ashcraft, IPC, would welcome a compromise to work with the registrar and thanked Thomas for his comments.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, stated it would be nice to get this done, this is going to be homework to the Board and it seems silly. No one is waiting for this billing data, there is no reason to have this data. Principles and details are great, but we should move on and agree to option 1.

Vivek Goyal, BC, asked if there was a precedent.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, answered that there have been previous drafting errors

Vivek Goyal, BC, questioned the first sentence that this will be done once, but will not make it a precedent, is this something that has been done before?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, answered that it would not presume that drafting errors are necessarily going to happen.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, noted that concerns with option one shows the unique circumstances of this EPDP was working on. This TPR there were drafting errors and could have benefitted from longer discussions and there just was not the time. There has been a temp spec once in ICANN history and there was an accelerated timeline meeting in August and a final report in February. TPR took four years in contrast. There is a way to tailor the motion to alleviate the concern for precedent.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, thanked Caitlin for the concept of a precedent of not being able to go back and correct errors if errors emerge. The focus this week has been on getting work done efficiently and if Council can take care of this quickly, acknowledging it was a drafting error and correct it. She has previously noted that billing contact was clearly in scope as it was in the charter. The recommendations

in the final report addressed the question of what data elements should be collected by the registrar that then informs what goes into escrow, which did not explicitly mention billing contact or admin contact. Everyone agreed that admin contact is now eliminated. There is no admin contact. Billing contact is not unique in this from the EPDP. Registries agree that the preferred path forward is option 1, they are open to compromise on option 2 with Greg's suggested guardrails.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, noted that NCSG does not have a compromise, but would like to reword the motion for rewording precedence.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that the proposed text was a rough draft of the option.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, noted that the temp spec was an immediate reaction to the GDPR and was an exercise the temp spec before the EPDP registrars stopped collecting certain data elements to honor the principle of domain EPAC ICANN sued on this and the courts held the view that this data element should not be collected. Unlike other privacy regimes GDPR is a general prohibition unless you find a reason to process it. So the report being silent means that it cannot be collected. The team tested for every purpose for the needs of the registrant and the billing contact was not amongst those, and acknowledged that it was done in a rush.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, Sam provided a solution in compromising by having the second approach to assess the IRT determination to have a strong look at all the proceedings of the IRT and confirm the IRT assessment, along with what Caitlin said.

Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG, agreed with Thomas coming to the initial point that a non-outcome is a very clear outcome. She volunteered to help draft motion 1.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, has had a number of robust discussions about this matter. Some unclarity around the datasets that we are talking about. Is there a definition for billing contact or other datasets to intelligently determine it should no longer be collected. There appeared to be some interest around the situation where billing contact is no longer collected if it is not needed. But the language in option1 has to do with the process. Process precedent that is not the BC does not have a strong position until some clarity is given around what is being done away with. BC would want to comfortably stay with the second option.

Manju Chen, NCSG, there was a fourth option for a contract amendment which was not included because it would be too difficult, suddenly it is not as difficult

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated the registrar perspective, it is not that it is difficult, it is not a tool of Council. That is something apart from what Council can do here, but contracted parties were concerned about the scope of a contractual amendment.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that next meeting this will move to a vote for leadership to propose a motion on this issue to try to get resolution.

Susan Payne, IPC, this is a motion on option 1 or option 2.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that option 1 has more support. We need to take some type of vote or Council can respond to the proposed motion, but we need to move on.

Vivek Goyal, BC, queried if option 1 was going to be redrafted and circulated before the vote.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that Council will circulate a drafted motion.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, option 2 the second one being what Sam had talked about being the possibility of compliance deferral and a later assessment of the IRT determination. It would be great if Council has an alternate motion.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, thanked Anne and said that it would be taken to think through the best way to present it.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, said on the balance there is more favor for option 1 rather than looking at 2 motions, we attempt to incorporate feedback of two into option 1 if it turns out we cannot get comfortable with that.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, thanked Sam for the proposal and noted that Caitlin is working on this topic already. Note that Council has a starting point and should move past this issue.

Action Items: GNSO Council leadership directs staff to draft a motion along the lines of Option 1 for leadership to review by 26 March: A motion agreeing with the IRT determination but making it very clear that this will not serve as a precedent of superseding other contractual or policy obligations.

Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION: Update on Trilateral Meeting on Urgent Requests

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

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, introduced the topic and updated Council on what was discussed in the November meeting and next steps for Council on urgent requests. There was agreement on GAC and GNSO and IRT is appropriate to work on the urgent requests timeline issue. An email in February where the GGP was suggested as well. But because we had already sent a letter to the GAC it was not the right time to go back on that. ICANN Board confirmed its alignment to go to the IRT for the urgent request timeline issue. GAC, GNSO, and PSWG agreed that authentication work is needed and the PSWG and that the work is progressing, but implementation will take some time. Council emphasized that it needs to be broader community discussion. There was a call for volunteers and a number of Councilors

volunteered. Where that work is at, the PSWG has engaged EUROPOL and INTERPOL looking at next steps and meetings bi-weekly to develop a set of feasible authentication options and publish a high level summary of progress after each meeting.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, as a member of the team emphasized that this not a small team or a PDP or an ICANN thing it is a PSWG and other law enforcement thing to invite us to make sure they capture everything as they think of a solution. Seb advised they get together with tech ops to ensure that this is in line.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, leadership understands that from the conversations and the GAC communications that the input from the PSWG on the authentication mechanism will be put to the IRT to use that to discuss the urgent request timeline issue. In the event that there was additional work that came out of the registration data policy rather than the authentication work that the PSWG is doing that relates to policy that will be handled separately from the IRT.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, reiterated that the authentication mechanism needs to come into the IRT for review and advocated proceeding in parallel with the authentication mechanism. It is more efficient to proceed this way in parallel.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted that Anne raised good question in her email about the status of rec 18 is still pending and the IRT has never ended. Council agrees with the issue of timeline and IRT will likely review that and noting that other issues may arise, but will be identified as they may arise.

Manju Chen, NCSG, questioned if it is given back to the IRT it will not change the original policy recommendation?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded, correct, it was an open question that is left to implementation but the policy is set.

Manju Chen, NCSG, asked what conditions changed to expect a different outcome.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded in initial discussion the thought was the lack of authentication would add time to the review requests. Can we think of a timeline for urgent requests going through an authentication mechanism that has yet to be invented.

Manju Chen, NCSG, queried, based on an imaginary promise.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, clarified a promise in progress of being developed.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, asked who is the Council liaison for the IRT

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, answered Thomas Rickert

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, put on the record for the technical PSWG, NCSG is worried that they go to the territory of policy and if that happens, then we flag it and bring it back here. Additionally there will be policy about how the system is used and asked if we have the mandate to discuss that for access or terms of use and how that is set up. How to send documents and what is required etc. the PSWG will set that up.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that Council do not have the answers, but Council will participate in that discussion and if policy issues arise Council will address them.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, will flag whatever is policy and then decide what is within Council mandate.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, replied that is his understanding.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, believes it goes beyond that in that LEA work on authentication should then the proposed system needs to come formally into the IRT as GAC PSWG is not a formal body and it has to come into the IRT and Council letter to the Board.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, one part that is known is we will have to accept it.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, noted that she does not think that the LEA authentication system the IRT is required to be accepted as proposed. Especially if LEA and PSWG disagree, she hopes that the IRT is open.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded, yes the review is open.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, she is not sure that IRT is required to review the authentication mechanism as the policy itself does not dictate does not mean that it will have to respond, it is a tool that will help registrars assess but it is left to the specific company itself. It is not up to the policy or implementation arm to get involved. Concern is that it will take a long time.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, did not want to imply that registrars wouldn't be making their determination yet.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, authentication process has to do with the related timeline, cited by Becky Burr that the timeline for triggering events of 24 hours might be too long. If authentication triggers a short timeline by the IRT, it will have to look at authentication to make sure the timelines correlate properly with authentication.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, Council will draft a letter, but the idea of a letter to ICANN is agreed.

Action Items: GNSO Council leadership directs staff to draft a letter for review requesting ICANN org to reconvene the IRT to review the Urgent Requests timeline.

Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION: Outcomes of Strategic Planning Session

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

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, introduced Caitlin Tubergen of ICANN org.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, shared and discussed the following [slides](#).

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, asked about slide 3 and noted it has a lot of implications for the Board readiness small team to also have it go to that team to discuss.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, agreed.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, thought that it is potentially part of continuous improvement for adopting a recommendation for the SCCI as another possible avenue for approaching this.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, maybe this is better answered by SCCI but there is some feeling amongst board readiness small team would go back into SCII but maybe Maju would like to add.

Manju Chen, NCSG, is patiently awaiting board readiness so we do not want to rush their work.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, noted that this a fairly discrete task and it maybe does not need to be sent to a small team and can remain with Council. Leadership and staff will formulate something to document procedure and where the mechanism will be memorialized. Staff and leadership will work together to propose it to the Council to consider without going to a subteam.

Action Items:

1. Councilors to agree on high-level outcomes and actions from the SPS including the drafting of procedure for non-adopted PDP recommendation, as well as exploring options for memorializing the procedure in relevant documents.
2. Support Staff to then produce an action plan and start progressing on these items.

Item 9: Any Other Business

9.1 - [GNSO Chair Election Timeline](#) Announcement

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, dropped the following [link](#) in the chat for important dates:

9.2 - Update from the GNSO Informal Internet Governance Tracking Group

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, noted the efforts of the informal GNSO Internet governance group and highlighted several outreach activities during ICANN82. The group reached out to the ccNSO IGLC (Internet Governance Liaison Committee) Co-chairs and informed their working group about this informal group's existence. Additionally, there have been informal discussions with members of GAC IG informal group. The GAC informal IG group consists of 48 members working on this matter, so far. The GAC has also held a dedicated Internet governance webinar on the WSIS+20, which other government members found useful.

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, Furthermore, an AC/SO informal discussion group, consisting of ICANN staff and some GNSO representatives, is working to enhance coordination. Bruna is one of them and Tony Holmes but they may be seeking additional GNSO members to improve engagement and we, the informal group, may send an email to facilitate closer collaboration on Internet governance matters.

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, Registration is now open for the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), which will take place in June in Norway as part of the WSIS+20 process. The IGF is an outcome of this WSIS process, fully embracing a multistakeholder approach to Internet governance. Councilors and the broader community are encouraged to participate. Councilors are also advised to reach out to Desiree, Anne, Jen, Farzi, Seb for further engagement. Special thanks were extended to Seb for coordinating GAC involvement with this informal team.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked which list it will be sent to.

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, responded it will be the full Council list.

Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG, queried what is the point of representation of GNSO in WSIS group and why does Council need more GNSO representation.

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, replied this came up yesterday stating that this group meets on a monthly basis whether they wish to see any more bodies on this discussion group. It is also an informal group

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, thanked her for summarizing the ideas for the group and what they were thinking about. It is an informal group and are trying to be lightweight as possible many groups working towards this to alleviate the info gap at the GNSO Council and SGs/Cs we can bring this information back to Councilors and constituencies and nothing is meant to make it more confusing or complexities

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, it would be great for GNSO to have a strong presence to strengthen comms and to tell them what is being done in Council.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, tell everyone be careful what you write and say, things that are maybe internally could be different externally to cool down the situation.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, agreed with Paul, but the ALAC session this morning discussed these issues but Tripti remarked that ICANN is not a political organization and Jen made some great comments about various multistakeholder for an oasis of the governance model and the predominant sentiment of multistakeholderism is don't break the internet. Thanks Seb Desiree bruna, Farzi etc.

Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG, GNSO nomination, conversation questioned her presence there

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, it is simply adding more members

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, Paul's comment it is important aspect to consider and method that she uses is to emphasize the important role of multistakeholder model approach to keep the internet open and running all these years to bring people online through this approach as opposed to other method of governance and that is one method we can use. Also talk about GNSO achievements doing policy and domain names contributing to security of DNS and enabled access to domain names globally so that we can think about and message to discuss and redirect the conversation from whatever is said to why we are doing this and how to strengthen the multistakeholder model.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, thanked Anne for the oasis quote. GNSO Council is bottom up policymaking. She noted it should keep doing its work, but tell people in plain language what we do. Exactly what we make policy on and then translate how to bring this into negotiations leveraged through our PR officer and use real impact use cases. PR our successes so people understand what we are doing. The informal is important and the formal will be helpful with ICANN org iterations.

9.3 - Accuracy Scoping Deferral Expiration

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, we had deferred and are picking up that work had expired but now we are working on accuracy.

9.4 - Open Mic

Meeting Adjourned 15:02