EN

ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council
Thursday, 10 July 2025 at 13:00 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.

The audio is also available at:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/_HJaKOEvlVeNpPlmJmQPPdcUQMh1lHfNzPcVx8ArGOfI_SHVxluTIKTucHD4TeLP3KkYbL3220QjhRmF.nOOrVSRQ1iQoR0qj

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/CUAO_gwAdw0anq-zevDEPfVRe99vGze93QI4xVAWLk8Z9FmpogZZf443bCVdh3bk._OyIxumDEMYVOYzS?startTime=1752152471000

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

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Anne Aikman Scalese
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Greg DiBiase, Prudence Malinki
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans (joined after first vote)
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii (apologies, proxy to Manju Chen – joined after first vote), Bruna Martins dos Santos (apologies, proxy to Julf Helsingius), Julf Helsingius,Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Peter Akinremi,Manju Chen
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady (tentative apologies, proxy to Tomslin Samme-Nlar)
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :
Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison
Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC
Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests:
Ashley Heineman and Peter Koch, IFR2 Co-Chairs
Reda Josifi from ICANN Org support for IFR2

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.

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) (apology)
Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support
Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO)
Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO)

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on Thursday, the 10th of July 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: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Hong-Fu Meng?

HONG-FU MENG: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Samantha Demetriou?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Greg DiBiase?

GREGORY DIBIASE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Prudence Malinki?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Desiree Miloshevic? I don't see where Desiree has joined, but we will try to get her on. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts? I don't see where Lawrence is on, but we will try to get him on as well. Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Thomas Rickert?

THOMAS RICKERT: I'm here. Hi.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Hi.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi. Farzaneh Badii? Farzaneh did send in apologies, and the proxy will go to Manju Chen. 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? Bruna did send in her apologies, and the proxy will go to Julf Helsingius. Paul McGrady?

PAUL MCGRADY: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay. Paul will be—he may have connectivity issues. He does not plan on it, but if so, there is a proxy in play, and that will go to Tomslin Samme-Nlar. Anne Aikman Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Antonia Chu?

EN

ANTONIA CHU: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. We do have guests joining us today. It'll be Ashley Heineman and Peter Koch from IFR2. They are the co-chairs. Jennifer Bryce and Reda Josifi from ICANN Org, who support the IFR2. You also have your Policy team supporting the GNSO on, which are Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Berry Cobb, Devan Reed, and myself, Terri Agnew.

May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. As a reminder, we are in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphone and participate in the chat once they have 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 ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standard Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. And I do note Lawrence is on. So, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present.

EN

TERRI AGNEW:	Perfect. Thank you, Lawrence. All right, with all of that, I'll now turn it over to the GNSO chair, Greg DiBiase. Please begin.
GREGORY DIBIASE:	Thank you so much, Terri. Welcome, everyone, to our July meeting. A lot to get through today, so we'll dive right in. I'll start by asking if anyone has an update to their Statement of Interest. Sam?
SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:	Thanks, Greg. It's not an update to the Statement of Interest per se, but I just wanted to let everyone know that—I think everyone knows I'm expecting a baby at the end of this month. So this is going to be my last Council call for a few months. The Registries will appoint someone to hold my proxy for at least July. Sorry, we're in July. For August and September. And I expect my leave will be finishing up in time for me to join remotely for the October meeting at ICANN84, but TBD on at this point. So I just wanted to let everyone know. Thank you.
GREGORY DIBIASE:	Great. Thanks, Sam. That's a much more exciting Statement of Interest than we usually get. So appreciate it. Peter?
PETER AKINREMI:	Thanks, Greg. I just wanted to let everyone know that my region changes to North America. Thank you.

EN

GREGORY DIBIASE: Okay. Thank you, Peter. Great. Would anyone like to amend the agenda that was sent out? Okay, seeing none. I'll note that the minutes of our June GNSO Council meeting were posted on June 30. If folks would like to go back and reference those, we are not going to go through the projects list today because nothing has changed status, right? We haven't moved anything from pending to a different status, so we can go right into the Consent Agenda, which we have Tomslin to help us with.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Greg. This is a simple one. So we have two Consent Agendas, one to confirm the GNSO appointed member for the Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group, WHOIS—I forget the name. I'm trying to… Nitin Walia, yes. And then the second is the content to the GAC Communiqué from the Council. So I'll pass it on to Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Before we start, I'm just looking for Desiree one more time before the vote. I don't see where Desiree is on so we will mark her as absent. So here we go. One moment, please. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion to please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye. That was my voice. I want to let you know nobody did vote against it. Hearing no one, would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

EN

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies—so it'd be Julf for Bruna, and Manju for Farzi—please say aye?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Aye.

MANJU CHEN: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Just a note again, we have one absent, but no abstention nor objection, the motion passes. Back to you.

GREGORY DIBIASE: All right, thank you, Terri. Let's get into the more exciting vote or interesting vote. Okay. By way of background, as I'm sure you've all seen on list over the past couple of weeks, the various stakeholder groups have been reacting to an ALAC Empowered Community petition regarding a resolution taken by the Board to defer ATRT4 and suggest that a review of ICANN's Bylaw mandated reviews be undertaken, given concerns about how those are working, and an idea that it might be the right time to look at those reviews again holistically to make sure that they are fulfilling their intended purpose.

The IPC has submitted a motion related, but not specifically regarding the ALAC petition. I think you've seen it on list, but it

kind of speaks to what Council's reaction should be to this. It contemplates helping draft a Bylaws amendment, as well as providing guidance on this subject.

Since this motion was submitted after the document deadline, we have two votes here. The first is to vote whether to consider the motion, given that it was submitted late. And then if that passes, there's a second vote on the motion itself.

Before we get into that, I have even more updates from yesterday that I haven't shared with the list yet because they're breaking news. There was an SO/AC call with the Board and SO/AC leaders. And in that call, a couple of things of note happens, and we will be sure to send a summary after this meeting as well. But first, Alejandra, chair of the ccNSO, shared that the ccNSO has started on a draft charter proposing what a CCG, a Cross-Community Group, work could look like, what the charter could look like for a review of reviews, and is looking for feedback on how that looks and how that works. So that's one element. Thank you, Justine. A Community Coordination Group. So that's the first part.

And then the second update came from the Board in which they expressed a willingness to consider the Bylaws amendment that have been proposed by a couple of stakeholder groups on list in which they would change the cadence of the Bylaw mandated reviews and then propose this one-time review of reviews that would have some type of limitation. The caveat that they said is that they were hesitant to put in like a firm timeline, like a year, for example, by which the review of reviews had to wrap up because we don't know exactly how this is going to proceed and it could be

going well but taking longer, and if there's a strict time period, then that could be problematic. So they're trying to figure out some other mechanism where the community still has the ability to say, "All right, this has gone on long enough, and we need to return to the original Bylaws as stated."

So that's the idea. This is all tentative from the Board, but they wanted to give their input and note that they're willing to engage with the different parts of community that do have concerns. Because I think, as noted, even in messages regarding the ALAC petition, those that did not feel like it was prudent to sign on still noted that they understood the ALAC's concerns and were appreciative for ALAC for raising those.

So that is a lot of backgrounds. I'm going to focus us back on the first vote here, which is whether to proceed with the consideration of the IPC motion. So I'm going to stop there and open it up the comments on the first vote, noting that we will have time to discuss what we think the next step should be, regardless. Hopefully that was not too long and it was comprehensible. Anne, let's start with you.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thank you, Greg, for that breaking news. I just wanted to note that I think a lot of what you said about the approach being taken by the Board is quite consistent with the IPC's motion, maybe only requiring a slight friendly amendment when relation to the issue of timeframe with respect to whether the existing Bylaws kick back in and a mechanism to deal with that. Also, I think that the idea of having Council draft, a small team presenting a draft Bylaw to

Council would be consistent with our multistakeholder model. So I guess I would urge everyone to allow us to consider that motion at this meeting. I think it's also completely consistent with what the ccNSO is proposing because there's nothing about what the ccNSO is proposing that would conflict with our ability within GNSO to propose a Bylaw to the Board. And I even have a recollection that they may have previously requested that the community be involved in that. So I really urge all councilors who vote—and of course, I do not vote—to vote in favor of consideration of the IPC's motion. Thank you.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. And I think you're right for the most part. There's certainly a lot of parallels between what the IPC is suggesting and what the Board has signaled they're open to. I don't think there's an exact overlap, and we need to figure out if it needed to be amended or not. But, yeah, I think the paths may be converging, I guess, for lack of a better term. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. And thanks, everyone. I do appreciate that this has gone on the agenda. As I said in my e-mail, I completely appreciate this is on late. I wanted to just give a bit more explanation, I suppose. I had also put my hand up to say that I thought, in the absence of Desiree, we possibly couldn't deal with the first part until she joined, but I've just seen Desiree's pop up, so I think we're okay in terms of that now.

I very much appreciate the opportunity for everyone to consider this. It really was to have something on the table for people to look at. And we knew we were having a discussion. It's possible that the result of our discussion would come out in a place where we were all aligned around one of the options, and having a motion on the table would allow us potentially to vote, and that seemed like a good thing. But if we don't seem aligned around that particular path, or we aren't yet aligned, then obviously I wouldn't be trying to push us forward down a path. This isn't trying to preempt an outcome. That's what I'm trying to say. It was more just in case if we had something on the table and people were able and willing and in a position to vote, it would allow us to actually pass a motion.

And the second point was just to say, again, the part about sort of the idea of us convening maybe a GNSO small team. It may or may not be that that's necessary. It's not intended as an attempt as a sort of GNSO land grab. But it was more that, you know, we're kind of two months or so past the kind of original Board decision. We're a month now after the ICANN meeting. And until that information that Greg just shared, it didn't seem like masses of progress was being made. And so it felt like if someone needs to draft a Bylaws amendment, and it isn't being drafted already, maybe we should just pick up the pen. And so that what was in mind. It was, "Let's get a draft on the table that people can pull apart," rather than "Let's seize control." So that's just the kind of background, really, to what the kind of thinking was, not an attempt to do some kind of land grab or takeover. Really, just an attempt to move things on in an environment where, for the mere mortals of us, there's not an obvious sign of it moving. So

EN

obviously, there's been a bit of movement behind the scenes, perhaps. But I don't necessarily think that the idea of us helping with a draft by laws amendment is in conflict to some kind of charter that the ccNSO might be putting out on the table. In fact, I think it's no different to that kind of idea. They're equally trying to just put something on the table for people to consider.

And yes, I think the reason for picking that option one, and again, it's all subject to discussion, was because, as Paul's pointing out, it was the option that I think the NCSG had proposed, and it was the option that as we understood it as a Council, was the one that gained traction during the ICANN—I don't know which meeting we were at—the Prague meeting, and so that was why. Now, whether we do ultimately come down on that path or not is for discussion. I think I'll stop. I'm probably rambling.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Susan. That all makes sense to me. I think we're all on the same page of driving, putting pressure to drive to an outcome, and I think that's the important takeaway. Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Greg. I guess my question is purely procedural. I think we are all willing to discuss this motion, like the content of this motion, but probably some of us will prefer to think of it for a longer time, because this is really quite last minute. And as for NCSG, although we know we clearly understand that this is building on what we propose, but still we didn't have time to bring this back to RrSG, in a sense, discuss this. So we might have to

ask for deferral of voting on this motion for the next—well, we'll vote in the next Council meeting. But if we're deferring this, do we still have to vote to agree to discuss the first in order that we could defer this up? I'm not sure how we do this. Should we vote no? Whether we vote to discuss this or not, we were going to discuss this. It's just very confusing to me, so that's my question. Thanks.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Manju. I think that's right. I think what the difference is, if we vote against consideration, it is no longer on the agenda, and no one needs to ask to a deferral. So next meeting, someone could bring an entirely new motion, but that would be a new motion. If we vote to consider it and then someone asked for a deferral, which seems likely, and full transparency, the registrars are also thinking about that, as Prudence said in the chat, but if we vote to consider it and then defer, it remains as an item on our August agenda, right? So that deferral, it keeps the motion alive, so to speak, for our August meeting.

So I think, since we're going to discuss it regardless, I'm not sure it makes the hugest difference, but I think perhaps the path is we could vote to accept this consideration, to consider it, given that I think that IPC the motion is, I guess, on the right track of a lot of people were thinking. Then, if it's deferred, it's moved to August, and we have time to amend or change as necessary, given the movement that we're seeing in a couple other places. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Great, Greg. That's very good to know. And since you're the guy who has the discretion to defer, I'm sure that all those voting would like to know that that would be within your discretion in terms of granting a deferral, if requested.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Yes, I would. Given that there's a short timeframe here. I think how this is going to go is if you want to vote to consider this, like keep the discussion going and keep it on the agenda, leadership will be granting a deferral, given that there hasn't been much time to consider. Makes sense to everybody?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Great. Thank you.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Okay. So seeing no hands, let's move on to the initial vote. Really get into some in-depth GNSO procedure here. So, Terri, do you want to run that first vote?

TERRI AGNEW: Sure. We will go ahead and take the first vote. Before we do, Desiree has joined so she will be voting this round. Also, Farzaneh has joined so she will be voting this round as well. All right, here we go.

Would anyone like to abstain from this vote? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion?

EN

Please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in the favor of this motion, please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies please say aye? So that is now Julf Helsingius for Bruna Martins Dos Santos.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. No abstention, no objection. The motion passes. Back to you.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Terri. Before we start discussion, I guess I'll open it up and ask if anyone would like to defer this motion, given the short time since it's been proposed? Prudence or Sam?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: I'll just jump in really quickly. In light of the recent developments that you proposed and shared with Council, Greg, and also in light of also understanding the ethos of what Susan mentioned about just wanting to move things forward, I would like to respectfully request a deferral, just so we have adequate time to consider all

of the developments because there's been multiple different things that have been thrown into the mix as it were. So I'd like to request a deferral. Thanks.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Prudence. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Greg. I'll just note my support for Prudence's request.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Obviously, I don't have a say in this, but I just wanted to point out that you want to take this motion forward, then there should be an amendment to whereas paragraph seven. I think it should be ICANN83 meeting rather than ICANN84 since ICANN84 hasn't happened. Thanks.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Justine. Yeah. I think if this were to go forward, there's likely a number of amendments given discussion to the Board. So I'm seeing support for Prudence's request for deferral and nonobjection. So leadership will grant this deferral. Those will keep the motion on our August agenda unless it is withdrawn with IPC, and we have time to submit amendments that can reflect the

EN

discussion we're starting now. So I'll stop there and see if anyone has concerns with deferring this motion. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. No, I do not have any concern. The hand came up just when you're asking the question. It's not to answer the question and whether there are concerns. I just wanted to just make a comment that I think NCSG was wondering whether a Council small team was the right team or place to actually craft that language. So whether we could consider looking at Cross-Community Working Group so that we involve many people, since it's not a GNSO-specific item. That's just what I was going to put so that it's considered. Thanks.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Yeah. I think moving on to the next phase here, there's, I guess, two questions in my mind. The first regarding ccNSO work, the work that's already been done, I'd like to, as opposed to reinventing the wheel, look at what they've already put down on paper. The one request we did get from Alejandra is they don't want too large of a group. They want one or two people from the GNSO to participate in a meeting directly with ccNSO. But I guess that does not preclude us from having more volunteers that are thinking about this, I guess, more holistically. So, yeah, I guess those are the two open questions. How do we engage ccNSO specifically and looking at this proposed charter? And do we want a small team or something less formal, like a group of volunteers that are thinking about this and reporting back to Council? Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks, Greg. I think that the charter idea in the ccNSO, in terms of the charter for review of reviews, would be a great community cooperation exercise. However, with respect to the drafting of a Bylaws amendment, I think we are better off within Council drafting for that purpose, because, again, size of the group and the very large number of participants I think would involve some time issues that would be less expedient. I think that the GNSO Council is actually a great place for a Bylaws amendment to be drafted. And of course, there's nothing final about that because it's a proposal to the Board and the community, and the Board always seeks public comment on Bylaws amendments and has to have the communities, essentially. It's not an approval, but looking at an agreement with respect to amending Bylaws, even though it's not a fundamental Bylaw, it will come to the community, and it would eventually go to the coordination group that's being discussed. I just think a coordination group is not the most efficient way to propose Bylaws amendments. I think Council is more efficient. Thank you.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. Well, I don't think we're decided on the fact that we, I guess, "write" the Bylaws. There certainly could be a group of volunteers that could work on a letter or something, giving our feedback on how we're thinking about the Bylaw. And if that letter includes proposed sample text to consider, maybe that's a path forward. Damon?

EN

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I think all the information about the ccNSO and the Board meetings that I guess happened yesterday, I suspect staff will already do this. I just want to request, if there's any notes or recordings of those that could be disseminated to us as councilors, that would be really helpful, just so we could just have everything in writing or recording, just so we can sort of compare notes and everything, and come back with everything analyzed for our August meeting.

GREGORY DIBIASE: We'll certainly do that, Damon. Thank you. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Greg. I would second Damon's point there that having something on paper makes it just a lot easier for us as councilors to review, but also to get input from our stakeholder groups and constituencies. But also, I wanted to chime in on the point about a small team and what that small team might focus on. I think I come down on the side that you articulated in your last comment, Greg, which is, I think it would behoove a small group of councilors because that team could meet intersessionally between now and the next full Council meeting in August. And it seems like this process is going fairly quickly, and could kind of take the lead on reviewing the draft charter for review of reviews as well as potential Bylaw amendment text. However, I don't agree that that team should take the lead on drafting the Bylaw amendment text. I think that's a role that's much better suited toward ICANN's Legal department, actually.

EN

I was trying to remind myself what happened, like what the subject was, but there was very recently, in the last year or so, a small change made to the Bylaws. ICANN Legal took the lead on drafting it, and then the community reviewed and responded and provided input. I think that's a smoother path. So I would maybe prefer to see the small team focus on that. But I do support the idea of having a small team who can work quickly and review this and bring some recs back to the full Council for discussion in August.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Sam. Yeah. I think I agree we need to be careful on whether we're drafting the Bylaws. I think that is ICANN Legal. But to Anne's point, I think they're always open to suggestion on how we're thinking about it. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks all. This may be my misunderstanding or mishearing of what was being said, but I felt like I came off a recent meeting, which probably was the meeting planning call a couple of weeks ago, with the distinct impression that the view was that the Bylaws amendment was something that the community had asked for rather than the Board, and that they were looking to the community to propose something. And so, quite frankly, that was what was in my mind when I was suggesting it. If that's not the case, then that's fine. But again, it was an attempt to kind of get us all talking about what's the right path to get this done quickly, because there didn't seem to be something on the table for us to look at yet, and time is moving on. And it felt like it's always easier

EN

to have a draft out there to look at that you can then pull apart and tweak than it is to have a blank piece of paper. But I'm not wedded to the idea of us drafting it. I came away with the impression that the Board was expecting the community to do this work, and it wasn't clear to me who in the community was doing it.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Sure. Thanks, Susan. I'm seeing a lot of chat that's basically we think the Board is open to ideas and potential language, but there's an understanding ICANN Legal would take the final cut of this, right? So, I think I'm hearing convening a small group of volunteers. I don't know if this needs to be a formal small team because we need to move pretty fast here, but that team would look at the charter and perhaps send a representative to talk with the ccNSO and whoever else that's talking about the charter, and then have language regarding the Bylaws and the path forward to send back to Council. So that is kind of what I'm hearing.

I do want to just pause real fast. It seems like we're all aligned on the option that NCSG proposed and was outlined in the IPC motion with the caveat on, I guess, the callback on timing may be subject to change. I'm just going to say that out loud to saying that I think we're all aligned there. So I guess path forward, a small group of volunteers would be looking at the CCG charter, suggesting language, whether that's an actual Bylaws amendment or an articulation of how the Council thinks a Bylaws amendment should be laid out, and then consensus around this option that the NCSG articulated and was contained within the IPC motion. Does that sound right to folks? I see a floating thumbs up. Yes from Paul, sounds good.

EN

Okay. Then I think the next items are per Damon's request for Council leadership to write this all out so it's digestible and able to bring back to groups, and then we'll solicit volunteers to join a small group to get to work on this and make some progress. Okay. So, yeah, we can volunteer now or respond to the letter that leadership sends out with volunteers. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Greg. Considering that you suggest that we volunteer now, I remember that ccNSO is a pretty small group, so I wonder whether there is an indication of how big that group should be, so that we know the maximum people who can volunteer to look at it.

GREGORY DIBIASE: I think maybe within our GNSO team, it could be more volunteers, but I think with that group we would have to send a representative to talk to ccNSO so the room doesn't get so big. So that group could be a larger group on Council that make sure we're on the same page with our thinking, but actually in going to a meeting and engaging the ccNSO, let's just have one volunteer. Otherwise, all the SOs and ACs are going to send their armies of volunteers, and so on, and so on. And we already have Anne nominating Susan to rep our volunteer group. There we go. I love Susan's surprised face.

Okay, cool. We'll get to work on that. But I'm encouraged by what appears to be progress here. I guess the last thing I'd note before closing, just a note to Justine and ALAC, I guess at least in my personal capacity, we appreciate the ALAC's sentiment here. And

even though I think that groups ultimately aren't signing on to the petition, we understand where this is coming from. And I think, as a side note, it's also good and interesting to use this Empowered Community muscle to test out how it works. So I think that's a worthwhile exercise. So I want to make sure that our hesitancy to sign on the petition does not come across as opposition or anything like that to ALAC. I think we appreciate the effort, and it's pushed us to be more proactive here. Great. Anyone else have comments on this topic? Okay. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks, Greg. It looks like a great path forward. I did want to take the opportunity, if it doesn't take too much time, to ask Justine for any updates that she could share with us regarding the ALAC petition, if she's willing.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. And the answer is no, I do not have an update.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Okay. Thanks, Justine.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Justine. Okay. All right, let's move on to item five, which is a Council briefing on the Second IANA Naming Function Review Team Draft Report. I think we have special guests, Ashley and Peter, to present this to us.

EN

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi. Thanks all. Apologies in advance. I'm a bit froggy. I have a cold. And apologies again if I start coughing. But thankfully, Peter, we're co-chairs, so he will, I'm sure, be happy to jump in on the slides that have been allotted to me.

Yes, IANA Naming Function Review 2. We're going to skip a lot of the background in terms of like why we were formed, how we were formed, and all that. I understand we have 20 minutes, and the main purpose here is for you all to understand our recommendations since you all will have to vote on some of them. So with that, if we go the next slide, please.

In short order, these are our recommendations. We spent quite a lot of time going over the contract as well as the Statement of Work that PTI is doing to perform the naming function. And in that extensive review, we came up with four recommendations. The first two have to do with DNSSEC, first of which being, in the Statement of Work, there's quite a few very specific details with respect to how DNSSEC is to be performed. And it was up our view that these specific details should be removed to allow for flexibility. Actually, I'm not going to go into too much detail here, so I want to go over the next couple of slides.

So the first to deal with DNSSEC. The first removing some of the policy details. The second is to identify the appropriate policy authority for DNSSEC. Third, make the IANA Naming Function contract as amended publicly accessible. And fourth, with reference to the timing of the reviews, which I think is timely, considering your previous subject just covered, is that we recommend that the timing of the reviews be modified slightly. Next slide, please.

All right, so the meat that I was prematurely getting into. All right, these first two dealing with DNSSEC. As I noted previously, there was quite a lot of specific details regarding DNSSEC in the Statement of Work, and we would like that to be removed only because you don't want too many specifics in a contract because things can change, and this will future proof the alignment of the contract with DNSSEC as it evolves. And this is fairly standard with how other functions are performed.

The other recommendation has to deal with identifying and pointing to an appropriate policy authority for DNSSEC. As you may know or may want to look into is that when it comes to other parts of the naming functions, like how TLD changes are made to the root, and same with ccTLD changes made to the root, the contract and the Statement of Work refers back to specific documentation and/or specific groups that are responsible for the development of these policies.

So, for example, the GAC had developed a number of documentation with respect to how certain things should be handled, the ccNSO with how CC should be handled. And it would be great if there's something existed for DNSSEC, because right now it is not noted in the contract or the Statement of Work. Who has the responsibility? If there ever is a time that the approach to how DNSSEC is handled changes, who has that responsibility?

So pointing to that we think would be helpful. That being said, we don't say how that should happen. We think that should be a discussion within the community. I think it's understood that that would be a community-driven process. But the purpose of our

group as the review team was just to spot what needed to be fixed and not necessarily how to fix it. Next slide, please.

Third recommendation, as noted, making the IANA Naming Function contract as amended publicly accessible. This came up as part of our review because, as we were doing the review itself, we were finding things that we thought needed to be fixed, and then realizing later that they had been fixed. It just wasn't immediately obvious. So what we would like to see happen is have a way to publicly see how things have changed. And so we have suggested that providing a clear mapping of which lines have been amended to sit alongside the original contract, there are probably other ways that this could be handled. The overarching recommendation is just make it clear so you don't have to be diving through lots of documentation to find what changes have been made to the contract over the years. And the intent of this is to ensure visibility of the latest version of the contract. Pretty simple. Transparency. Next slide, please.

Recommendation 4, with reference to the timing of the reviews. As it currently reads—and let me pull up my notes here so I get it correct—that the reviews are to take place according to—I believe it's the Bylaws. Is it once every five years, measured from the date the previous IFRT for a periodic review was convened. So, basically, at the start of the IFR. And it was noted largely by the ccNSO in the previous review period that this is problematic and that it takes at least 12 months to conduct a review, and that does not include Board approval and implementation. And we actually experienced that this time. I mean, it had just been approved by the time our group was kicked off and hadn't been implemented.

EN

So it was really hard to start a review when changes from the previous review hadn't even begun yet.

So what we propose is that these reviews be conducted once every five years, measured from the date that the most recent IFR, the review, submits its final report to the Board. At least our thinking is that this will provide sufficient time between delivering the recommendations and commencing the next review. So, hopefully that makes sense. Okay. Next slide and final slide for me.

In addition to these recommendations, as I noted, we went through the contract and that Statement of Work with a fine tooth comb. I mean, we really looked at that sucker. As you can imagine, particularly with those folks of us that participate in ICANN, we like to find stuff. We're really great at editing. So we found a lot of things that are nice-to-haves, as we called it. We found knits that should have been fixed, would have been picked up maybe by a legal review but weren't. But they weren't causing any problems per se. They didn't rise to the occasion of opening up the contract and making changes.

That said, we did have conversations with PTI staff and ICANN Legal, and we raised these issues with them, just kind of bounce off like, what do you think about this? How did this happen? What did it happen? And their thought was, "You may have decided that these don't rise to the occasion of recommendations, but make a list of everything that you found." And if we do come to a point where we're going to do a major overhaul of the contract, we're going to make little knits and bits and fixes here and there, then we could take a look at them at that time. So we included a whole

EN

annex of these little knits, the nice-to-haves, but we're not asking for them to be fixed immediately and aren't something that we subject to you all to vote on, but just wanted you to be aware of them.

So, basically, in this bucket are drafting improvements, suggestions to timestamp the transition plan, which is something that's a requirement under the contract to have a transition plan. So every time you review the transition plan, put a timestamp on it. That might be helpful. Consider alternative approaches to reporting on regular SLA exceptions. We found that going through the SLA reviews that there were some exceptions noted, but it wasn't PTI's fault. They were like circumstances outside of their control or they were issues that occurred on the customer side. So it really wasn't fair to show it as a ding on the SLAs. So that was one thing we flagged as a "Hey, you might just want to take a look at these SLAs and take account for exceptions that are outside of the control of the contractor." And then also consider the role of the Ombuds and complaint routing.

That is it in a nutshell. I'm going to turn it now over to co-chair Peter Koch to give you an update on the comment process that we conducted. So take it away, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Ashley. Hello, everyone. I must apologize. I'm in a noisy environment, so let's hope that my machine can actually calculate that background away. Can we have the next slide, please? Yes. Thank you.

So this is all following the procedure laid out in the Bylaws, actually. We had a draft report out with a public comment period, and we received a number of comments that would support the recommendations with no commenters expressing lack of support, so no opposition. That's for one and two. That's the easy part on the terms of separating out the gory details of DNSSEC out of the contract. And the third one, again, four of the submitters referred to this and supported. There's no opposition. And then six of the commenters directly supported the final recommendation, which is the one that would require change to the Bylaws, changing the definition of the start interval, as Ashley just explained. And also the commenter supported what we call the incidental findings, which was the list of things that Ashley just talked about in terms of we didn't want to waste the work that the team had done. Actually, it might be instructive for anybody who has to go through the contract at that level of detail in the future anyway. So there was a broad support. We had no opposition to either the collection of the report or to the recommendations in any detail, which brought us to—I guess we have one more slide here.

We did have some additional comments or some commenters added to this and went beyond the questions that were asked in the Public Comment period. One was an issue of the HSM security and the location of the key facilities for DNSSEC signing of the root. But the team decided that this particular detail would be out of scope for the review. And this also refers to the level of detail where we suggested in Recommendation 1 and 2 to separate out this kind of detail out of the contract.

We got a hint about the IANA IPR agreements that is mostly about the question who holds the IPR on the IANA term and the iana.org domain name, and so on, and so forth. The Community Coordination Group that deals with that, you can find the details in the report, but the team decided again that this was out of scope for the functions review. It is remotely related to the contract, but it is not scope of our review.

And then we had suggestions regarding the existing findings and to expand on a solution. We had—I'll start with a second. There was a suggestion to schedule or align the timing of the IANA Function Reviews that we just talked about, also in relation to the CSC reviews. But the team refrained from adopting this as a recommendation because, again, we thought that this is out of scope for the review team because it involves or affects another stream of reviews, and we wouldn't want to make recommendations here. Again, this is up for anybody else in the community take up and find the appropriate venue to make suggestions. Our assessment was that it is out of scope.

And the other one, the complaints process across ICANN, there is someone that, and especially the ccNSO, pointed out there is the Ombuds that has a special role that has never been executed when it comes to the IANA functions in the customers, which is basically the TLDs, Cs, and Gs, if they feel that the request wasn't appropriately handled, so on and so forth. In that case, this is not an misconduct issue. It would be another type of issue that is gives the Ombuds a special role.

Now, also the Board recently approved the ccTLD Specific Review mechanism, which now adds to the number of review mechanisms

in here, so that we have multiple, maybe confusing and maybe competing or at least having unclear relations, a number of review processes. Again, the team decided that that's a valuable suggestion, but it would be beyond the scope of the review of the contract. It's something that was created by adding another piece to the overall set of policies, but it's nothing that comes out of the contract itself. So everything should be reviewed in context, and that's why we kindly abstain from it.

So as it says in the colored rectangle here, the team consensus was that the additions were all out of scope, and that's where we are, which leads us—if we have one other slide. Yeah, okay. So that's the next steps before that. So the recommendations remain the same. We received the comments, the additional subject suggestions that the team decided that are all valuable but we won't change the report to that regard. We added some minor editorial changes, but the recommendations remain on substance.

Now, for this to come into effect and for the team to be able to be dissolved and actually for us to deliver the report, what we need is both the GNSO and the ccNSO Council to vote on the approval of the IFR2 Recommendations 1 and 2 with the super majority. And then upon approval, because that goes into the details of the contract, that's where the contracts will be changed. And upon approval by most of the Councils, then our team will formally submit the final report to the ICANN Board, which cannot be done without the blessing, so to speak, of the affected customer bases. And then, as you see, the Board has 45 days to act on this, and then the team can be dissolved.

EN

So you can help us with that. But before that, maybe any questions? And whoever is moderating, Tomslin has his hand up.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thank you both for that detailed summary. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks Greg, and thanks, Ashley and Peter, for, like Greg mentioned, the detailed summary. I just have been struggling with the incidental finding in the Ombudsman, which you explained a bit further, Peter. So if I understand correctly, the concern with the Ombuds here is not necessarily what is in the contract but the fact that there are other mechanisms outside this contract that sort of overlap, and therefore the reason for the incidental finding. Am I correct?

PETER KOCH: If I may. Yes, this is basically correct. So there were two aspects to this. One is when we reviewed the contract, we found that role of the Ombuds, which we discussed and weren't sure about, so we had a couple of conversations, including with the Ombuds and ICANN Legal. It's important to understand that this path has never been explored so far. It's kind of an unused code path in this kind of program. So there is no issue with it by itself. It's the issue of its presence that might be confusing. Now, added to that, for the CCs where we now have the specific policy on review mechanisms, there might be an overlap. We didn't finally assess that there is an overlap, but at least we were of the opinion that that should be further investigated then maybe fixed. But again, in the context of

what the applicable policies are plus what the contract says. Does that answer your question?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think so. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Just a very small addition to that explanation—thank you, Peter. This is Ashley, co-chair of the IFR2—is that this was also, in our digging to find out where this all came from and that this was actually called for during the IANA transition and the Accountability Review that happened, I don't know how many moons ago now, and so we didn't want to tinker with anything that was called for as a direct result of that process. So that was something else, like having to go through the time machine and figuring out where all this language came from. That's one of the reasons why we just flagged it as something incidental. But we didn't want to change anything because it came out of another process. Thanks.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Ashley. Any other questions for Ashley and Peter? I'll note, as Peter explained, we are going to vote on this at next Council meeting. So please share this report with your stakeholder groups. And if you do have concerns, raise them expeditiously. I don't see any other hands. So thanks so much, Ashley and Peter, for this presentation. We hope to have a positive vote on this in August.

PETER KOCH: Thank you so much. Bye.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Okay. Moving on to the next Council item, we have update on privacy/proxy services, accreditation issues, implementation work. I think we have Paul McGrady, the Council liaison to this IRT, to present.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, everybody. We have done quite a bit of work, and hopefully I do it all justice, and I certainly hope the staff is here with me to help bail me out if I leave something out or got it wrong, but they were kind enough to put together some slides. So let's just jump in here. All right, and we'll go to the next slide.

We are going to talk a bit about the background, the current work from the IRT, and what the Council will be looking at next. All right, let's go on to the next slide, and the next one. Here we go.

So we have a long history here, folks, and that's part of why the team is asking us to do what they're asking us to do. We'll get to that. The issues related to privacy and proxy services relate back to the 2013 RAA. The Council initiated a PDP in October of 2023. And that final report came slightly more than two years later, and the final report with 21 policy recommendations. These were approved by Council. Then in 2016, ICANN worked on implementation until 2019. When the staff—again, it's important to be accurate to history. The staff chose to pause the IRT. And IRTs

EN

are staff-driven processes, so there it is. And the reasons for that was because of the overlapping issues around GDPR, data processing, and we all remember the famous Temporary Specification. So, in essence, the work ran into changes in the law that staff thought required a pause. So we're going to go on to the next slide here.

More background, although the gTLD registration data is no longer public by default, we still have proxy and privacy services within the ecosystem, and we still need to deal with implementing these recommendations, so that the IRT was resumed in July 2024. I guess that was a year ago. It seems like just the other day. We now have sort of the full set of GDPR issues, data processing issues, Temporary Specification, and the Registration Data Policy as the proper background. So that's how we got here. Let's jump ahead here to what's next.

This is sort of like a prettier way to talk about the timeline. I think we'll skip this one for speed, but it's nice. The current PPSAI IRT work. Let's jump into here. So it's a normal IRT, right? The team is assisting staff and developing implementation details for the Privacy/Proxy Accreditation Program, and it is reviewing and answering some threshold questions identified in the areas that require additional guidance from the Council to inform the implementation design. Let me sort of explain what all that means, which is some of the recommendations of the 21 seem a little crusty to some since they were 2015 recommendations, and the IRT team has put together or putting together a list of questions that they believe Council needs to weigh in on. So that's what the team has been up to. Let's move on to the next one.

So the Category 1 questions, the threshold questions, are there any policy questions or items in the IRT that the IRT already wants to bring to the Council for guidance? That answer was yes. The group identified questions around the definitions of proxy and privacy service in the final report as they pertain to changes in the industry landscape, and the guidance requested as the IRT would like the GNSO Council guidance on the scope of what can be adjusted in implementation.

Next up, Category 2, implementation model related to the Accreditation Program. You all might remember that part of the PPSAI work was to develop a way to accredit privacy/proxy services. So this question came up as, can an implementation model without a new stand-alone Accreditation Program remain consistent with the policy recommendations? The IRT seems to believe so, but they would like the Council's guidance on whether the policy recommendations would preclude the implementation of potential accreditation models for this policy. In other words, are we looking at the spirit or the letter of the recommendations.

Category 3. Disclosure frameworks for intellectual property and law enforcement. And the question there is, are there specific areas to revisit under new law and policy? In other words, have the disclosure frameworks been overtaken by changes to law or changes to ICANN internal policy? The IRT does not believe that there have been any changes that would overtake those, and that they are asking the question of whether or not, again, if it's a letter of the recommendations or the spirit of the recommendations, in other words, where the disclosure frameworks intended to be illustrative or prescriptive. So the IRT would like Council's

guidance on to what extent the illustrative disclosure framework in Annex B of the PPSAI Final Report is a policy requirement or is intended to simply be illustrative of what could be.

All right. More about disclosure frameworks. The next question is, can these frameworks be aligned with existing work on Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), Registration Data Policy, and other existing procedures and remain consistent with the policy recommendations? The IRT believes that answer is yes, but they are seeking Council guidance on aligning PPSAI disclosure frameworks with the work involved in RDRS/SSAD and/or successor systems, as well as the Registration Data Policy. So that's a chunky question for Council to consider.

In terms of what's next for Council, we expect in August that these threshold questions will be formally presented to Council, and then Council will determine what approach to take to review these or to provide the guidance to the PPSAI threshold questions. In September, we're hoping for draft responses to these questions, and that can be socialized with different groups. In October, we hope that Council will be prepared to discuss input received and finalize the responses to the IRT so that they can keep working considerations.

Paul's retirement, October. For the record, anybody listening, I am not retiring from practice of law or real life or anything like that, but I am evaporating from Council. I prefer the word evaporating over retirement. I think it's much more descriptive of what's happening. But I'm going away, so we do need to have a new liaison basically come along, I think, now to help shepherd this work so that we

EN

can hopefully hit the October deadlines, and that person will be intimately familiar with where this is all landing.

And then the other considerations are, as we all know, the RDRS itself, that team is getting ready to bring a report back to Council. And so bringing those two big, giant work streams—they're both chunky—into some sort of alignment or at least that they're not working against each other, is an important piece of all this. And I think will most likely involve Seb and some of the leadership from that group as well.

Is this our last slide? I think it is. The bottom line here is that I'm happy to try to answer any questions, and hopefully staff can bail me out if I don't know the answers, but this is almost like a heads up. This is coming your way. I have done my very, very best with this team to help them focus on things that have been overtaken by changes in the law, or changes in technology, or changes in ICANN internal policies, and to not relitigate all of these questions. And if you don't like the outcome, or if you think like the whole thing should be scrapped or whatever, we had some of that. I encourage people to stay focused. So hopefully the actual threshold questions that we get in August will be in alignment. If I think that some of them are relitigation, I will let the Council know that. And I think if they are pure relitigation, rather than looking at things that have possibly been overtaken by events, I'll point those out. And I think that should affect the Council's responses. I don't think we should be in the business of encouraging relitigation of recommendations that have been adopted by the Board, and nothing much has changed, but people just don't like them anymore.

So that's long-winded. I see Farzi's hand is up. Greg, do you want me to run this particular queue and then hand it back to you? Or do you want to do this?

GREGORY DIBIASE: Sure.

PAUL MCGRADY: All right. Farzi, go ahead. Please don't stop me in public.

FARZANEH BADII: No, I'm actually very happy that you brought up this question. I'm interested in question number three this quarter. Not only those recommendations have been overtaken by events, these also are further also being discussed in other working groups that we have. So this is my preliminary answer. We have discussed this in NCSG but we haven't solidified the position yet. But unfortunately, for IRT it felt like most of the time, when it came to disclosure recommendations, many things were being [inaudible].

So I'm glad that you're asking for doing these questions for us. We are going to go back at NCSG and we are going to discuss this. But what I wanted to mention is that, but you also mentioned this, to see if the work is being done or has been tackled by other groups, and especially for question number three, the disclosure to law enforcement and intellectual property. And also another thing that we need to consider is that whether the IRT is really a capable of addressing those recommendations.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Paul, I think you're muted.

PAUL MCGRADY: Can you hear me now?

GREGORY DIBIASE: Yep.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay. Thank you. Farzi, your comments are well taken and show that the reason why we're giving the Council a heads up that this stuff is coming is because these are not going to be easy binaries, right? It's going to take some work from interested councilors who are steeped in this. And it's not going to be like yes/no or one paragraph each. And when you talk about not only aligning the philosophical frameworks on disclosure frameworks, but then trying to understand how that fits into the RDRS and the other work that's going on so that it's not, I mean, I guess duplicative is better than contradictory, right? But we do need to sort of line up those streams, and it's not going to be straightforward, and it's not going to be easy, and we do need to talk to the other stakeholders, like the RDRS team, about what they're up to to make sure that we stay on track. So, Farzi, thank you for that. It's a great example of why we're talking about this a month early.

EN

GREGORY DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Farzi. Should be an interesting conversation in August. Does anyone else have questions for Paul at this juncture? Okay. Seeing none, we'll move on to a quick update on the small team on Accuracy. I think this is Paul again. We're getting the most out of Paul before he evaporates.

PAUL MCGRADY: I love it. I love the phrase evaporation. That is my new thing. Thanks, Greg. So this one will be a little more straightforward because you guys have heard three quarters of this before. So our Accuracy Small Team is putting together its report for a proper consideration in the August meeting. It will consist of things you've all heard about, plus one more thing which we've been kicking around. So these are the famous golden nuggets. Let me just run through them real quick again. Just a heads up of what you will be seeing on this report.

The first recommendation is that the small team recommends examining existing process for validating and verifying registration data under the RAA. And again, this is out of that INFERMAL Study that suggested that moving that forward in time could result in a 70% reduction in malicious registration. Again, we're not endorsing the study or prescribing the outcomes of the examining of the existing process or even a method of how it's looked at, whether it's the DNS Abuse Small Team or some other process like a nearly tailored PDP. But we do think that there's enough there there to warrant a further examination. So that's Recommendation 1. You guys heard all about that in Prague.

Recommendation 2, y'all heard about in Prague as well. This was the small team is recommending creation of clear and user-friendly education materials that can be provided before, during, and after, and that we are recommending a diverse group of stakeholders to work on this, rather than it coming necessarily just from Council Small Team. We think having different points of view, and frankly, some thoughts on how people learn would be very useful. The rationale behind this is that we think you could improve registrant willingness to provide accurate data if they know how it's collected and how it's protected. So that's number two. You heard all about that one before.

Recommendation 3. This one has to do with something that the Council previously committed to work on in 2020, when further work on accuracy occurs. And we were just putting this one up here so that the recommendation is not lost, and that is further consideration of outstanding cross-community recommendation including a notation in the WHOIS record—are we still allowed to say WHOIS?—for inaccurate data. Again, this is not prescriptive of how or where this would work, but we're just flagging it so that we don't forget to keep talking about that kind of notation. And so that's Recommendation 3. Again, nothing here should be a surprise because you've heard it all from Prague.

Recommendation 4 is relatively new. It's because in Prague several of us were asked, and I think that the GAC is interested in this answer as well, like, "Hey, what's going to happen to the Accuracy Scoping Team in light of the Council Small Team work?" And we thought that to be unclear is to be unkind, that there are people in the Accuracy Scoping Team that want to know if they're

going to get called back into action or if they're off the hook. And I also think that just being clear with the community about how we're doing the work is useful. So we are recommending to discontinue further work with the Accuracy Scoping Team, thank them for their effort, and send them on their way in light of the work that the Council Small Team is doing, which is essentially capturing ideas and scoping them out for work.

We believe the Scoping Team's work was helpful as a starting point for the Council Small Team. And then this is something else. There may be additional scoping work in the future through a scoping team or otherwise. The small team isn't proceeding with the existing small team or another scoping team at this time. We think that the small team can serve that function for a little bit. And we don't think that these first three substantive recommendations essentially end the work of the Council Small Team. The messaging here is that we think that small team should remain open for business and ideas can be handled through the small team, identify them, figure out where they could plug into further work, and get the work done.

So that's the three golden nuggets, plus Recommendation 4 on clarity, and I am happy to take any questions.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Paul, for that preview. Any questions for Paul? Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Paul. Thanks for the update. Farzi mentioned in the chat the new input from the SSAC that's sort of just been shared. In

your small team, have you had an opportunity to consider that yet? Or is it too soon? And do you feel that has any potential impact on your timing? Or it's probably too soon to say whether it's got impact on your potential recommendations, or is it not something you're going to look at?

PAUL MCGRADY: It was not considered. It came in too late, I believe. And like I said, we're still open for business. So if the Council wants the small team to take a look at that, we are happy to do it.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Thanks, Paul. I think I plus one that. The idea of the small team, as new inputs come in, new recommendations can arise, right? That there was that primary input on the INFERMAL report that seemed to raise an issue. There's a recommendation related to that. But if we keep the small team composed, we can react to new inputs as they arise.

Okay. Thanks, Susan. Thanks, Paul. I'll note that we've posted that SSAC report in the chat for those that are curious to peruse it. Okay. Any other questions on Accuracy, noting that this will also be on our August agenda? Okay.

One more preview of the GNSO Council Small Team on DNS abuse and what will be coming up from their perspective. Jen is at WSIS, doing a great job there, so I think we have John or Steve to help with this one.

FEODORA HAMZA: Actually, it's Feodora, Greg.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Oh, excuse me. Sorry.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you. I was on vacation, and Steve and John voted for me to do this today. So we have a few slides prepared, and I will try to do my best Jen impression, but I also, of course, invite the small team to comment and complement the presentation while I go through it, in case I miss something.

Trying to keep it brief. So you've seen this before. This is not new. This is just the assignment in brief. And in essence, it's that the small team looks into various sources and consults with different stakeholders to see if more work, at least policy work, is needed in terms of DNS abuse. In terms of progress, the small team came quite far. As you can see, we've done pretty much most of the tasks that have been mentioned in the assignment form, and we are currently at almost reaching the finish line, where we are drafting the recommendations to the Council and aiming for a vote for an issue report in August.

Here you can see the slide that has been also shared with you at ICANN83. It's a list of the cluster that has been identified by the small team, and within those clusters, you can find different gaps related to DNS abuse. And the small team has in the last meetings focused on—kind of seeing which ones need further work or need other consideration, and also which ones can be merged or should be named differently. And that is still a work in

progress, but we have received more input from different stakeholders, so the small team is going through those.

Another step that the small team has undertaken in regards to the gaps is organizing the gaps, relying on the groupings from the first DNS Abuse Small Team. In their final report or final findings report, they kind of categorized the recommendations based on the lifecycle. So as you can see here is the preventative measures, the abuse reporting that we have here as Phase 1 and 2, and their contractual obligations enforcement. We have it here as Phase 3 and 4, but we probably will have them as separate phases in the final report because it makes more sense as two different actors are in place here. The small team has also identified two more categories that don't necessarily fit into the lifecycle, which is community collaboration and data and transparency.

As said, and as you all know, the assignment form says that the small team should reach their recommendations and conclusion within six months. But due to the importance of the topic, the small team aims to deliver its assignment much sooner and to allow for the Council to request an issue report in August.

What will this issue report entail? What can we expect here? So it's an analysis and scope of the issues, as presented earlier, and many of you have access to the opinion of the general Council, whether the issues are in scope for policy development in the GNSO. Then, of course, the opinion of ICANN staff of whether the Council should initiate a PDP on the issues, a proposed charter for the PDP Working Group, and the 45 days allocated to the

preliminary issue report. And once it's completed, it is published for public comment for no less than 30 days.

What is important to name here is that it is a standard practice for issue reports. It was pointed out during one of the small team meetings that one issue report relates to one PDP. However, in this instance, that might not be necessarily the case, especially if the goal is to make efficient progress on issues where there is broad degree or consensus even, that an issue needs to be addressed. So it's still actively being discussed by the small team. But one idea was that it could be suggested to allow a narrowly charted PDP on a single topic or gap identified by the team and complete that work expeditiously. Subsequently, the other PDPs could then be initiated from the original issue report when the initial or original PDP completes its work. The small team will, of course, continue discussing and seek to provide a suggested approach on this. So we just wanted to give a heads up here.

Another important element here to consider is whether the topic is appropriate for policy development as well, as staff suggestions of whether a PDP should be initiated. What this might mean in practice for the issue report and the charter is that staff will endeavor to identify when gap and an issue is better addressed in a mechanism other than a PDP. So as you see in the slide, that will probably be covered in item two and three.

That's it in terms of slides. If there are any comments and questions, I'm happy trying to address. Greg?

EN

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Feodora. On the opinion of ICANN staff on whether the Council should initiate a PDP, is that right? Or is ICANN staff making a determination on whether they should or whether a gap is well-suited for a PDP? Like a PDP could be used to address this gap?

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Greg. I'll ask for Steve's support, but my understanding is that staff will provide an opinion that this issue might warrant a PDP, but it's up to the Council to start one. But Steve, if you have more on this, please let me know.

STEVE CHAN: Just nothing more to say than that's accurate. That's actually a standard practice for the issue report. All of these things at the top are all standard practices and, as Feodora said, it's clearly not binding on the Council, but is a recommendation on whether or not a PDP is appropriate. But yes, Council decides.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. I think that's just what I wanted to clarify for councilors here, is that the issue report will have recommendations, but it's going to be up to Council to identify what specific gaps that they think warrant a PDP, or at least prioritizing the PDP. I want to make sure that that's clear that what's in the issues report doesn't determine what we will do. It's, I guess, more of a menu of options of how we can proceed. And then, Feodora, is that draft issues report, has that been sent out to the Council more broadly? I can't remember.

EN

FEODORA HAMZA: We've shared it with the small team initially, but I think there is a link on the wiki so non-small team members and observers can have view access. I will drop the link in there.

GREG DIBIASE: I think we should probably send that out to make sure all councilors are aware of what is being proposed for the issue report if we're going to vote on that in August.

Okay. Any other questions from Feodora? Or comments from small team members? August is going to be a big meeting.

Okay. Let's go back to the agenda. We have a ccNSO Council update from Desiree. Desiree, are you available?

DESIREE ZELJKA MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Hi there. I'm also in a bit of a loud place here like everyone else and I would propose that I actually send a report and an update via e-mail, if that is fine.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry. Going off mute. Okay. Thank you, Desiree. And then we have an update on the Customer Standing Committee Effectiveness Review Deferral. And I think, Caitlin, you have some background on that.

EN

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Greg. This is Caitlin Tubergen from GNSO Support Staff. I just wanted to note that during the last ICANN meeting in Prague, a couple of folks from the CSC as well as ccNSO chair and Greg met. And that group talked about a deferral of the CSC Effectiveness Review. Those of you who have been around might remember that last year, the Council issued—both councils, the ccNSO and GNSO Council, also requested the Board to defer the CSC Effectiveness Review. That is because the status of the implementation of some of the major recommendations from the second CSC Effectiveness Review Team are still being implemented. Given that that's still underway, there was general agreement within that group that they should request another deferral. Provided there are no objections, we can vote on this as part of the Consent Agenda during the August meeting and circulate a reminder of what that letter looked like in terms of deferring this review. But I will open it up in case there's any questions or concerns.

GREG DIBIASE: Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much. And apologies for not knowing this. Caitlin, can you remind me or us, even, if there is a set timing for when this should happen, like a kind of Bylaws timing? Or is this something that has flexibility?

EN

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: If I'm not mistaken, the review is supposed to occur every two years. However, my understanding is the recent CSE Effectiveness Review Team has recommended that that change to a cadence of every five years. And that has not yet been implemented into the Bylaws, if I understand correctly. Others, please, correct me if I'm wrong. Once that change is implemented, it would be every five years. But for now, it's on a two-year cadence. And because those recommendations are still not implemented from the last effectiveness review, the Effectiveness Review Team is asking if that can be considered as deferred for another year.

GREG DIBIASE: Caitlin, my memory was that it is in the works to have the Bylaw changed to five years, but it's not completed yet. And until it's completed, we're hopefully asking for this, I guess, last deferral before the Bylaws actually implemented. Is that ringing true to you?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: That's correct, Greg. And to answer Anne's question, we would revisit the decision in June of 2026.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Manju?

EN

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Greg. I'm not specifically reacting to this. I have no
                      problem deferring the review. I just kind of wanted to, I guess,
                      point out this thing. I think we talked about this also in Prague that
                      there seems to be a problem where the implementation is not
                      catching up with either review or policy recommendations. We've
                      been deferring things because implementation hasn't been done.
                      There have been discussions forever how we should enhance or
                      improve our efficiency when the community do the work. But when
                      it comes to implementation, it seems like we're letting it go forever
                      and we're just deferring everything because implementation is not
                      done yet. We had this discussion about policy recommendation
                      not being implemented. Probably it's a Board readiness issue.
                      And probably the next issue for Council to consider in our next
                      SPS, which I'm not going to be there, is implementation-ready
                      recommendations or implementation-readiness issues. How we fix
                      this problem where implementation is just not catching up. Is it a
                      problem for the community to fix or is it something we have to
                      discuss with the Org? Because, in a sense, I guess,
                      implementation's out of the community's control. But I just bring
                      this up for the future Council, I guess, to consider as one of your
                      SPS topics. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Manju. I think that's a good topic. And maybe that's also
                      something councilors that are reviewing the CCG on review of
                      reviews should keep in mind. Is there an implementation element
                      here that we should be thinking harder about? I agree that that is
                      a big part of this and want some more discussion.

Okay. Any other questions on this topic? Seeing none, I guess I'll move to the next item which Thomas proposed, and I sort of objected because people said nice things about me in Prague already. But I guess I'll turn it over to Thomas as someone who added this last part of the agenda.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks so much, Greg. Whether folks are going to say nice things or not, I don't know.

GREG DIBIASE: That's true. They said nice things in Prague is what I said. I didn't pre-suppose that they would say nice things on this.

THOMAS RICKERT: You're right. And I don't expect anything nasty to come up. But I thought that since we are usually saying goodbye and thank you to the Council chair during face-to-face meetings at the AGM, and this is not possible for us to do this time around because you're leaving us after this meeting to be elevated to the Board—well deserved, I should say—I thought that we should probably take a little bit of time to give opportunity to councilors to say something to you so that we don't just let you evaporate, to use Paul's word, but to have an opportunity to say goodbye. I see that Damon has raised his hand. Damon, do you want to go first?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. First off, thank you, Thomas, for putting this on the agenda. Greg, thank you. You've been a fantastic chair. You've led us well. You've been very helpful. You and I come from constituency groups that don't always see things eye to eye, and yet I've always felt that you've been very fair and very even-handed with all your decisions in running the Council. The Council will go on. We've benefited greatly from your leadership and now that's going to go on to the ICANN Board. Best wishes to you as you join the Board. Thank you. And then best wishes to you. And thanks to Amazon for their support. And also, thanks to your family, your wife and kids. It is a big sacrifice to do this. Thank you very much and look forward to working with you on the Board. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks so much. I appreciate that, Damon.

THOMAS RICKERT: Nacho?

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Thomas. I don't usually take the mic, but I think that the occasion deserves it. Because I've seen firsthand the amount of work that Greg has put into working with all the issues, working with the staff, helping us out understand what the possibility is, taking some extra time to try to reach out to everyone that had something to say about any issues so that every review was incorporated to what we were discussing. I think he's been a great chair, and I'm just afraid for these two months, because he's left the standards super high, and Tomslin and I will try to do what we

EN

can. Luckily for us, we have a great staff. But Greg has put a lot of work, he's a great guy. I really mean these words. We'll miss him, but we'll see him around the ICANN meetings, right? I'm really looking forward to the meeting in Dublin.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Nacho.

THOMAS RICKERT: Farzi?

FARZANEH BADII: I have said many good things about Greg all the time, and in person goodbye party as well. But here I will say it again. Thank you, Greg, for many times when you bring up the issues, you have been very active about it. [Inaudible]. And that's because you are by nature a very agreeable guy, and really including us in all aspects of the Council. Thank you, and we are watching you on that Board, and you are not going to leave us and not say hi.

GREG DIBIASE: Understood. And thank you, Farzi.

THOMAS RICKER: Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. My turn, I think. I love that we are watching you, Greg. Just bear that in mind. I just wanted to add my own sort of thanks and best wishes as well, Greg, because I didn't get to say anything in Prague. It's been an absolute pleasure working with you on Council, both as a fellow councilor and then, for the last two years, as chair. I think you've led us with fairness, even-handedness, good humor, and an easygoing style, which has been really great. Even in your first task as Council chair, we kind of pushed you off to go and negotiate with the Board on the fly over the Auction Proceeds resolution, and you didn't lose your cool. We didn't make your life easy right from the outset, I think, but very sorry you're leaving early off Council, but it couldn't be for a better reason. I think you'll be a fantastic asset to the ICANN Board and to the whole community. Just wishing you good luck.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you so much, Susan.

THOMAS RICKERT: Prudence?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Greg, I know how much you hate this, so I'll keep this really brief and I'll keep this really short. I just want to kind of reiterate a lot of what's been already said. You've created such a legacy behind you. Kindness, diplomacy, fairness, these are things that have been echoed in all of the sentiments from those who have spoken before me. I cannot thank you enough for being not only such an amazing chair, but a good friend, a great councilor, a great leader,

and for helping me feel welcome and safe in a new environment that's completely outside [inaudible]. I appreciate all of the support that you've provided to me personally. And I just want to also take time to congratulate you. This is a well-deserved promotion and step-up. And as Farzi said, we're going to be watching you. And we hope that this Board seat doesn't change you too much, but we just wish you every happiness. I think that's one of the things I just want to say. You will be missed sorely. I will personally miss you loads. But I wish you every happiness and every success in your new position. And thank you again for all of your exemplary work as chair. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Prudence.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Prudence. Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. After Prudence, I'm going sound like a childish gibberish, but I'm going give a try anyway. Thank you, Greg. I think you were a very good chair. I mean, I'm not sure how to share this. At first, I was skeptical, but as I told you, I think you are one of the best chairs I ever had. Because you're a cool guy, like Justine said in the chat. You're cool, you're chill, you seem very laidback. I was like, "This guy, I don't know if he gets things done." But you do. You got things done. You got things done still with your laidback nature, which is amazing to watch. And you're not only a good chair, you're a very good person. You always have

very good stories to share during Council dinner. It's either about going to the dentist in Mexico or somebody getting murdered, something like that. It's very cool. It's very good to sit next to you either in the Council meeting or in the Council dinner. It's always has been a blast. Next time I see you, hopefully you can already do a pistol squat because you can do it in Prague. But you've got two months more to practice and hopefully, you will be the only one on the Board who can do that. Get to see you again, I guess, in Dublin. I hope to see you on the higher up elevated thing.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Manju. It's a pistol squat that I need to master? That's what I tried and fell down in Prague. Yes? Wow. Thanks, everyone. This is really nice. I don't even know what to say.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Greg. Steve, and then I'm going to wrap it up.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, all. Thanks, Thomas. You said councilor, but hopefully, you'll allow your staff and also share something. I could have saw a comment that said Greg doesn't like this and that really inspired me to want to say something and prolong this further. So here I am. Greg, it's really been light working with you, honestly. It's your diligence and the pragmatic ideas you have and creativity. I think someone else mentioned it but like all the outreach that you do to folks to try to gain alignment on things, it seems to me that you really go above and beyond. And all that really leads to a great demonstration of how this can all really work, which makes you a

great advocate for the multistakeholder model itself to me. From the staff side, we have really greatly appreciated working with you and I think the Council has made a ton of progress because of your efforts and, of course, all the councilors that have worked with you but a lot of it comes from your leadership. Kudos. Thanks. I think we're really, really happy that you're not going that far away. Kudos, cheers, and thanks for everything.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve.

THOMAS RICKERT: Now, a lot of kind words have been said and I'm not going to repeat anything of that. But I just like to share a thought with you, Greg, and the others. Many years back, I had a discussion with the late great Marilyn Cade when I was new on Council, when I was there for the first time. And she said, "Well, Thomas, everything that you're going to say is going to be on world stage. It's not like amongst ourselves." And representing the community as diverse as the GNSO, you can make so many mistakes and upset part of the part of the community, which you never did. I think you always found the right words. I think you did an excellent job, great statesmanship, apart from all the expertise, kindness and other characteristics and features that you bring to the table.

Thank you so much for doing this. I think we're all looking forward to seeing you up on the riser to speak with us from your Board position. All the best. I'm very confident that the co-chairs are

going to do an excellent job until the AGM. Thank you so much, Greg, and back over to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Thomas. Thanks, everyone. Like I've said, I got really lucky with the councilors. While I was chair, everyone has been really constructive, agreeable, and focused on pulling in the same direction. I'm really appreciative of that, appreciative of all these comments. Understood I'll be watched. I'll work on the pistol squat. Thank you to councilors and thank you to staff. Staff really made this job easy, continue to support. I know Tomslin and Nacho will be doing a great job in the interim until the election in October. Thanks, everyone. I really, really appreciate it and look forward to working with all of you in a slightly different capacity starting in October.

Well, great. Okay. I think that's our meeting for July. I won't be joining you in August but I've saddled all of you with a tremendous amount of work. Good luck in that meeting, and we'll talk soon. Thanks, everybody.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Greg. Bye-bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, everyone. As you would heard, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]