
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, 10 April 2025 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Audio is available at:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/H66oq2jwJqE3dH30c4OggQikOKZs7CjLMZx4ZKWK_bTmPCMMpMw6AjRJGWiiFe1Rco43dSQZHEA6Yy8O.UwfuQKzpVdjK-QFe

Zoom recording is available at: <https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/1BdJrVMYICLOfeH4W7CEh-g9Udop0TZrUmaQ47ekzkZxRkwQ1GOzSHEEEIEUHHU.YVb3zS-ocr9Voj41?startTime=1744318875000>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar/2025>

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)

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

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)

TERRI AGNEW: The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. And welcome to the GNSO Council Meeting taking place on Thursday, the 10th of April, 2025. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Nacho Amadoz.

NACHO AMADOZ: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Jennifer Chung.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Hong Fu Meng.

HONG FU MENG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Samantha Demetriou?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Prudence Malinki.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Desiree Milosevic.

DESIREE MILOSEVIC: Present, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Damon Ashcraft.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Present. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. For Vivek Goyal, he sends in his apology, and the proxy will go to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, as well as Osvaldo Novoa. He also sends in his apologies, and the proxy will go to Thomas Rickert. Thomas Rickert?

THOMAS RICKERT: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Julf Helsingius. And Julf is on. Yes, Julf is on. He's typing chat in Zoom chat. He's typing here, but he's working on the audio, everyone. Farzaneh Badiei.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, you made it, perfect. So, Farzaneh did send in a proxy, but she was able to make it. So, we'll only use the proxy in case of connectivity issues. And if there is, the proxy will go to Julf Helsingius. Peter Akinremi.

PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Manju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Bruna Martins Dos Santos also sends in her apologies, and the proxy will go to Manju Chen. Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Anne Aikman Scalese also sends in her apologies. Sebastien Ducos. Seb, are you able to unmute? So we'll work on Seb's audio as well, but he is present in the Zoom room. Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. The policy team supporting the GNSO is also on. So, Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, John Emery, Barry Cobb, Devan Reed, Feodora Hamza sends her apologies. You also have myself, Terri Agnew. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking

as this call is being recorded. A reminder that we are in the Zoom webinar room.

Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and panelists and participate in the chat once they've set their chat to everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning you do not have access to their microphones, nor the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With this, I'll turn the call back over to the GNSO Chair. Greg DiBiase, please begin.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thank you so much. Welcome, everyone, to our April meeting. As usual, we have a very packed schedule, so I will dive right in and ask if anyone has an update to their statement of interest. Seeing none, I will ask if anyone would like to review or amend the agenda. Seeing no one, I will note that themselves, sorry, did I hear someone? No.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Yes, it's me. It's Farzaneh. I just wanted to mention that if we get the time, I'm just going to mention something very quick about the progress in how NCSG is working with the transfer policy chair on coming up with the human rights checklists on that thing.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, great staff. Let's add a point to AOB. And see if we can get that update. Thank you, Farzi. Next, I'll note that the minutes for our March meeting were posted on April 1st. If you're looking to go back and review those. And I'll move on to opening remarks and review of the action list. Two notes on topics that are changing status.

First, the transfer policy will soon be going to the Board after we vote on the Recommendations Report to send the transfer policy final report to the Board. And then second, we'll be discussing the WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group, some work that's been on hold and on our backlog. As we discussed, I think at the last ICANN meeting, we will be reviewing what that work is exactly and starting to think about how to address it. With that, let's move to the consent agenda. And I think I have Nacho to help us out with that.

NACHO AMADOZ: That's right, Greg. We have two items on the agenda, the review of the GAC Communiqué and the Recommendations Report for the Transfer Policy Review PDP. And these being the consent agenda, we then need to read the motions and we can move to the vote.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. We'll go ahead and move to the vote then, since we do not need to read the motion. So, here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please

say aye. And Julf, did you want to test your audio really quick before we go to the last portion of the vote? So, Julf, are you able to unmute? I was just seeing if we could hear you this time. Okay. So, Julf will be typing his vote in chat, everyone. So, here we go. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

ALL MEMBERS: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Would councilors holding proxies, please say aye. So, Thomas for Osvaldo, Lawrence for Vivek and Manju for Bruna.

ALL PROXIES: Aye. Aye. Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. With no abstention nor objection, the motion passes back to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Nacho. Thanks, Terri. With that, we'll move on to our council vote. By way of introduction, this is something we've been discussing for several months now. The vote is on confirming the IRT's determination that there was a drafting error that did not address billing contact and that this was within the scope and the

reason that there was not a recommendation on billing contact was a drafting error and memorializing this information in a motion.

Over the course of this discussion several concerns were raised with things like regarding precedent. Leadership and staff came together to draft a motion that tried to capture or address some of these concerns while still moving forward. And we decided to put forward a motion as it seemed in our last meeting. That seemed to be the direction that the majority of councilors wanted to move in.

So I guess I'll just say, thanks everyone for the discussion on this. I realized that there may be some councilors that don't find this the perfect solution. But hopefully, we can understand that after five months of discussion, a vote is probably needed on this issue so we can move forward. So, before I read the resolved clauses, maybe I'll stop to see if anyone has questions or concerns about moving forward with this vote. Okay, seeing no hands, I will go to the resolved clauses.

Resolved. One, the GNSO Council confirms its guidance to ICANN Org that the EPDP team did intend to modify the current Registrar Accreditation Agreement requirements related to billing contact and the current RAA requirements for the collection, retention, and escrow of billing contact have been eliminated by the Registration Data Policy. For the avoidance of doubt, the modified sections include section 3.6 as it relates to 3.4.1.3, 3.4.1.3, and 1.1.2, and 1.1.5 of the data retention specification.

Two, the GNSO Council confirms and commits that going forward, it will be specified in working group charters that if the working groups intend to modify a requirement within the Registry Agreement or Registrar Accreditation Agreement or Consensus Policy via Consensus Policy recommendations, the policy recommendations must explicitly and specifically identify which requirements are intended to be modified and how such requirements are recommended to be modified per their Consensus Policy recommendations.

Number three, the GNSO Council requests GNSO support staff to inform the ICANN Org global domain services team of this motion. Okay, so before moving to the vote, is there any, or would any councilors like last chance to make a statement or any comments on this vote before we go ahead? I am not seeing any. Oh, sorry, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you, Chair. Just wanted to put on record that the BC had had some additional discussions around this and feeling, I mean, based on the fact that, from our members, based on the fact that we find out that the particular data set in terms of the billing contact isn't what is used per se in enforcement of abuse cases to a large extent.

This happens to be different from the actual billing information that is related to every domain and based on guidance from some of our members who particularly work with this particular data sets have decided to reverse our stand. However, it still remained a concern on other issues that you had touched on. And we are

hoping that, like we've said, this doesn't become a precedence. Just thought to put that on record. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Great, thank you, Lawrence. Feedback is appreciated. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure, thank you very much, Greg. The IPC, Susan and I are going to be voting no on this motion. And I just have a statement I'd like to read into the record. Would you like me to do that now or after you do the roll call vote?

GREG DIBIASE: Terri, I think now is the right time.

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, now would be good. And then in addition to that, Damon, can you please send me the email with your statement and we'll get that added as well. And it will be a voice vote, sorry.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Absolutely, sounds good. So, 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 the submission as being a drafting error and thus effectively having council amend the section of the RAA. Thank you again for the discussion and the vote.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Damon. Okay, great. Terri, do you have everything you need to move to a vote then?

TERRI AGNEW: I do. Thank you very much. Julf, we just want to check back in with you. Will you be doing an audio vote or typing your vote in chat? And it will be a voice vote. Typing, okay. Thank you very much. So, here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing none, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye.

ALL MEMBERS: Aye. Aye. Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And I did hear Damon and Susan against it. Thank you.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

ALL MEMBERS: Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies, please say aye. So, Thomas for Osvaldo, Lawrence for Vivek and Manju for Bruna.

PROXIES: Aye. Aye. Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. It'll just be one moment for me to get this tally. And the motion passes back to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Terri. And thank you all councilors for the hard work on this. This was definitely a novel issue that was really, I think, supplemented with everyone's really well thought out comments on this. So, I appreciate everyone's input. And let's move on to our next item, Aspirational Statement Review. This is something we had discussed last year that we didn't reach consensus on. And then we took a fresh look at SPS. And Samantha had graciously offered to take the pen there. And she drafted something else that she sent out to the team. And I think, Sam, you volunteered to touch upon kind of what your thoughts on the edits were here.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Sure. This is Sam. Thanks, Greg. I'm happy to give a brief overview. I'll try to keep this pretty short. I'll turn on my camera too. So, just to give a bit of background on this, because it actually does predate my time on the council. Thank you to staff for providing me with a little bit of the history and context here. The Aspirational Statement was something that was first discussed during the strategic planning session back in, I believe it was 2023. And the goal is really three things for the statement.

One is to reinforce the council's role as the manager of the policy development process. Two is to socialize the unique role of the GNSO councilors within the various stakeholder groups and constituencies that make up the GNSO. And the third is to support the multi-stakeholder model and explain the important role that the GNSO council plays in that overall construct.

So I understand that the previous iteration of the Aspirational Statement didn't achieve agreement from the council, because some councilors were uncomfortable with some of the statements made in it, that it was directing how they should vote or kind of setting standards about the way each individual councilor should approach a given vote on a specific issue. So in rewriting this, I attempted to avoid that issue. And I also really took to heart the aspirational part of the description, right?

And I tried to capture all of the things that we discussed at the SPS this January in 2025 about not only what we see the role of the council as now, but also what the role of the council can be and where we as councilors can continue to advance the good progress, we've made on being effective managers of the PDP. So, some of it is maybe a bit forward-looking in ways that I think

we as councilors have done a good job and can continue to do good work in managing the PDP. And I'm very happy to hear any edits or feedback that you guys have on the statement. I'll turn it back to you, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Sam. Really appreciate your work on this. I see we have Lawrence in the queue.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Greg. And thanks, Sam and others for the work done around this. So, just to get some more clarity, because I didn't have the opportunity to join on the last discourse around this particular issue, but rightly so, Sam, you mentioned the concern that some of us who are directed on how we vote had. And I guess my question is, because like you said that it was crafted in such a way that that addresses our concern.

My question is, what will the Aspirational Statement help us achieve where I still get to be directed on how to vote? And it might not necessarily be in tandem with the expectation of council. So, I mean, won't we still end up with having a statement, but the current practice continues? How does this change anything?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks for the question, Lawrence. I think that's a really good point to raise and a good question to kind of put out for everyone. My understanding of the purpose of this Aspirational Statement was that it wasn't meant to change A, the way individual

stakeholder groups or constituencies direct or do not direct their councilors to vote. And it doesn't take the place of any supplemental statements that a group would want to submit in conjunction with any specific vote. So, like, for example, the IPC just submitted a statement for the vote that we just took five minutes ago.

Really, this whole Aspirational Statement, which has turned into like a mini essay, I guess, is just meant to be a description of the way the council operates. For anyone who is curious to know about the GNSO Council and its role in the ICANN model, for them to be able to review. So, it's more of a descriptor than a directive, I think is maybe the short answer to your question. And so, really that's down here in the third paragraph where we've just tried to capture a description of the fact that the council does vote on policy recommendations once they are finalized by a Policy Development Working Group.

And to put a little information around that without creating any expectations that it should change or influence the direction that stakeholder groups or constituencies give their councilors on each individual vote, which needs to obviously be assessed on its merits. I hope that answers the question.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Sam. I'd also add that we still have the language, if you look at the last sentence of paragraph three, councilors strive to support recommendations that follow the PDP consensus building process because doing so supports the MSM. So, I think there still is that element that there is an aspiration to vote, yes, if the

process is followed, but this allows for a circumstance that could arise where councilors, for whatever reason, instructed to vote otherwise. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure, Greg. I mean, I really like this Aspirational Statement. And Sam, thank you so much for the time you put into doing it. And we've talked about doing this and we've had different iterations of it in the past, and I think the devil really in the detail here is that this is an Aspirational Statement, it's something we try to do, and I think that's good. And I would really, I personally think that we should go ahead and we should adopt it. I mean, I think we as a council should be able to come up with something and say, this is what we're trying to do. Are we going to hit it 100% of the time? No, that's okay. But I think having this makes a lot of sense. So, thank you very much.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Really appreciate the kind words, Damon. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Damon. Also note support in the chat as well. Okay. So, the plan is to vote on this in our May meeting and adopt it as a council, assuming there aren't any objections, which I'd really like to raise here. But unless there's any more questions for Sam, I will leave this at, consider this work complete and that we will vote on it in our May meeting. Any questions or concerns with that approach? Okay. Great. Thank you all. And thanks again, Sam.

Let's move on to hand script single character gTLD recommendation 3.17 of Subsequent Procedures. We have talked about this a little in the past and discussed an issue that has arose regarding the hand script single character gTLDs and some possible approaches for addressing it. But before I go too deep into the background here, which I'm not so familiar with, I think we have Steve to give a descript, a reminder of the issue and then present some different paths for council to consider.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks very much, Greg. This is Steve from staff. And I think we immediately go to the next page. So, before we go into the analysis that we performed, I thought it'd be helpful to provide a little bit of background to talk about how we got to where we are now. This is a very high level and just really just a reminder. So, the SubPro final report had a recommendation, recommendation 25.4, and it was an allowance for single character gTLDs in ideographic scripts. And so, that was already adopted by the Board. And so, what the IDN's EPDP phase one report did was essentially refine and add detail to that recommendation.

And so, I guess you could think of as maybe extending that recommendation. And what it did was it limited the single character gTLDs in ideographic scripts to one script, which was the hand script. And then in addition, it tasked the Chinese, Japanese and Korean generation panels to develop guidelines. And those guidelines were intended to serve as a dependency to allow the single character on script detail these to be applied for.

And so, what happened from there is that there was an initial determination that the work of the RZ-LGR was sufficient for the purpose of determining and providing guidance for allowing these gTLDs to be applied for. But when that approach was put out for Public Comment, there was some opposition about moving forward with that approach. And so, the next phase of seeking guidance, I believe this was in the context of applicant guidebook language.

One of the co-chairs of the Chinese generation panel noted that when the initial work for the RZ-LGR was formed, that was not part of the scope of work of examining the or looking through the lens of risk of confusion when they performed the work. So, they didn't think that the existing work that they performed was fit for purpose and nor were they the right party to do the work in the future. I'll pause for a second. And I know Susan is, and I think there's others also that have quite a bit of history with this topic too. So, definitely invite you all to chime in as well. And we can go to the next slide. I think I see one.

GREG DIBIASE:

Can I just ask really quick, go back. So, when on the bullet, but a majority of Public Comments opposed moving forward, it was opposed moving forward on the basis that there was a risk of confusion.

STEVE CHAN: It was. Good question. I should take that one back. Let me give it, I'll keep it a little bit further than I think I can probably get. Oh, thank you, Susan. Thanks for the save.

SUSAN PAYNE: I wasn't expecting the question, but I would say from recollection, I would say yes. Generally, that seemed to be the tenor of the comments. Not all of them exactly that, but the majority seemed to be around. They did think that it was that there was a kind of risk. It was it's all very complex. It needs more work was basically the tenor of the comments.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks for that, Susan. And I'm trying to find some specific language. I think the concerns were about the lack of alignment with Chinese linguistic laws and regulations. The complexities of the Chinese character ideographs and user confusion. I believe that was the basis. So, just expanding on what Susan shared. And I hope that helps.

With that, I think we can go to the next slide. So, the next phase after some of these concerns were identified is that the SubPro IRT was brought into the discussions. And there were basically two directions that were provided to them. One was determined that the recommendation was not implementable or if the issue should be reviewed by the GNSO Council.

So, as is standard practice for IRTs, there's discussion about whether or not the issue should be raised. And that discussion was managed by the IRT liaisons. So, Ann and Susan. And there

was agreement in the IRT to elevate the issue for Council consideration. And so, the first conversation at the Council level on this topic was the December 2024 Council meeting. And there the agreement was to have staff perform some background analysis and to try to examine some advantages and disadvantages about two specific mechanisms.

The GGP, the GNSO Guidance process, was the specific recommendation from the liaisons. And then during the course of discussions, another option, the Expert Working Group was also identified as something that the Council wanted to learn more about and whether or not it might be an appropriate avenue. And pausing again for a moment. Also okay to move on. So, we'll look at both of these options.

We thought a good lens to look at these through was these three, I guess, factors, whether or not the applicability of the process, the governance structure of the process. And I think something that's going to be necessary for looking at this topic is whether or not there's an allowance for inclusion of experts. And so, we'll look at these two processes. The first is the GNSO guidance process.

In terms of applicability, it's used for gTLD issues where GNSO guidance is needed. And significantly, it is used when the outcome is not expected to create consensus policies or any changes in the contractual obligations. For governance, the GGP is managed by the council. It's also governed by the ICANN bylaws and the GNSO operating procedures, which where all the documentation is captured. And it also allows for the inclusion of experts, which can be beyond just the membership of the group.

So, you can also solicit the opinions of outside advisors or experts as needed.

We can quickly go to the next slide. And we have a table here that at least from the staff's perspective, we thought were the advantages and disadvantages to this mechanism. Generally, the GGP is limited in scope, and at least the part that I talked about for applicability, it seems to be fit for purpose. There doesn't seem to be a change to contracts or a change to consensus policies. I mentioned it just a moment ago. It can accommodate the addition of experts beyond just the GGP members. And it is shorter in duration than a PDP.

And in terms of disadvantages, and this is probably not limited to GGPs, but it can be difficult to manage the scope and stay within the right lines of the charter. And so, I did mention it's shorter than PDP, but it also is rather lengthy. And so, a disadvantage might be that the procedural rigor that is included for GGP can result in a rather lengthy process. The GGP, while it can't develop Consensus Policy and change contracts, it still requires many of the steps you would encounter in a PDP or an EPDP. So, things like the initial report and Public Comment and a final report, council consideration, and also Board adoption are all needed for a GGP.

And I'm putting a hint here. This unwieldy process may be more than is needed for what might be a simple charter question. And I'll get into that differently, or sorry, I'll get into a moment because there might be a different way to think about this issue. And from the staff perspective, we did want to provide this as an alternative path. And then lastly, given the specialized nature of the subject

matter, a community support group may not be the right one to examine the issue and might not have the requisite expertise. Pausing for a moment. All right, thank you. Saewon.

And so, the next one is the Expert Working Group or EWG. And you're going to see a theme here, which is that as far as the staff is concerned and that looked at this issue is, there is no formal definition of what an Expert Working Group is. And so, therefore we don't really know exactly what the applicability is. It's been used in the past in respect of gTLD directory services or in other words, registration data. And in that instance, this group was convened by the ICANN's then CEO.

In terms of governance, again, it's sort of the same theme. It's unclear because we're not really positive who is empowered to convene this group, even if it has been the CEO in the past. On the plus side, because of the name of EWG, I think it's a safe assumption though that experts would be a part of any EWG, whatever that might mean exactly. And so, on advantages. Advantage, it's expressly designed for providing expert advice while we're not positive exactly what the mechanism is intended to be.

That could be an advantage in the sense that you can scope it as narrowly as you need. And therefore, if it's narrow, it can likely be nimble and short in duration. And then you'll see this bolded thing, which is I think from the staff perspective, a pretty important factor, which is that it's not a formal mechanism and then that leads to ambiguity. So, there's no guidance on the structure. There's no governance on the governance mechanisms. And then that can also potentially lead to questions and confusion about the remit,

the rules of engagement, accountability, and then perhaps most importantly, what is intended to be done with the recommendations or outputs of an EWG.

At least from what we've seen, that can only be convened by the ICANN Board or the ICANN CEO. And then depending on the level of expertise you need from experts; it could require the expenditure funds to support the group. And once again, but we have a conclusion slide. So, stating the obvious, there's obviously advantages and disadvantages for both of these mechanisms. But I've hinted at the one big disadvantage for the EWG is it's not a formal mechanism. And then that means that we don't really know exactly how to design it, how to utilize it, and what the outcomes from EWG are intended to be used for.

So, at least from the staff perspective, and you'll see some texts that's in italics, and this is pulled from, I think the text that the liaisons escalated this topic to the council. So, if you're looking for guidance that's necessary to allow Han single characters to proceed, at least from the staff perspective, it seems to be that the GGP seems more appropriate. And then I foreshadowed this idea and concept, which is that the council may want to look at this topic from a different perspective and I definitely see your hand and I'll wrap up in a second.

From a staff side, what we isolate as the issue is that essentially there's no qualified party at the moment or identified at least to perform the work that's envisioned in the IDN's EPDP Rec. 3.17. And so, it might be helpful for the council to look at this from a different perspective. So, it's one thing for a GGP or an EWG to not only identify the party that performs the work, but then also

that GGP or EWG also monitors the work and make sure that the outcome is produced by that new group.

And so, what you could maybe recharacterize the problem is there is no CJK generation panel identified to perform the work as identified in the recommendation. And so, maybe all that really needs to be done is to find a new party, a new expert party that can essentially take the place of the CJK panel to perform the work. So, rather than convening the GGP or an EWG, it's really just finding that expert party, ensuring they can actually conduct the work and sending that back to the existing IRT to undertake the work as it was envisioned, but with just a different party performing the expert analysis. And with that, I'll stop there. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve. Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hey, Steve. Thanks for that. Paul McGrady for the record. I thought you used the word dependency somewhere along the line. And can you clarify, is this a dependency for the launch of the Next Round or is this a small D dependency? Because I'm just trying to understand the stakes. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN: I don't recall where I used, I know I used the word, I don't recall exactly where I used it, but it's definitely not a dependency for the Next Round. Okay, I'm trying to find where it was used.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. I think that answers the question. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, thanks, Greg. This is Justine. So, I have a supplementary question to what Paul asked. What in Stiles' opinion is the status, meaning that if we don't find a solution to this issue and noting that it's not a dependency for the Next Round, then what actually happens? Would the default be that we do not proceed with a single character TLDs, Han script single character TLDs?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Justine. At least from the staff's understanding, I'll answer this in two pieces. One is, as just mentioned to Paul, I don't think there's any effect on the Next Round, the immediate Next Round. I think that was made clear. I think in the way that the liaisons escalated the issue to the council. In terms of the second part, I think it can't just be left with complete ambiguity and no decision.

I think the council at some level will need to make some decision, whatever that decision is, either to pursue additional work, to identify a different party to perform the work or potentially recognize that, or I guess, determine that the recommendation is not implementable. That could also be an outcome from this too. But I think there needs to be some decision. I just don't know what it might be. That's what the council is supposed to deliberate on. Hope that helps.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve. So, I'm going to put myself in the queue. Can you go back to the last slide? So, the staff is explaining a third option in which a different, sorry, CJK is identified specifically for that issue, but who would identify that?

STEVE CHAN: And answer that, but I think Jennifer might also be able to. Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Greg and Steve. I didn't put my hand up for answering that, but I guess I could answer that in the knowledge that I know, at least the context that I know. I think I've explained this in a previous council call before.

The generation panels, language generation panels are convened to do one thing, what they're doing is to come up with the rules for the RZ-LGR for the Han script. What they're not convened to do is to help us with policy or implementation. So, it is correct what you see on the slide there. However, the people who has the expertise to do this work will still be the individuals that are part of the CJK. I hope you understand that nuance.

So, not this vehicle, not the CJK GP, but the experts or the expertise contained within this group of people will still be the people who will be performing this work. And now I've forgotten what I put my hand up for. So, I'll lower it and then I'll remember.

GREG DIBIASE: Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. And this is Steve again. And just to add to that, the parties I think would be in a good position to identify maybe the specifics of what Jen was mentioning is staff. So, Sarmad and his team who support the UA and IDN teams within ICANN. And then also staff, sorry, community experts like Jen and Michael Bauland and others I think can help with identifying who the specific parties would be that would be in a good position to have the proper expertise to perform this work. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Greg. This is Manju. I have a question. So, once we, let's say we have the ability, someone has the ability to identify the alternative party, what is, how does such tentative party work? Do they work under the IRT? Is it, who has the authority to kind of summon these people to do this work? And what mechanism are they following to conduct the work? They still need a name for what we call them. They still need a procedure for what they do their work.

Are we not actually still considering GGP or EWG? It's just like, we just have to have, I'm so confused because it's going to be the

same people but we're not naming the names. And then what this alternative party really means. Are they going to be different people or is a different mechanism? Is it a different procedure? Because I think we're just playing games like with the words but actually we're just trying to fix it with, yeah, sorry. Yeah, is it going to be under an IRT? This is my question, I guess. Alternative party, is that going to be under IRT or we still have to find a name for this alternative party? Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Steve, do you have a response?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. And thanks, Manju for the question. So, I mean, maybe it's a matter of semantics. So, I guess practically what this could look like is as I mentioned, relying on staff experts and community experts to identify the folks and maybe you create a name for that. And then the idea I think is that that decision on who those folks are or who that party might be is maybe a better way to put it. Then they would formally communicate it back to the IRT and they would essentially resume the relationship that they expected to go on with the CJK GPs instead of work with this new entity or new party.

And in terms of governance, I guess they would report to the staff team that is in charge of implementation as well as the IRT that is administering the work or supporting staff in implementing the recommendations. Sorry, not the easiest question to answer. Hope that was okay. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Sorry, I was muted. Thank you, guys. Sorry for that. Steve, apologies for like further making your life difficult on this, but Manju I think raised a very important point about the structure and governance of this group. But I actually also have some concerns about what the specific ask of this group would be in the sense that here the slide lays out that the idea is that the group would complete the work in recommendation 3.17. But it seems to me reading the text of the recommendation 3.17 that the work it requests has been done. It requests that the label generation panels, the CJK generation panels conduct an assessment and the panels did that work.

So I guess I'm also a bit confused as to what the specific ask of this new group is. And I'll just, before I turn that back over to you, I'll also just add onto the end of that, that like if the ask for this group is to make assessments about semantic ambiguity, I don't know that that's really something that falls under the purview of what ICANN should be doing in terms of these recommendations when there are mechanisms baked into the gTLD application process that provide for string confusion objections and other kinds of objections based on various grounds. So, just a concern and also my two cents.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Sam. Any response, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. And thanks, Sam. And thanks everyone for exceedingly difficult questions after additional difficult questions. Maybe going back, a little bit towards what the, I think going back to the background of what has occurred already is helpful. So, I don't think the implementation of this recommendation was not completed. I think there was maybe an initial assessment that the existing work of the RZ-LGR was sufficient, but then Public Comment came in and basically disagreed with that outcome.

And then further, one of the co-chairs of the Chinese generation panel, I guess, further extended that and said that the work, the existing work was not fit for purpose. It wasn't done under that, with those intentions. And so, it sorts of amplified and further amplified that the work under 3.17 was not completed via the RZ-LGR. So, I don't know if that helps, but the recommendation 3.17 talked about the CJK panels developing guidelines. And so, with the RZ-LGR itself not being fit for purpose to serve as those guidelines, there was not additional work undertaken to develop the supplemental guidelines. So, I hope that might help. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Greg. There is some Fast and Furious chat that has very important questions as well for this particular issue that we're

discussing. Specifically, since it's right now in limbo, Justine had a great question, and I'm just going to put that on record. She wanted to know what would happen if, I'm scrolling back up, is it a default position until such time that we have such guidance for Han single characters? Applications for such strings will not be accepted. I responded to her in chat, but I'd like to know, I guess, if there's staff understanding about that as well.

I noted in chat that right now the situation with the Latin script diacritics PDP, they are doing something similar as well. We as council have said that they are not going to be a gating factor, the work for them is not going to be a gating factor for Next Round. But for them, I think they're also looking to put some text somewhere in the AGB that says, until such time the work is done, those applications that come in should not be treated as rejected, instead put on hold.

I would assume the same thing would happen for this situation as well. And then the second thing I wanted to mention was, I think there's a lot of discussion back and forth about how we get things done. And there was confusion about what it is we need to get done. And it is exactly what Steve has just talked about. It is the guidelines on how this needs to be implemented. It's a very narrow implementation guideline work. So, I don't think it's anything more than that. And it should not be further policy development. We should look for a tool that's lightweight enough to be able to address this narrow implementation guidance question and then move on as council. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Jen. That all made sense to me personally, at least. Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Greg. And thanks for that, reiterating that point by Jennifer, because the question I have sort of relates to that point of what we need to do. And you said guidance. So, my question was, does council necessarily have to be involved in this process, as in manage the process since we are managers? Or are we okay to let the Board put together or call this EWG and we happy to just contribute to it? Because if we go with the two options we have here, or another that we do not have here, it will come down to whether we need to have control or we don't. And that will be driven by what the outcome of that process is.

If it's not policy development, then we probably do not need to. If it's guidance, and we need to provide that guidance, then I suppose we need to have control. If it's something that we do not need to have control, then we quickly let the right parties in ICANN to do it. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Tom. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes, thanks. So, one of the things we haven't talked about, and this may be a stupid suggestion, I'm not sure, but it feels like there's a recommendation from the IDNs PDP 3.17 that kind of just doesn't work is sort of what we're being told. Arguably,

because they task the wrong, they task the right people, but under the wrong title with doing the exercise of coming up with guidelines.

That's at least one interpretation of where we've ended up. I mean, is there a role here to just to send this back to the IDN, reconvene the IDNs PDP and ask them to just amend their recommendation and come up with a different solution? Told by whom? I'm reacting to what's being said on here. I'm not trying to form judgments. I'm just reacting to the kind of feedback that we're being presented with in terms of we, there's a recommendation about that panel developing guidelines.

They said they didn't need to, then there was Public Comment saying that their guidelines are, we need guidelines. I don't know, but is there, given that this is something that obviously that IDN PDP group clearly thought about, and given that they only recently wrapped up, is there, is this a situation where we should be sending it back to that group and just going, can you look at this again?

GREG DIBIASE: Interesting idea, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, thanks, this is Justine. So, I'm going to take my liaison hat off and put on my IDNZ PDP formal vice chair hat on, right? In answer to Susan's question is, we, the IDNs PDP came up with a recommendation, right? And it kind of requested the CJK generation panel to develop the guidelines. The CJK generation

panel came back to us and said, they didn't need to do that anymore because whatever they have produced for the RZ-LGR was sufficient. So, that was on the basis why this recommendation moved forward, right?

It's only until Public Comment that certain people came back and said, no, this is wrong. And that's why we have this problem now, right? So, that's the context that my understanding provides. Just to clarify, thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Justine. Any other thoughts or comments or questions for Steve? Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. This is Steve and I hope I don't muddy the water more, but waters more, but I am getting pings in the background with yet another option. Maybe this is a good thing or a bad thing, but it might help with folks that are struggling with having a specific name for this expert party. So, the ping in the background I got is, it's from part of the ICANN bylaws. And it says that in support of policy development, there's an ability to seek external expert advice.

And so, it's a formal named thing, expert advisory panel, I think is what it's called, but it needs to be requested by the Board. And then so in the context of the Expert Advisory Group or sorry, expert advisory panel, maybe that is where you house the people with the expertise, has an official name, has a governance structure. And then that information can then funnel into the IRT

to perform the work and the final implementation. So, this is just sort of background chatter and hot off the presses. If we want to look more into that specific mechanism, we can take that back and do a little more research on that as well. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: So then, yeah, Manju just asked the question in chat that I was thinking, then what's different than EWG in that scenario? And that just, the issue is still at the IRT and they're just requesting advice from this panel.

STEVE CHAN: I guess the easiest way to answer that is the expert advisory panel is something that's specifically called for and mentioned in the bylaws. And you can see the reference from Mary, as opposed to an Expert Working Group, which is sort of a made-up mechanism that supported registry directory services at one time. And I don't know if it's been used other times, but it was something that was convened at the request of the then CEO of ICANN. And there's no documentation for what the process is as opposed to the expert advisory panel. That's the difference. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks. And thanks, Steve. I mean, it's possible that when we talked about this before we maybe have used sort of loose

language, but certainly my understanding was when we were talking about the two options, originally, that's what we were talking about. We were talking about either a GGP or that bylaws expert group. That was what I thought that were the two options. So, it may be that the Expert Working Group maybe was a bit of a red herring.

GREG DIBIASE: Better time. Thanks, Susan. I see Tomslin's chat, the better documented process than a non-documented one. So, Steve, I'm looking at Justine's comment to try to frame what councilors should be thinking about until next meeting to try to reach a decision point here. So, we think the options are GGP, EAP, or declined to act on the Public Comment.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. I think you're directing that at me. I would say maybe those sound like the right options with maybe a fourth, which is what we had proposed earlier is something more informal where staff and community experts can do maybe a more direct line to identify who the experts might be that can perform this work to develop the guidelines.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. So, maybe we can take back this conversation and try to refine those into more specific options that we can put out to council to think about. But before I do that, let me pause and see if people have additional questions for Steve. He's given us a lot to mull over here. Okay. Yeah.

So, seeing none, maybe we'll work and I see some support for Justine's option. So, my proposal would be for council and leadership to kind of refine the options that we've discussed here, have councilors discuss with their constituencies on what they think is the right path. And then proceed from there. Does that sound right to you, Steve? Yes? Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Greg. And thanks, Steve. Can I request the next time we have this in front of us if there's a handy dandy chart that kind of shows us the differences between our options that would really help if it's possible.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, I think. And I think an email ahead of time. That lays out everything would be helpful too. Because as Sam mentions, I would not be able to take this back to my group currently. Okay, great. Okay, so we can work on that. Any other thoughts on this, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. In my minor defense, it was hard to develop a comparison table when we didn't really have a definition of what an EWG. If we had been looking at an EAP, I don't know what the acronym is off the top of my head, that we can definitely do that and we'll make sure that we circulate materials that helps with understanding. And I will follow up on something in chat because I read the comment from Justine in one way and I don't know if I did that properly.

It was about her option three, about decline to act on Public Comment. I sort of presume that meant declining or considering the recommendation to be non-implementable, but I think she might have meant something different. So, I think I can just follow up on that in chat.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. All right, great. Thanks, everyone. This is a rather confusing one. So, I appreciate everyone's input here. Let's move on to Item 7, which is an update from the standing committee on the RDRS. And I believe we have our colleague, Seb, to present to us.

TERRI AGNEW: And Seb, it's Terri. I'm not showing in Zoom where you've unmuted your Zoom microphone yet.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hi, can you hear me?

TERRI AGNEW: Now we can. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I am having problems with the audio and I'm not sure if you can hear me. Okay, well then, I'll start. I can't hear the return, but I'll start. So, we wanted to give you an update on the Standing Committee for the RDRS. It's been a few months since we've

been able to, and since we're coming to an end of our work, we wanted to be able to give you a bit of forecasting. So, next slide.

This Standing Committee was chartered a year and two years ago now, essentially to work on four targets. The first one was to establish trends of usage of the RDRS Pilot. And we've been doing that since the beginning. There's been monthly reports that are now collated into an annual report and monthly reports continue happening. And then working on listing possible technical updates.

The Pilot had a finite number of elements that we could develop it into. And with usage, there's a number of enhancements that we were able to do during the Pilot. But with usage afterwards, there's also a number of things that we believe should be added to the system. Then work on lessons learned, and particularly in consideration with the recommendations that had been met with SSAD. And finally, suggestions to the council's recommendations with a small R. We're not talking about policy recommendations here, but suggestions from the Small Team to the council. Next slide, please.

So in Istanbul, a year into the Pilot, we decided that we probably had enough data, ready usage data to start drafting our report. And so, whilst we continue running the Pilot and we continue gathering data on it, there's still monthly reports being issued. We started shortly after Istanbul, our report drafting process. So following the same, I'm not going to go back, but following the same four tenets in the charter, we're working on four chapters, each on the different topics. And we basically have now three of those chapters drafted and being reviewed, and we're about to

start the drafting of the fourth chapter. We're going to start that with a group of a series of discussions on those recommendations.

So the first chapter, the annual report, is basically all the monthly reports. As we said, chapter two on the recommendations, you would have heard, because we did this before, but essentially having an API or even two APIs went for the requesters and went for the registrars. The inclusion of Privacy and Proxy Provider, this is a, obviously it goes with the work of the PPSAI, so until policy exists there, it would be on a voluntary basis.

The same thing for ccTLDs, for those wanting to participate, to create an avenue for them, that both of those new providers would require some development of the system. And also bridging the work that is being worked on by the PSWG and law enforcement on authenticating law enforcement users to have something that we can bridge and include into the RDRS. These further developments are not insignificant. We haven't really measured the effort there, but I would assume, I would estimate myself that it'd be just about as much as was already developed into the Pilot. So, the Pilot is 50%, that would be the other 50%, so not insignificant work there.

And then in that case also, there is discussion to be had with Org, obviously, on, do we keep the Pilot on the current structure that it is, that was always thought as a Pilot, or do we need to move into a sort of more permanent structure, possibly even with a third party, external party provider to develop that. But that's discussion to be for ICANN Org to have and decide on.

The chapter three, so the most recent drafted, we went through a recommendation per recommendation comparison of what was SSAD and what is RDRS. Again, we're not doing policy development here, we're just picking what seems to have been kept and what's changed or what has been abandoned for another group, another policy or intergroup to look at into details and work on what the new policy should be. And as I already said, the fourth chapter, we haven't started yet.

Next slide, please. So, now that's the biggest question here for Council, is the report that we're producing now, which again is not a policy report, it's just our work, our presentation of our work to the Council. Should it go through Public Comment? It wasn't in the charter. It wasn't specified in the charter.

In essence, there's three ways that we see to look at it. Either we continue our work and produce a report and the current timeline would have it during or directly after ICANN83. Should we run a Public Comment phase, which would then take another 40 days for the Public Comment, plus our work to reintegrate those comments. So, meaning a report probably not back into Council until September, October this year. Or should we, as has been actually suggested by one of our members that is also a Councilor, I'll let him take the mic once later, let us finish the report, send it to Council and then for Council to decide on the face of the report, if it wants to run Public Comments on all part of the report as it sees fit.

So that's basically the question, obviously not an answer immediately, but that's basically what the Standing Committee would need to be able to know how to proceed from Council. I'm

happy to take questions. Again, I'm having difficulties hearing, so I'm not sure if I can, I'm not getting any feedback. So, I can't really take any questions. If they're said, maybe, maybe not.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Seb. Questions for Seb on this update? Seeing none, then I would advise Councilors to take note of this open question, should we report published for Public Comment, or yes or no, or should the report first go to Council and then Council can decide whether Public Comment is appropriate. No need to answer that now, but keep this in mind and take them to your groups. And I see Farzi noting that as a general principle, Public Comment is always a good idea. Any questions for Seb before we move on to the next item?

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands. Thank you so much for that update, Seb. And we will be working together fairly closely in the not-too-distant future. Okay, let's move on to Item 8. Council Discussion Next Steps for the WHOIS Implementation Advisory Group. So, we kind of teased this in the last ICANN meeting that this is something in the GNSO Council's backlog, the ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group. And instead of going into all the context, I think we have a presentation to get us up to speed on what exactly we're talking about here and what the Council's decision points are. So I think staff, I'm not sure who's jumping in here. Feodora?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Hey, Greg, it will be Caitlin.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: No worries, thank you. If we can go to the next slide. So, Jen provided a recap of this during the Council webinar in preparation for ICANN82, which Greg noted. But just as a very quick recap, many of you probably don't need this because I know that you diligently read the projects list, but the WHOIS Implementation Advisory Group is one of the projects in the Council's portfolio that's been at the project initiation phase for quite some time. This is a procedure that was recommended by the WHOIS Task Force back in 2003.

And essentially, it allows Contracted Parties who believe that their local laws are in contravention of current contractual provisions related to RDDS have a procedure by which they can apply for a waiver from those requirements that violate their local laws. So, how is the GNSO involved in this? Well, back in 2005, the GNSO launched a PDP on this topic, which resulted in the WHOIS Conflicts Procedure.

The Board adopted the recommendations in 2006 and Org produced that procedure also in 2006. Part of that procedure envisions an ongoing review of the procedure that Org would conduct in conjunction with Contracted Parties, as well as other ICANN constituencies. And as part of that review process, there was quite a bit of feedback about some of the limitations of that

procedure. And to that end, in 2017, there was an alternative trigger added to the procedure, or another way by which Contracted Parties could apply for this conflict. And I won't go into the details of that because that's not important for the Council discussion, just wanted to provide a history of where we were.

So, once that alternative trigger was added to the procedure in 2017, there was a Public Comment launched by Org to get feedback on that alternative trigger. And several comments came in, Org prepared a report and sent it to the Council. And in 2018, the plan then was to draft a charter for a new working group, which the Council did and was about to send out the call for volunteers. But as many of us know, in 2018, the landscape changed quite a bit with the adoption of the temporary specification. And then soon after that, there was the creation of, or the GNSO launched an expedited policy development process to review the temp spec.

And because there was a lot of overlap between who was participating on the EPDP and who would be part of that working group, potential working group, the Council paused the call for volunteers. And if we can go to the next slide, please. And noted that there was parallel work going on, so awaiting the conclusion of what that EPDP on the temp spec came back with, the Council was going to revisit that decision then. So to that end, in 2020, the Council voted on a different go forward plan, which did not envision immediately launching a new PDP based on the charter that the group agreed to.

Instead, at the time, the Council's go forward plan involved outreach to ICANN Org, requesting that Org, in consultation with

Contracted Parties, take into account the Public Comments received on that modification and draft a proposal for an updated modification to the procedure. And then once that proposal was submitted to Council, Council could consider that perhaps with consultation, the Council could just adopt that proposal. Or if the proposal was unsatisfactory, in other words, if the Council believed that the proposal was not consistent with the policy recommendations from 2005 about the procedure, then the Council could have a Small Team look at the charter that was drafted in 2018 and confirm that it was still fit for purpose before launching a PDP or updating this procedure.

So, shortly after the Council voted on this, the Council reached out or sent a correspondence to Org noting this go forward plan. And at the time, Org was working with Contracted Parties on what is now the data protection specification, which was another requirement coming out of that expedited policy development process on the temp spec. And Org and Contracted Parties mutually agreed that the priority should be completing that DPS before engaging in discussions about the conflicts procedure or modification to it.

So again, for those of you who have been diligently reading your projects list, you would have noted that the completion of the data protection specification was a dependency to restart this work. So, next slide, please. The DPS was published in 2025. So, the Council has a decision about what to do next. And we've included some factors here to consider when making the decision because obviously when that charter was developed in 2018 there's been quite a passage of time. And some circumstances have changed

a bit. So, there have been some large changes to RDDS as a result of the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations.

That policy, the Registration Data Policy, will be going into effect in August and that has some significant changes to requirements. Additionally, to our knowledge, no Contracted Parties have made use of the updated procedure in years. So, it might not be an urgent necessity to pursue work on this immediately. And then what is always a factor when the Council considers new or additional work is the Council's competing priorities and the prioritization of that work.

So, a couple of the options that we put on the slide, this is a not exhaustive list of options that we've discussed. But essentially, given some of the factors above and others that might not be on the slide, the Council may wish to defer reconsideration of this procedure if it doesn't seem like an urgent need or if it's not something that Contracted Parties feel is something that needs to be done. Then the Council could defer this indefinitely until there's a need to revisit it.

So for example, if we hear from the community that this needs to be revisited and prioritized, it could be a time for the Council to relook at that. Secondly, the Council could defer this for a finite period of time based on competing work and resource limitations. Because it probably goes without saying that a lot of the people that would be working on this proposal are colleagues that are involved in the implementation of other work. So, for example, the Phase 1 Implementation Review Team is now going to be discussing urgent requests again. So, obviously, that's going to take some resources. There's been a recent request to startup

Phase 2a, which is the legal versus natural and anonymization of contacts to start that soon.

Again, that's another resource need or resource consideration, rather. The third option would be to continue with the previous go-forward plan, which would be for the Council to ask ICANN Org to draft a potential modification and then consult with Contracted Parties. Of course, the consideration there is that, as I noted before, some of the colleagues that would be involved in the drafting have other work. So, it's probably not going to be something that could happen immediately. That doesn't mean it can't happen if the Council thinks that this is important to proceed with urgently.

We thought that providing a verbal update a little bit on the history and some considerations and options before the Council would be helpful before perhaps writing this into an email to the list. But we understand that you probably need to consult with your groups, and we are obviously interested in hearing from Contracted Parties about the priority of this, if this is something that is urgently needed. But we thought that rather than sending a 14-page email, that maybe having an update during the meeting would allow for initial reactions, as well as questions, if there are any. We're happy to address them. So, I will turn it over to Greg to see if anyone has any thoughts on what we just presented.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Caitlin. Initial thoughts or questions for Caitlin? Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, thanks, Greg. And Caitlin, I really do appreciate you guys taking the time to give this verbal update, because I am very much in the camp where this was so much easier for me to digest than a 14-page email. So, I think the history and the context is so important, especially understanding that this is an evolution that I guess spans back like 22 years, which is kind of mind-boggling to me.

I would just say, in terms of the options that are in front of us, and the concept of reconsidering the procedure as a whole, that perhaps one of the things on, I guess, in part of the reconsideration of the procedure, should be the consideration of whether the procedure needs to continue to exist. And I think that is just due in large part to everything you said about the way the landscape has changed, especially in light of the new Registration Data Policy that's in place.

And so, given that, obviously, I would have to take this back to the registry stakeholder group to get their full opinion before making a final decision. But just an initial reaction to some of the options you've laid out in front of us, I wonder if the second bullet point here, where we defer consideration of the next steps on this until the Registration Data Policy has been in effect for a specific period of time, might be a good way to approach this. And then, following that, ICANN Org could go and consult with Contracted Parties to see if there really is a need for the WHOIS exceptions procedure to continue to exist, given the way the landscape has changed. That could be part of it. So, just a couple of initial reactions.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Sam. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, thanks, Greg. And thanks, Caitlin, for this overview. I may inaccurately remember things on this, but wasn't this the procedure where, paraphrasing here, basically, you needed to ask ICANN for permission to be compliant with your local privacy laws? And I think you even needed to come up with some expert opinion or something that explained why you can't follow what ICANN's requirements are. And I thought it was absurd when I first read it a couple of years back. I still think it's absurd. And I was wondering whether we can just do away with it and forget it.

I think that the new specification is a good Strawman for folks to work on. It keeps some flexibility, because that document still, for example, doesn't speak to the question as to who the controller or who the processor is and all these things. So, you need to adjust the specification to your local needs anyway. And I think ICANN can't force anyone to be in breach of their local applicable laws. So, we might be putting an awful lot of community resources into stating the obvious, i.e., if you need to do something different because your local laws require you to do so, be my guest and go ahead.

And other than that, if you can do what ICANN requires you to do, then you have to do so. But if you can't, then ICANN can't put you on notice and terminate your agreement because of that. So, I think that this is an exercise that we should stop if we can. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Thomas. And sorry, follow-up question. I think I heard you say that new policy has superseded this and given Contracted Parties flexibility. What are you referring to specifically?

THOMAS RICKERT: What's the name? The outcome of EPDP phase one, the data protection specification, I think it is.

GREG DIBIASE: Got it. Thanks, Thomas. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, I agree with Thomas and even the name of this group is antiquated. We don't use WHOIS anymore, right? So, I think that, but we have to discuss with our stakeholder group because NCSG's opinion is for the privacy of the domain name registrant and some of the issues that arise from publishing the domain name registrant private sensitive data in WHOIS, now in RDAP, that has caused like violation of privacy of the domain name registrant.

So, these are the things that we deeply care about. I personally believe that it's like with the Registration Data Policy, we have in some ways solved some of the issues, but we have to take this back to our stakeholder group and decide on a path forward and I hope not decide on a path right in a year, but you know in a month or so before the next council meeting. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Great, thank you Farzi. Okay, great feedback. Any other comments or questions for Caitlin before we move on to our next item? Okay, we will send a follow-up email and please consult with your groups on that item and we will be ready to discuss if not in May shortly thereafter. Susan looks forward to the long email. Okay, let's go to Item 9, starting a lengthy Any Other Business. So first, we have an update on ICANN83, which I believe Terri will walk us through.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. Hi everyone. All right, ICANN83, this is known as the Policy Forum Meeting and it will take place on the 9th through 12th of June, 2025 in Prague. Prep week will take place the 27th and 28th of May. Meetings are being submitted as we speak and we worked with council leadership, team leads, the SGC support staff to get them all lined up.

Good news, Seb is taking on the GNSO Council dinner, but more details will follow closer to the meeting. The pre-ICANN83 GNSO Council webinar will take place on Tuesday, the 20th of May at 5 UTC. Invites have been sent out and reminder, this is mandatory for GNSO councilors to attend. The GNSO Council sessions we have lined up are the Tuesday joint GAC and GNSO meeting. Just a side note, that is only going to be 45 minutes, even though you see it in the slot for a 90-minute slot, they're splitting that that time zone with another group, so ours is only 45 minutes.

Also on Tuesday, the GNSO Council informal meeting, the closed session with our SGC leadership. We will offer Zoom for remote folks for that meeting. More information will be sent closer to the meeting for your Zoom room. Our normal GNSO Council meeting will be held on Wednesday and we'll have our GNSO Council wrap-up meeting on Thursday.

The prep week schedule will be published on the 5th of May and the comprehensive schedule for the meeting will be published on the 19th of May. Very, very important, funded travelers. Emails went out to you on the 8th of April and please make sure you spot those if you're a funded traveler and I really need you to open that email and note the deadline to book your air if you were funded for air is due by the 15th of April. There may be a couple of exceptions in there just because a couple folks names might have been added a little bit later, but anyway, but most of you the deadline is for the 15th of April.

Also very important, in that email, the funded traveler email, there's a registration link. Please make sure you register for the meeting. It's super important. One, it triggers a lot of things including you to be able to access the schedule with all of the Zoom links and your meetings and it's just very important that you do that. That's all I have on that unless there are any questions.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Terri. Any questions for Terri? Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, just really quick, Terri, so is our first meeting as a council with the GAC or are we having a meeting as a council by ourselves before that or is our first meeting in Prague with the GAC?

TERRI AGNEW: You are correct, Damon, the first meeting is with GAC and we do not hold our workshops because there's no weekend meetings and so you are correct, that is the first meeting.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Okay, I'm just thinking, I mean, I think collectively I thought we probably could have used a little bit more time as a council beforehand for in Seattle to meet with the GAC, so I don't know. I mean, I'll leave it to leadership and staff on that one. That gives me a little bit of heartburn.

GREG DIBIASE: So, great catch, Damon. I 100% agree. I think I agreed with the sentiment that we should go through the slides and really talk through what we want to present, so maybe that's probably kind of too far out. We'll take that back and figure out a way to address that because I think we have to address that. Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: Would everyone be comfortable if we could get that scheduled to take place during the 20th of May? I can, or I'm sorry, the GNSO Council webinar that was taking place on the 20th of May?

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, maybe, but if we can't find anything else, but I guess my concern would be if there's further developments that we want to discuss before then, and I'd like to meet in person. So, if we can't think of anything else, that is what we do, but I'd like to brainstorm a better solution. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, I just, sorry if this is off topic, but I just saw in chat that, and also like there was this sentiment that GAC felt that we were not, we were not answering their questions and requests. And I think that we have to be very clear with them. I'm very direct in that whatever they request, we need to consider it carefully, and we need to consider the interest and the comments and the feedback that we get from our diverse community and then respond to them.

So, if they like us to work on accuracy, we cannot like start working on accuracy because GAC wants us to do so. So, I think that there has to be a more diplomatically worded messaging that we, and we also need to show them that we are listening. We understand their concerns, but when it comes to these thorny issues of DNS Abuse and accuracy and other issues, just because it is on their agenda, it doesn't mean that we can come to a quick conclusion that we are going to like create this initiative to address it.

So, I think we need to sit down and think about how we can tell GAC how we actually work. And the other thing is that we have

actually done like this Small Team on like we have done multiple Small Teams on accuracy and DNS abuse, and we have done a lot of work on those things. It's not like we have left it off. We've done a survey and we will do further work. But just like putting it out there that just because you're dissatisfied doesn't mean that we are not doing our work.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Farzi. I agree with all that and agree with the comments in the chat that we need to have the agenda earlier. We have leadership has their initial meeting with GAC in the last week of April. So, we will work on getting those topics finalized for a meeting before we meet. So, yeah, great feedback, Farzi, and agree with the comments in the chat as well. Lawrence, did you lower your hand? Oh, no. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. I lowered my hand, but just thought to reiterate again that we have a mechanism, or rather we have a process where we have ample time in between meetings to get to arrive at what the agenda discussions will be with the GAC, particularly before each public meeting. So, that's also part of what I think the major job that Seb helps us to do and the bridge that he helps us to build.

But so, it's not like the issues brought by the GAC catches us by surprise, because there is ample time for some kind of communication between both parties. But I think it's we having to go to the GAC to keep saying the same thing over and over again,

that makes the process looks tiring, or makes us look like we're not doing anything about the issues highlighted.

So, definitely happy now that we have Small Teams that are being inaugurated. And I'm sure that when we are going to have to interact with the GAC going forward, there will definitely be some different progress reports to report around. But I don't think the issue is not being caught off the spot. I think it's just being able to show adequately what we're doing. I just felt we should have that on record too. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE:

Great. Thank you, Lawrence. Okay. Seb and leadership and staff, which work on that, addressing those concerns. And let's move on to 9.2 WSIS+20. And Desiree, you had some information to report back to Council.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC:

Yes, thank you, Chair. This is really to briefly give you an update on a few developments related to our informal work on internet governance and the WSIS+20 process to request Councilor's support on three points. First, we'd like to share those members of our INFORMAL group met with the GAC's informal IG group during ICANN82. And it was a constructive exchange. And we hope to share the meeting notes as well with you shortly pending confirmation from them, from their informal group. And secondly, we've as a team been working on a WSIS+20 mapping document, which actually aligns key areas of GNSO's work with the WSIS action lines.

As you know, the work of the World Summit of Information Society is structured through 11 or 18 action lines. And this mapping exercise is intended to support the Council's engagement in WSIS+20 and its related internet governance discussions. So, we believe it will be valuable, not just internally, but also as a resource to the GAC and the ccNSO IGLC and others as they prepare for their contributions they're considering with regards to the WSIS+20 review process.

And the GAC in particular has expressed interest in using it for their preparations. And they are also preparing a second webinar for their work. They had won an Internet Governance, I reported back at the Council at our meeting in Seattle. So, we would appreciate the Council's review of this draft we sent, also send it to the mailing list. And then we can share it more broadly with the ccNSO IG Topic Leaks and the GAC informal group. I'm not sure if anyone had time to review it, but the document is in an email and available. I can also put it in the chat room.

And third request is that the Council appoints a new representative from our informal group to the SOAC informal ICANN discussion group, because we understand this group has been active since September, 2024. And regretfully, Bruna, who previously represented GNSO, has since stepped down. And we'd like to ensure a continued GNSO presence. And we leave it to the leadership and the GNSO to decide how to coordinate in that space.

So, that's what our aim, is to both share the updates on our side and to better understand how the Council is engaging with the

broader WSIS+20 efforts. Yes, so these are the three updates I had.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Desiree. Before I open it to questions, when are you looking for feedback on that worksheet? The mapping exercise?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yeah, on this mapping exercise. Well, the sooner the better so that we can share it with the informal group, with these two informal groups. A week would be nice. Even after the Easter Monday would be really nice to get it. So, it's 21st of April.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, so maybe if we set a date by the end of next week, April 18th, would that work with the group?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: That would work. Thank you, yes.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah. And then I guess, I don't know if leadership has discussed the volunteers, but I guess anyone is welcome to volunteer. Email us directly or enlist a volunteer for the group. Staff, do you recall, do we have like a formal mechanism for pickings last time? I'm not sure we did. Yeah, it was an email. Yeah, so we can send out that email again to get the ball rolling for volunteers.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you. Yeah, that'd be great.

GREG DIBIASE: Any other questions for Desiree? Okay. Well, Desiree, thank you and thank the team for this work. It seems really important, especially at this juncture. And I also see with the team mind also recirculating the mapping exercise. So, we have it at the tops of our inbox. Desiree, would you mind sending that out one more time?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yeah, happy to do so. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Okay.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you all.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Desiree. With that, let's move to 9.3, an update from the Latin Diacritics PDP Working Group review of the project plan. And I think we had... Prudence, are you giving an update here?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Yes, that will be me, Greg. Thanks for the intro. Hi, everyone. I'll try and keep it brief. We have a very beautiful and simplified timeline that we're putting on the screen. Thanks, everyone. Just to give you all a bit of an update as to what's happening with the PDP, formerly known as LSD, lovingly referred to as LD PDP. I alluded to during the last ICANN meeting that there was suggestion of potentially implementing a phased approach to try and see if we can incorporate wording to do so we can impact the Next Round.

Just so you know, an expedited approach or a phased approach, the idea of it has been abandoned. And Jen kind of alluded to this a little bit earlier. And what we're actually doing, or when I say we, I mean staff, they're actually going to be investigating at the moment, adding some wording or like a provisional line to the Applicant Guidebook, specifically just alluding to a heads up or that or giving wording to the fact that there's recommendations to come without implementing a phased approach. So, that phased approach, as we say in the UK, is independent. Okay. So, I will segue. Does anyone have any questions about that? Did that make sense to everyone?

GREG DIBIASE: Questions?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Okay, well, let's talk to the timeframe. For those of you who are eagle eyed, you'll see that this could be deemed as quite an aggressive time frame and quite an aggressive project plan. But

hear me out, hear me out. We are actually looking at these and seeming as to how we're going so far, this is actually looking pretty realistic. So, we're looking at the early input, the deadline for the early voluntary input being the 24th of April this month.

And we're actually hoping to have the initial report public, public, made public or finished by February next year, with Public Comment for the preliminary recommendations for late around late February next year, 2026. And the submission of the final report to Council will be around approximately November to December, 2026. So, this is actually going to be quite a quick, and I'm touching wood right now, speedy and expeditious PDP. But yes, we'll be looking for Council consideration for the final recs around approximately December, 2026 to around January, 2027.

Okay, so that's that. And that's my update. Does anyone have any questions? I mean, again, it is early days, we've literally only had a couple of meetings, but any thoughts, any questions, any feelings? No?

GREG DIBIASE:

Okay. Thanks, Prudence. Next is 9.4. Review of the Project Plan for the Standing Committee on Continuous Improvement. And who do we have for that? Julie?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Julie Hedlund from staff. Great, okay. So, here's the timeline for the work. This has been circulated before and covered in our kickoff meeting at ICANN in Seattle. And starting with the Continuous Improvement Plan for CIP criteria and indicators. And

that's in two parts, as we're waiting guidance from ICANN for part two. So, we've actually started part one, and there's consideration of the criteria. And then we'll move on to consideration of the indicators. And we're also starting already on the policy implementation, policy status report review. So, these two tasks are actually ongoing. And then we'll move on to the PDP 3.0 review. Next slide, please.

So there are three assignment forms, which were sent out to the Council. The first is for the CIP framework development. And you can see that's for the ATRT3 recommendations. And there's consideration of the criteria and indicators. And let's see. Well, like I said, that's begun. They've begun that work. The groups are considering the criteria right now. And then we'll move on to the indicators.

The next assignment is Policy & Implementation, Policy Status Report. And the group has started the work on that as well with the recommendations and policy status report on EPDP. And then the GGP and CIP. And the product will be in the implementation and recommendations. If there are any implementation report. And then the third item to come is the PDP 3.0 review. And this is to agree with the 14 improvement strategies and if there are further improvements or refinements to produce an implementation report. And staff will do an analysis of the improvements and process progress so far on those improvements. I think that's it. Any questions?

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Julie. I don't see any questions in the queue. So, let's move on. Since we're running short on time, I'm going to switch and let let's do 9.6 first so Farzi can make sure to give her update before I talk about assignment forms. Farzi, did you want to give a quick update on the AOB you added?

FARZANEH BADIEI: It's really not an update. Just that because the group, the council members were very kind to allow us to do this work retroactively. I just wanted to say that we are going to have a meeting with the chair of Transfer Policy Review to discuss these things and we are going to move the work forward. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Farzi. And then the last item is just a note on the assignment forms for DNS abuse and accuracy Small Teams. Those have gone out. They will be there. I saw some discussion on list. They can be further discussed as we start up each Small Team. One question did come across from GAC. They just inquired whether a GAC member could join DNS Abuse. There is a provision in which non-councilors can join teams, but the limitation that is in the Small Team report noted that they usually bring expertise.

In SubPro, for example, we had some members that were intimately familiar with the SubPro process. I think that's just something for councilors to consider whether we want to open this up to members outside council or whether we can do something like allowing observers or liaisons to report back. So, we have a

little, I guess, two minutes. I'll see if anyone has initial thoughts on that. And if not, I'll just note that that is something for the Small Teams considered as they convene and consider their Small Team assignments in depth. Okay, Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks, Greg, for bringing this up. I also wanted to put it out here that when we, saying we now, that's myself and my colleague Vivek reported back to the BC on progress that we were making in this direction with the Small Team. There was also a similar request asked by membership and our leadership asking to join the Small Team. But we noted that this is a council, this basically is a council team. So, where there is an opportunity for people outside council to join, I'm sure there's also interest from within our constituency.

GREG DIBIASE: That's a great point, Lawrence. And I think that's speaking on, as my perspective as chair, my inclination would be to keep it to councilors unless we found some type of knowledge gap that was really important. Because as you note, if we let in one party, then I would imagine other parties will want to have joined their Small Team. And that could potentially hamper efficiency. But that's just my personal opinion. I think the Small Teams can decide. Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Greg. This is Manju. So, I agree with your personal opinion, I think. I think in NCSG, we generally also would like to

keep the Small Team as only councilors. And I think observers could be an okay idea. But I just wanted to also note that it's like now that we kind of improved our practice of Small Teams, all of meetings are recorded. So, if they're only observing, they could have just listened to recordings as well.

So, I think Small Teams mostly, we keep it to councilors. But I have a question, actually. Were you saying that if we don't decide as councilors, Small Teams can decide on their own if they want to allow more participants, or they still have to go back to councilors saying, this is what we're deciding, and we will either approve or not approve? Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thank you, Manju. I did say that, but now that you say it back to me, I have no idea if that's true. I would think it would be a council decision, a decision that we make at council. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Greg. 100% agree with what everyone has raised. I think if this is a topic that has broad interest from the community, and if we let one group join, every group is going to want to join, and then we kind of lose the point of having a Small Team. I would rather see the council set the direction that the Small Team engage in consultations with different community groups and get input fed in that way than have the direct participation.

The other thing I wanted to just raise, recognizing that our time has expired on this, we got a couple of questions and some feedback from the registry stakeholder group members on the

content of the assignment forms. Would you guys be open to maybe converting these into a Google Doc and letting us leave comments and suggestions in preparation for the next time we talk about this? Or would you prefer we keep it comments on list?

GREG DIBIASE: If there's comments, a Google Doc feels more efficient to me than having emails back and forth. So that is my preliminary answer, but I'll discuss with leadership and staff and resend if we put it in Google Doc form. Great, okay. All right, noting we are a couple minutes over time. Thanks, everyone, for their contributions today, and we will talk soon. Have a good day.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Thanks, Greg.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. As you heard, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]