

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 13 February 2025

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 13 February 2025 at 21:00 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/5zh8rb2v>

13:00 Los Angeles; 16:00 Washington DC; 21:00 London; 22:00 Paris; 00:00 Moscow (Friday); 08:00 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, 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, 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:

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance

Peter Eakin, ICANN org

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)

Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO)

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 19 December 2024 were posted on 30 December 2024. [Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 09 January 2025 were posted on 26 January 2025.

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](#).

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, updated his SOI that he has started an agri-tech in Kenya.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, flagged that the work on Transfer Policy has moved to a final report and will be discussed later during today's meeting and will eventually move to voting and hopefully implementation.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- Confirm the GNSO-nominated ICANN Fellowship Program Mentor and Selection Committee Member positions
 - Mentor: Glen De Saint Géry
 - Selection Committee Member: Maud Adjeley Ashong Elliot
- Confirm the Latin Script Diacritics PDP WG Chair
 - Michael Bauland

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, outlined the SSC selection process for the mentor and member and moved to a vote to confirm the PDP WG Chair for Michael Bauland.

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion

[Vote Results](#)

Action Items:

1. The GNSO Council confirms the nomination of Glen De Saint Géry to serve as a 2025 ICANN Fellowship Program Mentor for three consecutive ICANN meetings, beginning with ICANN84. [COMPLETED]
2. The GNSO Council confirms the nomination of Maud Adjeley Ashong Elliot to serve as a 2025 ICANN Fellowship Program Selection Committee Member for six consecutive ICANN meetings, beginning with ICANN84. [COMPLETED]
3. The GNSO Secretariat communicates the resolved #1 and #2 clauses to the staff supporting the ICANN Fellowship Program. [COMPLETED]
4. The GNSO Secretariat informs the appointed candidates that they have been selected. [COMPLETED]
5. The GNSO Secretariat sends a response to those applicants who were not appointed, thanking them for their interest and encouraging them to apply for future opportunities as they arise. [COMPLETED]

6. The GNSO Council confirms the nomination of Michael Bauland to serve as the Latin Script Diacritics PDP WG Chair. [COMPLETED]
7. The GNSO Secretariat informs the appointed candidate that he has been selected. [COMPLETED]
8. The GNSO Secretariat sends a response to those applicants who were not appointed, thanking them for their interest and encouraging them to apply for future opportunities as they arise. [COMPLETED]

Item 4: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Update on ICANN's Enforcement of DNS Abuse Mitigation Requirements - Six Month Progress Update

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance) -

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, gave background on the DNS Abuse small team. They noted that there may be a lack of enforcement mechanism and there was an amendment executed a contract amendment and Leticia is here to update from ICANN compliance for Council to think about to inform about DNS abuse.

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, shared the following [slide presentation](#) and noted that 154 investigations resulted in the suspension of over 2,700 malicious domain names and the disabling of over 350 websites.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, asked in the chat “where can we find details of the ongoing investigations and notice of breach?”

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, replied that reports on ICANN Contractual Compliance's enforcement of DNS Abuse requirements: <https://compliance-reports.icann.org/dnsabuse.html>

Vivek Goyal, BC, asked to help Council understand what is it that was done differently by ICANN Compliance that made the registry or the registrar take action now as compared to when they directly received the complaint from the party that was being harmed?

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, answered that it depends on the context. She gave the example that if ICANN gets the complaint and it is possible that the registrar is still investigating when ICANN is getting the complaint, so we contact them and they come back to us and say, yeah, complete the investigation. This is the evidence. This is what we did. This is where it's taking us. It has taken us 5, 10 days where we took us so that they confirmed that and that was the suspension was done at that moment. We do have cases where the contacted party did not take the appropriate action when the report was submitted and they do when we initiate the investigation, and where applicable is where they will provide us with the remediation plan because the obligations need to be compliant with without ICANN Compliance intervening.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, asked what the 12% all others meant in the pie chart?

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, answered that it was stopped through a different means it could be for example the domain name was not published, but the requirement to facilitate the report was non-compliant.

Farzaneh Badii, thanked her for the response, but suggested that it is better to clarify the “other category.” Raised that the compliance report is outcome oriented with success factors and we don't

want to incentivize registrars to mitigate DNS abuse by disabling the domain name completely. For transparency reasons it is great that we have a suspension of domain names and how many times the cases have led to suspension. But it needs to be clear to start the conversation on the data for success factors.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, thanked Leticia for the presentation and referred to the accompanying full report which mentioned that ICANN was working on guidance materials for supporting complainants and asked for an update on the development of those materials.

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, replied that there is a section in the report on how there are many complaints that are not actionable and there are different layers for that effort. For example, action was already taken with ccTLDs and those complaints are invalid and then provide the information on where to go and why they cannot address it. So, we have certain low-hanging fruit actions that we already took. There is a big one, which is making sure that we produce an easy-to-follow, easy-to-read guide for those coming to us for help, so hopefully that can improve the communication and resolution time.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, noted that she understand that the goal was to minimize time taken for ICANN staff to go and verify certain things, bringing awareness to complainants that they need to provide ICANN with all this information before any sort of action can be taken, or even whether a complaint can be reviewed to begin with. She reiterated that the question was what is the status of the development of those materials?

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, responded that there is no target date, it is a work in progress.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, then asked if ICANN org planned to release another update via a 12-month report?

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, responded that there is a monthly reporting and send through blogs as well as annual reports in line with the 6-month report.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, asked if the next iteration of Compliance's report would include any data from the full cycle of audits?

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, replied when the audit is completed it will have its own report and any relevant information will also be included in the reporting for DNS abuse.

Vivek Goyal, BC, noted that it would be helpful to see the number of complaints received, and the average time it takes for ICANN Compliance to work on them and send them to the registries and the registrars as required, or as appropriate. Logically, there will be a peak in the complaints ICANN receives, and then because of all the outreach and education that ICANN Compliance does to registries and registrars, the number of complaints should decrease. Capturing that number will help to see the success of the outreach and the education that ICANN Compliance is doing. He also suggested revising the pie chart in the slideshow to be clearer.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, highlighted the study in the chat provided by Feodora Hamza, ICANN org: "For another DNS abuse related update, Councilors may wish to register and join the ICANN Webinar that will discuss INFERMAL, a Project Focused on Malicious Domain Registrations, scheduled for 19Feb: <https://www.icann.org/en/announcements/details/icann-webinar-to-discuss-infermal-a-project-focused-on-malicious-domain-registrations-05-02-2025-en>"

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, advised Councilors to keep this in the front of their minds for further discussions.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, asked since the 6-month report if compliance has learned anything from the practices and regarding the 6-month report and if there would be different methods of enforcement that compliance is considering due to these lessons?

Leticia Castillo, ICANN org Compliance, answered that compliance is gaining better insight into the information about DNS type of abuse and action. Compliance is gaining this insight and working to expand the means of enforcement and will look into proactive enforcement while continuing to post results.

Action Items:

GNSO Councilors to discuss within their groups the information provided by ICANN Org Compliance and the ICANN [Webinar](#) that will discuss INFERMAL, a Project Focused on Malicious Domain Registrations, scheduled for 19 February, in preparation for a discussion on next steps on DNS abuse. [COMPLETED]

Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Next Steps for Policy and Implementation Policy Status Report

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Peter Eakin, ICANN org) [Slides](#) | [Action Table](#)

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Peter Eakin, ICANN org, shared the following [Slides](#) and [Action Table](#)

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked if the idea of the action table for the SCCI to look and evaluate them?

Peter Eakin, ICANN org, replied that yes the conclusion is that they would work with SCCI to assess recommendations and work to help Council implement decisions.

Anne Aikman Scalse, NCA, gave an example of past issues that have come up in relation to implementation guidance during SubPro. She noted that there is some history there that needs to be examined as we talk about how those roles get clarified and defined. She then cited the write-up on consensus policy implementation framework that there is a reference to incorporating the operational design phase into the consensus policy implementation framework, but generally what I've heard in the community is that the ODP was not a particularly helpful tool and we're trying to address those issues well ahead. She asked could Council get all this done without having an amended policy process, or is there some of it that involves some kind of additional policy process to amend the policy process?

Peter Eakin, ICANN org, answered that the ODP would not be considered until after the community consultation. The IRT incorporation is to centralize implementation in one place to make the guiding principle to streamline the process as efficient as possible and that will take some work.

Action Items:

The GNSO Council directs the Standing Committee on Continuous Improvement (SCCI) to review the Policy and Implementation (P&I) Policy Status Report (PSR) and to present the Council with a draft implementation plan, and questions for consideration, if any. GNSO Support Staff to send an email to the SCCI, updating them on the Council request on Review of the P&I PSR.

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

Question re: Billing Contact

Here, the Council will discuss the above questions and determine next steps.

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Thomas Rickert, GNSO Council Liaison to the EPDP (Temp Spec) Phase 1 IRT)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, recalled this from the last Council meeting where the billing contact was not referenced, but the IRT thought that was a drafting error and should have been mentioned because there is an obligation in the 2013 RRA for data escrow, which is different from registration data.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, noted the following:

The Council is being asked to consider the questions below:

1. Does the Council confirm billing contact was in scope for the EPDP on the Temp Spec - Phase 1 Team?
2. Does the Council confirm:
 - a. the collection of billing contacts by registrars should continue to be required as per current RAA requirements because EPDP Phase 1, by being silent on this, did not mean to change this requirement, OR
 - b. the collection of billing contacts by registrars should become optional because EPDP Phase 1, by being silent on this, meant to change the RAA requirement?

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, added clarity to the methodology used in EPDP phase 1. The way it worked at the time was to actually take a look at all the processes, all the data elements that were collected and see what's necessary for ICANN to perform its task. It was an approach that you would typically use when you're trying to make processes GDPR compliant. It's what you need and is there a legal basis for what you're doing? The way the discussions went through all the different data elements from a registrant. What data elements do we actually need from the registrant? What data elements do we need, if any, for the admin C? What do we need for tech C? And so on and so forth. For the billing C, we also had discussions on that, but we concluded that the billing C was actually hardly ever used in practice these days. If you are charging a domain owner, a registrar wouldn't do that by reaching out to the billing contact, but they would send the invoice to the account holder that has been set up with the registrar. And therefore, there's no real reason to actually continue to collect the data for the billing contact.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, believes that the mistake has been made at the time is that they didn't properly record this to give crystal clear instructions to the IRT to embed this in the policy. So, this is why we see this discrepancy between the data for the admin C, which has explicitly been made optional, and the data for the billing C where the registration data policy is silent. And since the escrow exhibit to the RAA requires the billing contact to be collected, and since we didn't overrule that, so to speak, with the registration data policy, we now have this conflict of the billing contact technically being required to be escrowed, and that I think contradicts the spirit of what the EPDP concluded.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, stated his understanding that this was a separate set of data, because a working group did not touch something we should not make a change to the RAA. One ought to be careful of what Council is suggesting and could set a dangerous precedent to make a change on something that was never suggested.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, mentioned that NCSG discussed the billing contact and has shared it on the mailing list. She noted that registries and registrars, in their comments and suggestions, repeatedly say that billing contact as well as admin contact and all that should not be in the registration data, it should not be considered as registration data. She cited the editorial mistake that the billing contact was not just added like admin and tech was. So, we are not making any new policy. We are not doing anything like that. We are just doing an editorial. NCSG was a little bit confused by the questions, but in the end, they support the outcome that if ICANN org receives this confirmation from the Council that it concludes that billing contact data is no longer required to be collected, retained, or transferred to the data escrow agent, ICANN org will begin the process of updating, which means removing current requirements related to billing contact. So, this is the outcome that we think is desirable, and it is in line with what EPDP discussed. Personally, she clarified that she does not think billing contact should be mentioned in ICANN's policy, especially in registration data policy that has a disclosure requirement in any way.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, put on his registrar hat to note that Sam described that position well in the chat.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, in the chat: "So, if they discussed it and didn't make a final determination, wouldn't that add to the argument that they didn't want to change it at the end?"

Samanth Demetriou, RYSG, in the chat: "To address Damon's point, my recollection is that the EPDP did examine the processing of data for the purpose of Escrow. It is clear that Escrow is used to protect registrants and that the Billing Contact as a separate contact entity was not necessary to meet that purpose. So I agree with Thomas's conclusion that the error here was in not properly documenting that decision." To which Prudence Malinki and Thomas Rickert agreed.

Susan Payne, IPC, stated that talking about the EPDP is almost a red herring. It is right that billing data is not part of that registration data and everyone is focusing on the EPDP, which was basically the data dealt with under temp spec for what needs to be collected and transferred, etc. The RAA is treated in a different manner and it has never been data that was disclosed the same way and it maintains a different status. She noted there is a passing reference in the EPDP charter to billing data. But it is only an example the group may consider. She summarized that focusing on EPDP is a red herring because we are not treating it as part of their remit. She echoed Damon and as Thomas acknowledged it was not captured and we cannot change the status quo without any kind of recommendation captured in the final report. She stated that it is not the right process to say no one made a recommendation, but we think they meant to and proposed a brief process to amend the RAA.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, agreed with Susan's points and reiterated that a major concern is going the route proposed. It would be alien to amending contracts across the board and will not give the opportunity to discuss the issue of billing contact. The BC feels this is a drafting error, but they see the billing contact as the most important data collected. This plays a vital role in the life of any domain and cannot clearly say what will subsume that role if no longer collected. For example, while the registrant is expected to be the person that owns the domain, the reseller often is the billing contact. He proceeded to give an example from his perspective in the Global South how in a lot of cases it is not the registrant who gets to play the role of the billing contact. He proposed finding an alternative to billing contact if there are potential unintended consequences.

Samanth Demetriou, RYSG, noted that billing contact was more than just a passing reference in EPDP. There is a specific charter question that asks about the collection of data and which data elements

should be collected. And it specifically asks for the registrant contact, the tech contact, the admin contact, and the billing contact. And those are all capitalized terms in the context of this charter to recognize the role that those contacts play in not just the existing ecosystem, but in the policies and the contracts that govern the actions of registries and registrars. It is not fair to say it was just a passing reference, in the actual recommendation from the EPDP's final report there are a number of recommendations about specific processing steps that don't reference the contact fields and the contact categories that are not considered to be necessary for those. She cited that the big one is the whole elimination of the admin contact in a lot of cases. So, the recommendation around escrow does not include admin contact. It also doesn't include billing contact. She argued there is just a strong case made that there was proper and due consideration of the billing contact in this context

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, clarified that the billing contact discussion may be conflating issues. It is true that the billing contact for the account holder is an important data point for law enforcement. That is a different data than the billing contact in the DNS with the registration data. There is not a single case where this contact has been used. It would be odd to get rid of admin and then keep a requirement to collect and escrow the billing contact data. He noted that he has not heard of a single case in the last 15, 20 years where this contact has actually been used. It would be odd to get rid of the admin, which was maybe even of better use for everyone, and then keep a requirement to collect and escrow the billing contact data. So if we can agree that the billing contact is not needed, and that therefore, due to the principle of data minimization, should not be collected. If we agree that the billing contact is or the billing data is important data at when it sits with the account holder data that's something that we don't touch. So, we don't want to impede investigations, right? Then I think the only remaining question that we should discuss is how do we get this problem solved, that we did accurately capture the results of the discussion at the time, without unduly encumbering the Council and the GNSO community with additional processes. You know, we had so many discussions about the Council being effective or the GNSO being effective and not too formalistic. So, I think that it would be good for us to show progress on this, if we're all aligned on the outcome, that we don't take great detours to achieve the result that we all converge on.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, highlighted the process point because it is not mentioned for Susan's point. For her, it was more process than substance. That basically, because it's not mentioned, that doesn't mean it can change a clause in the RAA. He proposed to focus this conversation more on the process point. So, let's say if IPC and BC is uncomfortable with silence, even if there was a discussion that wasn't captured, changing the RAA, what would be the right and most efficient way to remedy that? If we can't just decline and say it's a drafting error, then I think we should also consider what's option A or B, right? So, I'd like to avoid a PDP if possible, given that we're not that far away on substance.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, expressed greater concern of the discussion that it was discussed without a final determination if indeed it was an error, there are lots of discussions that do not result in a final decision. This goes to a credibility issue for the Council, we should not be changing things if they are not clear and that seems to be where we are at and it needs to be addressed before we make a big change like this.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, stated his view is more aligned with Farzi and Susan's solution. He is worried about the precedent if we do not catalog in an omnibus way final reports will be 10k pages. It was a question put to the group and this element was not specifically addressed. Scary to say that every possible iteration. Data is going to an escrow provider that no one can get to anyway. EPDP did it right and a tweak to the contract, that is one thing that makes sense. Just because it is not required to go to data escrow, registrars are still collecting billing data. Law enforcement can still get to it. Hesitant to say

that it maintains the status quo. Proposed it is better to focus on how we let the group proceed and look at the contracted parties house as this should not be controversial.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, question about agreement for something more informal. Is it true that no one can ever get escrow information, that it cannot be disclosed?

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, responded that it is not open to the public, and open to the public only by a court order.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, asked for Councilors unclear about the billing contact versus billing information that the registrar stores for the account holder. He summarized: in the registration data, we have a set of data elements that are required to be collected, and that included certain data elements for the adamancy, that included certain data elements for the tech C, and included certain data elements for the billing contact, and the practice of the registrars is that these data elements have never been populated, so whether you escrow it or not, there will likely be no information in it anyway, because it's not used. It's something that's been used in the 90s maybe when registrars relied more on registration data for the business relationship with the registrant. But these days, you set up an account with the registrar, and then the registrar would reach out to the account holder and send an invoice to the account holder. So, that data would not be escrowed anyway, and law enforcement can reach out to a registrar and ask for that data. So, it's two distinct sets of data with distinct processes. So, if there is the hope with some that by requiring the data to be escrowed that we would add any value to investigations, I think that hope is just not justified.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, proposed to bifurcate the substantive issues from the procedural one that Susan raised.

Action Items:

GNSO Council Leadership and staff to develop options for Councilors to consider with respect to processes to address the issue of Billing Contact for discussion at the ICANN82 Council Working Session on 09 March.

Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION: Final Report of the Transfer Policy Review PDP Working Group

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Roger Carney, TPR Working Group Chair) [Slide presentation](#)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Roger Carney, TPR WG Chair, at a high level recognized that there were 47 recommendations with full consensus on all of them. He also offered a suggestion that more regular meetings would have improved the 3 year timeline of work as work got done efficiently when they met and did not in between meetings.

Roger Carney, TPR WG Chair, shared the following [Slide presentation](#). He highlighted that the first 64 pages were frontloaded with the recommendations in a new format that has hyperlinks to see all the discussions. He walked through each set of recommendations and discussed the impact factor and rationale for each recommendation.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, let Councilors know that Roger Carney would continue the presentation with recommendations part 2 during the GNSO Council Webinar on 20 February.

Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION: Outcomes of Strategic Planning Session

Here, the Council will review the [outcomes](#) of the SPS and discuss next steps.

8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair) [Slide presentation](#)

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted this would be handled on list due to time constraints.

Action Items:

GNSO Council leadership to send an email update to Councilors on the outcomes of the SPS.

[COMPLETED]

Item 9: Any Other Business

9.1 - ICANN82 planning update

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted the reminder for the GNSO Council webinar mandatory on February 20th at 2100 UTC for 60 minutes.

Action Items:

Reminder that the Pre-ICANN82 GNSO Council Webinar scheduled for Thursday, 20 February at 21:00 UTC for 60 minutes is mandatory for GNSO Council members [COMPLETED] and day before reminder email will be sent to the council. [COMPLETED]

9.2 - Discussion of Request for LinkedIn Post re: Human Rights Checklist

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, cited a new proposal for the LinkedIn page to post regularly after Council meetings on current and timely events from the GNSO Council. He noted that a separate email alias has been established for those that would like to contribute to the process. The core of these messages will be accomplishments and this list will vet posts before Lawrence posts it publicly. To address Farzi's point on human rights, it will be noted as a part of the Latin Diacritics update along with the GPI framework.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, queried if her suggested text was rejected

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that it was considered and will be discussed in a more recent context of what Council has done and the list has been established to have these conversations.

Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG, queried about the photo on the Council page.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that it had been updated and adjourned the meeting

Action Items:

GNSO Council leadership and staff to propose a process for LinkedIn postings for Council consideration.
Staff to send out a sign up form to Council for the gns0-pr-officer email list. [COMPLETED]

9.3 - Volunteer needed to be the GNSO Liaison to the Latin Diacritics

Action Items:

GNSO Support Staff to send an email to the Council list to issue a call for volunteers for the GNSO Liaison to the Latin Diacritics PDP. [COMPLETED]

End Time: 23:00 UTC.