
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council

Thursday, 13 November 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/jvbmdfqZLuapu_zGK7g8AIN6BR2FkYv87oNJz1WcS5epbzO7Q4oCtPuKrv52pKfxZUF6VYSMF3Rzbfw.iTBzqOELsTORMiOv

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/VPXI_ZiuNQT1eZ726s4EY9Ip8Es7IcJUSJf3bmrdrWOfFnMby_ejngRaZEWtj2vM.YJ-oOKhatqupzxO-?startTime=1763038872000

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, Ashley Heineman, Prudence Malinki

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

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav Vedi

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne, Susan Mohr

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi, Tapani Tarvainen, Benjamin Akinmoyeje

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.

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Christian Dawson

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management (apology)

Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations (apology)

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, and good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on the 13th of November 2025. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Nacho Amadoz?

NACHO AMADOZ: Yes, I'm here, Terri, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Hong Fu Meng.

HONG-FU (TOM) MENG: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Samantha Demetriou?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I'm here, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome, Ashley Heineman.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Here, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Prudence Malinki?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome, Gaurav Vedi?

GAURAV VEDI: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome, Lawrence Olawale Roberts.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Vivek Goyal? I don't see where Vivek is on, but we will send him an email and see if we can get him on. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Present, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome, Osvaldo Navoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Susan Mohr.

SUSAN MOHR: I'm here. Good morning.

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome, Farzaneh Badii.

FARZANEH BADII: Present, good morning.

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning. Peter Akinremi?

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeji? Oh, you know what? Benjamin was on. I do believe we'll get him back on, but he was present, so we'll announce in chat once he rejoins. Bruna Martins Dos Santos?

BRUNA SANTOS: Present Terri, thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Hi, Terri, I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Ann Aikman Scalese.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm present tech.

TERRI AGNEW: Justine Chew?

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

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: Present, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Benjamin's not back on yet. Okay. You have the policy team supporting the GNSO, which today will be Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Berry Cobb, Julie Bisland, and myself, Terri Agnew. Just circling back, back to roll call, Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect, thank you. All right, may I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded? A reminder that we're in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once they've set their chat to everyone, for all to be able to read the exchanges.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior in the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy and the Community Participation Code of conduct concerning statement of interest. A warm welcome to attendees who are on the call as silent observers, meaning you do not have access to their microphones nor the chat.

With this, I'll turn it over to the GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Terri. Okay, everyone, thanks very much for joining. We're having our November 13th meeting of the GNSO Council. So first

up, I think, I just need to check whether anyone has any updates to their statements of interest.

And while you are all thinking about that, I will mention that I was endeavoring to update mine just to reflect that I'm now the chair, but, I'm having some technical troubles with getting access to the system, but I will make that update. I'll pause again and just see if anyone else has any other updates to SOIs that they want to reflect.

Okay. And yes, I'm noting from Terri that she's put in the chat very conveniently who we can email if we're having trouble with our updates.

Okay, then moving on, just also to check whether there are any amendments to the agenda that anyone would like to note. I have an amendment that I'll note as well, but I will also just pause and see if anyone has anything they want to flag.

Okay, then I just have to note that I think the agenda has been updated. So you probably have seen this anyway, but just a note, from the original version of the agenda that was circulated, we have moved two of the consent agenda items. Those are relating to the response to the GAC Communique, and also the Empowered Community Representative. Those will now be on the consent agenda for December. They were not time-sensitive, and indeed, I think in the case of the GAC Communiqué, I think that small team is currently working on that.

So the other thing to just note, unless there are any objections, our proposal is to move our remaining consent agenda item to the end of

the meeting. That's the motion to commemorate our colleague, Rubens Kuh. That way, if we move it to the end of the meeting, it means that people have an opportunity to say a few words in Ruben's honor if they wish to do so. I'll just pause again and just make sure there are no objections to that, but assuming not, we can move on to our next order of business.

Not hearing anything. We can move on to agenda item two, which is just the review of the projects and action list. This is mostly for the information for new councilors, it's just to flag that this is the part of the agenda where we look at the updates to our projects list, or at least we have the opportunity to focus on updates for our projects list and highlight if there's anything that we want to particularly call attention to or that might have changed.

In particular, it's the time when if there's a liaison to a particular work effort who feels that there's an issue on their project that they want to flag, it's the opportunity to do that here. We don't tend to go through the projects list and action items in detail on the particular council call, so it's more an opportunity for if someone wants to call anything specifically out. But just a reminder to all councilors that obviously we are expected to be keeping that projects list and action item list under review ourselves in advance of the meetings and also to flag that. I think we'll have a more detailed overview of those project tools during our upcoming strategic planning session in January. So that will give us an opportunity then to do a bit of a deep dive.

So for now, unless there's anything anyone does want to flag during this section, we can move on to agenda item four, which is the council vote. So again, I'll just quickly pause in case anyone has anything to flag.

Not hearing anything. The council vote agenda item four, noting again that the consent agenda item three, we've moved to the end. So this is the reminder. This feels like it's been on our agenda for quite some time now. We've had a few meetings where it's been an agenda item. This is a request for council's help in interpreting the intent of certain specific IGO INGO PDP recommendations for the purposes of the IRT that's working on the next round work and particularly on the applicant guidebook for the next round.

So just as a reminder of where we are with this, and sorry, I'm going to launch into what feels like quite a detailed history since the language on this has been a bit of a moving piece recently. But just as a reminder, this relates to the interpretation of the recommendations from that 2013 IGO, INGO PDP, specifically as they're relating to the protections to be given to certain identifiers for the Red Cross, Red Crescent, the IOC, IGOs and INGOs at the top level. So within the SubPro IRT, the implementation staff who were developing that applicant guidebook for the next round, reviewed those recommendations and their view was that in order to interpret the recommendations fully, the list of protected identifiers that we're talking about should be included in the string similarity review. What that effectively means is that if there were an application from a third party, that it would be checked against the list of those identifiers during string similarity evaluation, and that if an application was determined to be confusingly similar to one of the strings on that particular list, that it would be refused.

So I think it's reasonable to say that the staff's position is based on the understanding that potentially, if that wasn't the case, an unaffiliated third party might apply for a confusingly similar string, and if they were then granted that string, that would prevent the protected entity, the Red Cross, Red Crescent, IOC, IGO, INGO, from obtaining the string themselves in a later application window. So whilst that is certainly the interpretation that the implementing staff had, the majority of the IRT community members did not agree with that implementation staff assessment. The feeling was that the recommendations don't explicitly state that the protected identifiers will be included in the string similarity evaluation, and in fact, what the recommendations do is, what they were proposing to do is to place the names on an identified list of strings, which in the 2012 round, was explicitly not subject to the string similarity evaluation. So the view of the IRT was that staff's implementation approach was inconsistent with the intent behind those IGO, INGO, PDP recommendations.

So following this being referred to council for our interpretation, the board then sent a letter to council noting that the board interprets the recommendation in line with the way that staff were doing so, but also pointed out that this is obviously a matter of council, and that indeed, if we were to interpret the recommendations in the narrower sense, that they highlighted some potential steps that might be taken to make sure that the IGO or the protected entities in question were aware, and indeed that the GAC would be aware of an application if it were filed.

So we've looked, we in council have talked about this, we have a brief introduction in our, I think I'm right in saying September meeting, we then had an extraordinary meeting later in September, and initially

there did seem to be some convergence around what was being termed option three, which was essentially to leave the decision to the board and the staff. However, I think it's fair to say that following that extraordinary meeting, when the expected voting instructions of a number of councilors became a bit more apparent, there did seem to be a greater level of support for option one, that more narrow interpretation, rather than leaving this to the board. So option one was therefore updated and is now being called option three. It essentially states that council believes that the intention behind option one is the correct interpretation, but also includes some resolved clauses acknowledging the steps that the board identified in its letter, and which are really intended to seek to minimize some of the potential impact from option one, including, as I said, to make sure that potential applicants are better informed about the reserved names list, and that the protected entities and the GAC are also made aware should there be a confusingly similar application.

So as you know, we were unable to vote on this in Dublin due to some last-minute concerns of the RySG around the precise wording of what was then paragraph 3f, following that I proposed an amendment which would delete paragraph 3F, and Nacho was, as the seconder, was happy to accept that as friendly. We then had some additional concerns raised by Lawrence from the BC about removing that provision altogether, and so an amended version was circulated, which is what we have before us now. And then we had some further concerns that were raised by Anne around the need to ensure that applicants for TLDs are adequately aware of the potential risk before they put an application in, and that led to the proposed addition of a new clause which is now 3G, for which

we've also had a few suggested amendments going on subsequently. So I think I'm right in saying NACHA has supported the text of the amended 3g as friendly, and indeed so did I. So I'll just read it, and we'll read it again anyway, but 3g would therefore say the GNSO council further recommends that the IRT and org consider including a provision in the reserve names section of the AGB advising potential applicants that ICANN will notify the GAC and the relevant protected organizations to ensure they are aware of any relevant applied for strengths. Hopefully that text I think is now in a stable form.

Finally, I'm not sure if there may have been any last minute emails, there certainly have been quite a number, but we did have a last minute proposed restructure of the motion completely and some edits to it, and as I said on the email list, I'm not prepared to accept that at this point as friendly. I appreciate the intent behind it, and undoubtedly that probably would have involved might even have resulted in a better worded motion, but given that every single word of this motion has been poured over and exhaustively discussed, I think an amendment of more substance like that at this point is just not something that I feel confident accepting as friendly. So I think procedurally if Lawrence was the person who presented that last on the list, I think if Lawrence, if you want to, you procedurally can ask for us to vote on those suggested amendments before we vote on the main vote if you want to. I do think given that councilors have had fairly stable text aside from paragraph 3F and 3G for quite some time, and that is what they've taken instructions on, I'd certainly be a little concerned that people might then feel they don't have instructions on this, on the newly reworded language, and so I really would like to encourage us to get this vote across the line. So

with that enormously detailed background I'm going to open it up for discussion, and I can see Prudence has her hand up, so over to you.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Thanks Susan, and thanks for the very detailed explanation, and hopefully everyone's up to speed. Just to confirm everybody, so following the Dublin ICANN meeting, I represent the registrar stakeholder group, we went back to our stakeholder group for further discussions of this topic, and I just wanted to go on the record to confirm that the registrars, we shall be abstaining from the forthcoming vote on this topic, and I also shall be circulating our rationale after today's call. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Before we go on to as well, Prudence, did you want to give your rationale now, or do you want to give it after the vote?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: I can provide it after the vote, let's keep things moving, happy to do it later rather than right now. Or actually, let's do it right now. I'll do that immediately, hold on. Okay, having consulted on the area of protection of international governmental organizations, IGO and international non-governmental organizations, INGOs, in all gTLDs, the registrars upon consideration of this topic and related issues determined that due to our lack of direct involvement and the limited to no impact on registrar operations, we are not in a position to provide a vote that would create a result in either direction. We want to ensure that council members

appreciate that we did not take this decision lightly but to the contrary we understood the gravity of forcing an RrSG position which could create a consequence that we truly do not intend nor wish to stand by. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Prudence. Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Hello, thank you Susan. Just to let you know that our constituency has decided to support this motion number four but we want to say that we don't think this is the correct, we vote just to as a statement that we recognize that the PDP has been followed but we don't think this is the right solution. There was a very conflicting issues inside our constituency regarding whether this was a good approach on the substantive matter of protecting the IGO names. Just that, thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks Osvaldo, noted and appreciated it.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Susan, this is Caitlin Tubergen from ICANN Org for the record. I just wanted to note, based on some of the discussions, procedurally if a councilor proposes an amendment to a motion and it's not deemed friendly by the proposer or seconder, which in this case I'm referring to Justine's edits, if Justine is willing to withdraw her edits, then we can proceed with voting on this motion. Otherwise, we would

need to vote first on whether to accept that proposed amendment. And I'll post the relevant portion of the GNSO operating procedures in the chat. But just a procedural note Justine's hand is raised so she might be withdrawing. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Caitlin, before Justine speaks, I also had a question because I'm not sure if procedurally if Lawrence would also need to withdraw since he had also supported what Justine had said and had circulated some text. So I'll leave that with you while I'll hand over to Justine for now.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Susan. This is Justine for the record. I was just merely trying to be helpful when reading through the motion. And based on Susan's reply to me that it's not acceptable, I'm happy to withdraw to make sure that this motion gets through the agenda today and it's not dropped at all. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Justine. Really appreciate it. And Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. I also want to support the fact that we can move on without Justine's edits to now motion three. Based on what staff just highlighted, I'm also of the view that procedurally, we might need to formally also withdraw what was previously option two, which I guess is now option one, and previously option three, which would now be

option two, such that we only have our formal option four, which we now have as option three, before us alone for vote. If this is applicable, I'll be happy to do this. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Lawrence. Appreciate that. Everyone's getting a bit confused now. I think what we'll do is we will vote on this option four motion first, and then we will move on to formally withdrawing the other two. I think that's procedurally how we are best to handle it. And I think, having heard from you and Anne, that's what you both would be supportive of. I will just see whether there are any other hands want to be raised in discussion before we go on to a vote. And I can see Terri.

TERRI AGNEW:

Just before the call started, on the motion wiki page for option four, that's how it's written, so that's what I'm going to call it, option four, I did add the G. Am I removing that for the vote? Is that correct?

SUSAN PAYNE:

No, I believe G is accepted as friendly from both me and Nacho. So G stays. I think we have stable text. Thank you, and if you all have the motion page open on your laptops, you may want to refresh it if it's been open for a while, just to make sure you've got the most recent text. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: I'm really sorry to do this on the call, but Lawrence, can you please check your WhatsApp? Mason is trying to reach you. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you, Vivek. I will just see whether that changes anything from Lawrence's perspective. But otherwise, just one last call for anyone who wants to raise their hand to discuss this. Otherwise, I'm looking to move on to the vote. I'm going to proceed. And I think, therefore, that it is my task as the proposer of this motion to read the resolved clauses. I'm sure Terri will tell me if I have this wrong, but I think that's correct. This will take a while again, because this motion has got longer and longer. So bear with me, please.

Resolved. One, the GNSO Council confirms that the intent of the applicable recommendations is only to ensure that no organization other than the protected organization can apply for the exact match of the specific protected identifier associated with that organization. And as such, reserved name strings are now placed in the category formally termed ineligible for delegation under paragraph 2.2.1.2.3 of the 2012 round AGB. Accordingly, the relevant identifiers shall not be included in the string similarity evaluation in the new gTLD program. And such a relevant identifier shall not operate as a bar to an application by another applicant for a string that could be considered potentially confusingly similar during that evaluation. Objection proceedings and GAC advice could still be brought against such third-party application, where applicable, in the usual manner. Pursuant to existing policy, any application submitted by a protected organization for its protected string would remain subject to existing policy barring delegation if such

string is found to be visually confusingly similar to a string previously delegated. Option one would align with this interpretation.

Paragraph two, the GNSO Council acknowledges that this was a difficult issue. Although the majority support this interpretation as best reflecting the intent of the policy recommendations, which were made more than a decade ago, this view was not unanimous. It is clear that reasonable people can differ as to this intent.

Number three, the GNSO appreciates the board's consideration of steps which could be taken to ensure that the protected organizations and GAC are made aware if any application for a confusingly similar string won't be submitted. In the penultimate paragraph of the Board's letter of 26 September 2025, the GNSO Council would support and encourage the following steps. Paragraph A. The application process must prominently display and clearly communicate the reserved names list so that TLD applicants are fully aware of its existence and implications prior to filing its choice of the TLD string. B, that org should contact the relevant protected organizations after string confirmation day to ensure that they are aware of any applied for strings that could be considered confusingly similar to those on the reserved names list and are aware of their options for bringing formal objection or seeking support of the GAC. Paragraph C, that org should also contact GAC after string confirmation day to ensure that the GAC are aware of any applied for strings that could be considered confusingly similar to those on the reserved names list in order that GAC members may consider whether any early warnings or GAC consensus advice would be appropriate. Subparagraph D, we would also encourage the GAC to contact the relevant protected organizations to ensure that they are aware of any

applied for strings and can decide whether to utilize any challenge methods outlined in the AGB. Subparagraph E, that org should also notify the applicant of the confusingly similar string to give them the option to withdraw for an appropriate refund. Subparagraph F, the council notes that procedures exist under the AGB and ICANN by-laws that govern how a TLD application is treated where an objection is filed or GAC advice is submitted against the string pending resolution of the same. And then subparagraph G, the GNSO council further recommends that the IRT and org consider including a provision in the reserved names section of the AGB, advising potential applicants that ICANN will notify the GAC and the relevant protected organizations to ensure they are aware of any relevant applied for strings.

Paragraph 4. If the board considers it timely for the existing policy to be reviewed, the GNSO council would invite the board to request an issues report for further potential policy work which might apply to subsequent future rounds. The GNSO council assumes that org would again be instructed to take any steps considered appropriate to safeguard the strings on the reserved name list from any confusingly similar applications which might be submitted in any application round pending the future conclusion of any such policy work.

And finally, paragraph 5, the GNSO council requests that its liaisons to the SubPro IRT provide this information to the implementation staff and IRT. Okay, with that, I think we then go to the vote if that's correct. Can I hand it to you, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: You are correct and yes, you may. This will be a voice vote folks and I just want to note for the vote all councilors are present. Here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion, please say aye.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sorry, I couldn't find my audio.

TERRI AGNEW: Ashley, is that an aye? Sorry, I didn't mean to call you out, but I just wanted to make sure.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: That was a very gurgly aye because my voice wasn't working either. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay, thank you. Would anyone like to vote against this motion, please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. One moment, please. Thank you for your patience. I'm just quickly doing my little chart since we did get a couple of abstentions. We do have a few abstentions, but with all of the others' ayes, the motion passes. Congratulations, team. Back to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you so much, and I think we will all be pleased to see the back of this particular motion. I guess just to sort out the procedural matters, I am assuming that based on what Lawrence and Anne have both said, that the options two and three, the other remaining motions are withdrawn on this, but I will just pause and make sure that there is no objection from either Lawrence or Anne.

Not seeing any. I think then we are in a position now to move on to agenda item five.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm so sorry, I don't want to spoil the party, but I have a procedural question. And this is just a question. is it like normally that the board could decide that we don't have enough policy on an issue and can't instruct the council to do an issue report and come up? Is that like a process that we have? So anybody can, either the board or one of these advisory committees or anybody can request for an issue report from the council?

SUSAN PAYNE: I'm sure Caitlin or one of our other staff colleagues will give chapter and verse on this, but yes, I don't have in front of me, Farzi, our operating procedures to be able to give you chapter and verse, but there are, it's open to various groups, including the board to ask us to request an issues report.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: I knew Caitlin would have her hands on this. She's putting it in the chat, I think. Perfect. Brilliant. Thank you. I think then we will move on to the council discussion, agenda item five on the final issue report on the policy development process for DNS abuse, and I am going to hand this over to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Susan. This is Jen Chung for the record. We have a beautiful set of shiny slides. So today's session is really to update the council on our progress towards the final issue report on DNS abuse and to prepare everyone for the discussion that's coming up in our next call in December on whether to initiate a PDP or PDPs.

And here we are with the timeline. So, since we had the publication of the preliminary report, we have had broad community consultations, we've had the public comment period, and we had that very lengthy,

very productive community session, or the GNSO-led work session on DNS abuse in Dublin. So today, our main goal is to look at the main recommendations emerging from the preliminary issue report, the input and perspectives received from the community from all of the consultations, and also how we are planning to reflect and incorporate all of these discussions into the final report, and also, of course, the accompanying draft charters. We're going to look at input from our councilors now on pending questions, and we are right now in November, so next steps, final issue report, with all of this input and the feedback from councilors today, will be circulated to the council no later than December 1st. I'm just double-checking with Feodora and staff that this is still the case.

Silence is yes, I hope, unless you will tell me it's wrong. So, this will allow councilors to also have adequate time to review the document, its accompanying draft charters, including the proposed structure and scope of the potential PDPs. We're going to be looking at all of this, considering all of this, talking to all our SGs and Cs before this to vote on the December meeting.

We can go now to the next slide. I think it's preliminary issue report and I'm handing it over to Feodora.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Jen. This is Feodora Hamza from ICANN Org for the record. Now I'm going to briefly talk about what the issue report, the preliminary issue report concluded or recommended to council. As you've seen it and heard and discussed previously, the report suggests

that two topics or two issues should be proposed for policy development. This was unrestricted API access and the associated domain check. The report proposed as PDP structure one PDP for both topics, the PDP to be phased. And it also proposed a representative membership model or working group model. Another issue that was named as priority topic by the DNS abuse small team, the DGA coordination was concluded by the report could be better addressed outside policy as best practice. And finally, there were also other issues mentioned in the report that would require further policy development to be addressed. But that would be then left to council to see how to address them in the future. So this is the preliminary issue report in short, just a quick overview. And now I'm going to introduce to you quickly what we received as input from the community during the public comment, but also the ICANN 84 DNS abuse session. So this is a bit of an overview. And just to note that we are currently finalizing the summary report for the public comment, which is supposed to go online on Monday, November 17th, where this will all be reflected in more detail. But in essence, so on API and the associated domain check on the two issues, most of the community agrees that this should be addressed by a policy work and that these are important. They provided input on the PDP structure and suggested it should be two separate charters, not in one, so two PDPs, and they also provided comments on how to address the other issues.

So in detail, that's going to be seen on Monday. What we took from this is the areas of agreement and how we can update the final issue report. So based on that input, we noted that these seem to be the areas where the community agrees and wants the final issue report to be updated

accordingly. So yes to the two priority topics or issues, the associated domain check and the unrestricted API access. Proposed the two PDPs, but not in parallel, noting the resource requirements there, but potentially to stagger and connect them where possible. They also provided some further charter considerations that we want to incorporate in the charter. And also on issue three, the DGA coordination, the community noted, or many of the commenters noted that they think this would also be better addressed by a policy development, but potentially to be addressed at a later stage.

So this is the overview. And now I am going to show in a little bit more detail how this would look like in the final issue report. So you will hear something that I've already said again, but we just want to make sure that you are prepared on what you're going to receive and you have time to build an opinion and make an informed decision because we are working on a very tight timeline at the moment. So these were the further charter considerations provided by the community, noting that it might be difficult or very complex to codify associated domain check into a policy that is enforceable, but also very clear. Also noting additional data safeguards and privacy principles. So it was said that we should have a human rights impact assessment and a DPIA. And also members noted that security consideration that sharing too many details in this area in public might pose a security threat. So many of these things are already reflected in the draft charter. So the human rights impact assessment is part of every PDP. So that's a standard. The DPIA is something we can definitely look into, but those considerations are part of the draft charter already. However, in the draft charter, under the questions, the charter questions, there is a section where we

have included considerations. So we will very likely update that section with the community input. Similar to the API access issue, some noted that there might be a potential undue burden on new registrants. Also consider a baseline of accountability and operational standards that registrants must impose on downstream partners. And also consideration of establishment of due diligence monitoring and other parts of this. So this will also be included in the considerations of the draft charter. In essence, the changes in the draft charter questions are not too substantive as most is already reflected, but we want to make sure that the considerations shared by the community will be emphasized and reflected accordingly.

Now, the more complicated or interesting part, depending on how you want to see it. So as reflected in the community feedback and our own analysis, the next stage of this work would involve two separate PDPs. And also please note that this is just a high level plan on overview based on the current information that we have. A detailed work plan would be developed once the Council decides on the next steps on DNS abuse.

So we would have PDP one associated domain checks starting. Community members noted that this is the topic that we should start first as it might be easier to achieve consensus and then continue with the API access safeguards or issue. So while we are preparing for two distinct charters, as noted, we are planning to stagger the timelines, rather than run both PDPs in parallel, as noted, it might be too, or it will be too resource intensive and not helpful probably for the topic. So the idea is to have the first PDP running and towards the end or towards the initial report phase of the first PDP, we would organize a face to face meeting, as noted by Steve during the ICANN 84 session, where we

would connect, potentially connect the two working groups, also noting that there might be overlap in membership. So finishing off one PDP and starting the other right after and to see where there are areas where they can connect.

And then continue with the second PDP and proceed as with the working group deliberations and the finishing of the PDP. So that's how we see it in general. I understand that the community noted that this should be efficient and should be delivered in a timely manner. So this is how we are proposing to achieve this, which also is going to require a lot of collaboration and understanding from all actors involved. Damon, your hand's up.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. What's the estimated timeframe for the start of PDP 1 and the start of PDP 2? I'm a little concerned because you're saying we're going to have two separate PDPs, that likely may have the same people on it seems like having two and structuring out like this, not running them in parallel, is going to be very inefficient from a time perspective.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Damon. Can you repeat the second part of your comment again? Sorry.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

The first part was a question, which is, what's the timeframe for the start of PDP 1 and the start of PDP 2? Second part was, I think this could

be very inefficient from a time perspective, but go ahead with your response.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Damon. During the ICANN84 session, there were some comments saying that this should be completed within 12 months. I'm not sure if it was related to now one PDP or still both together, so it's very difficult now for me to give you an anticipated timeline as we don't know how it's going to look like in terms of membership and membership model and a few things that we need still input from the council on. Once we have all the information, we will be able to provide a working plan. That's why we have not added any dates because it's just very difficult at the moment to give an estimate right here. I understand that there might be overlap in membership, so that's why we are not running them in parallel, but we just wanted to show that there might be a point towards the end where they can be connected. But we will also see based on the realities once we have everything in one place. Back to you, Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure, so you're saying you think both will be done within 12 months?

FEODORA HAMZA:

I'm not saying that. I was not sure if that was the input or requirement made by the comments we received at the ICANN DNS abuse session. The aim is to deliver it in a timely manner and as efficient as possible,

but I cannot say that this can be done in 12 months or longer or shorter.
That is something I cannot say at the moment.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Okay.

FEODORA HAMZA: Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII: Hello, thank you. I just wanted to say that I love efficiency, but at the same time, we want to make sure that the policies that we come up with do not have adverse effect on the internet and on the registrants and end user, so we are not going to sacrifice a good quality mitigation mechanism and a PDP outcome for the sake of efficiency. So, whenever we talk about efficiency, we should also talk about fairness. Thank you.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Farzi, and I also see Peter's hand up, but Jen will chair the discussion later, and we can definitely come back to this slide. I would just finish the rest of the questions we might have to council so that the council can address or provide input to all areas. We would appreciate your input, too, so it's not just this one. There is also one or two others, so if I can just finish them off, then Jen has the honors to go through the discussion. Thank you for understanding.

I really appreciate the input, so if the council proposes a different approach, we are happy to take that into consideration, but based on the initial input we received, this is what we thought could work, but happy during the discussion to hear more suggestions how we can update. And just to note on the last part on the DGA coordination issue, as noted, we proposed it as a best practice or outside policy, but members noted or community members noted that it might or it's better fitted for policy development, and the update we are going to make in the final issue report is to reflect this input and to also include it as a policy development topic, but to be addressed at a later stage.

Sorry for the typo here. So another area of discussion where we would like to hear from the council is the membership model. What we proposed in the preliminary issue report is the representative model, and there are various factors to consider when choosing a model. We considered that the group or the community wants something efficient, but also in a timely matter, but then considering that there might be also limited budget to bring everybody together, we proposed the representative model, noting that as a past example, EBDB Phase 1 and 2 used this one. But, of course, we have three models to choose from.

Here is a comparison table where you can see the differences. Just to note that in the representative model, observers are still possible and experts will be invited and can attend in addition to the reps that would be appointed for this working group. And I think that's my last slide, and I would hand over to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you so much, Feodora, for working through all of this, especially a good recap for all the councilors who haven't been following closely, although I can't imagine why you wouldn't. This is such a great topic. I see a queue of hands already. Please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Jen. I'm not super familiar with all of the reports and everything here, but when it comes to the model that we use for PDP, I get concerned when we want to restrict models to only representative because we are all the time talking about how to include new people, how we get people who aren't familiar with our processes involved, how do we get people educated, especially from NextGen and other groups. Whenever we start talking about models where only extremely well-informed insiders can participate, that really makes me skeptical of the transparency of our processes, so I'm against that. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Anne. That's very good points, well taken. I see there's agreement on the chat as well. Theo, is it okay for us to go back to that chart that shows a little bit of, yeah, that might be helpful for people if they have more questions on that. Peter, please go ahead.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Jen, and thank you, Fedora, for that presentation. Just looking at from prior experience, how many charter questions is suitable for EPDP? Because we're talking about a timeline here, so we

can get it finished in time. So I just wanted to understand, how many charter questions are we looking at? That is number one.

My second point will be regarding the contactability and verification. Will a Charter Question clarify that? Is that going to be a discussion for the EPDP? Because we don't want situations where we leave that, we don't clarify what we mean, and EPDP is just going away and discussing different verification mechanism. Verification leads to something else, or an outcome that we don't want.

The third point that I would like to make is regarding the models that we want to adopt. What provisions do we have for technical folks? Because this is technical related. I'm sure that we have enough technical folks, but we might get to a level where we need an expert to give us an understanding of what mechanism do we have in place for that. So that's just my concern. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Peter. I'll attempt to answer some of it, and staff, please correct me if I'm wrong.

First, since we have the issue report, it's not really an EPDP for any of the PDPs coming out for the DNS abuse mitigation, so just a little note here about what it actually is. The second part you asked was about charter questions, how many, what's the usual. I don't think there is a set amount of usual number of charter questions. I think the more important point is whether these questions are scoped correctly to actually answer what we're trying to answer here. I think the general wish of Council, especially at least in the past two years that I've been

on Council, has been we need to have very focused, tightly scoped policy development processes in order for us to be effective working through this. So that is a general answer, but I think that is the case, and we can't really say three or five. It's not really an arbitrary number there.

Finally, your question, or really your comment on the membership model. Now I've forgotten because you've been very thorough in your questions, but I think, answering some of the more general concerns raised by Anne, and also in the chat as well. I remember you were talking about experts that might be needed, technical experts. I think the way that we're looking at potentially staggering the two PDPs would probably allow for experts to come in. And I think also Christian and others might have noted, Christian noted in chat and others have noted during the community session that most likely we will be needing different technical experts on these two items. So I think it's a good concern to note, but until we can see the two PDPs mapped on an actual timeline, we won't really be able to comment on the specifics of that. Sorry for taking too long. Going back to the queue now, Prudence.

PRUDENCE MALINKI:

Thanks for that, Jen. Prudence for the record. I just wanted to make a quick comment, rather than a question, and thank you so much for the presentation so far to do with the proposed PDPs. This is going to be really exciting from a registrar perspective. One of the things I just wanted to quickly note is that I'm personally, and speaking in my own capacity, I'm all for engagement from the broader community. I think that makes sense in this type of work.

However, I just want us to be mindful that registrars will be impacted from the outcome of this PDP, and the outcome of these PDPs, plural because there are multiple. And as we will have a practical impact, we are not a monolith. That's something to really bear in mind. There are multiple different types of registrars with multiple different business operations, models, infrastructure, and as such, these impacts, or the practical impacts, or the outcomes of these PDPs, will impact these registrars differently. And what that means is, I think we should be mindful with regards to this consequence when we're looking at the weighting and the level of engagement from registrars. I think we probably need to have this weighted more so then we can avoid any pitfalls, and we can ensure that when we're working on these topics, these important topics, that we have as much representation as possible of the different types, so we address potential issues in real time, as opposed to subsequently. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Prudence, for the really good reminder. Yes, registrars are not a monolith. There are different models that they employ in their business day-to-day. The one thing I can say is please do bring this back to the Registrar Stakeholder group, take a good close look to the charter questions, the scope, and all of that once we have the final report out. And also, I guess, in anticipation, you can take a look at some of the previews we've given to all of you in this slide deck. Sam, please.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jen. I wanted to address some of the points about representative models. On the representative model, I really take on board and I really hear the points that are being raised about we don't want to necessarily close this off to new participants. However, I do want to point out that being the representative on a PDP is not the only way to engage in a policy development process. I think having observers as an option is a key aspect to this, and I think it's also incumbent on the various ICANN groups, so whether it's a stakeholder group, constituency, an advisory committee, to keep their membership involved, and making sure that they're actually getting input from their membership and bringing that to the PDP. That's what the representative model is. You're not delegating one person to go and speak from their own personal experience. They're meant to have the responsibility of taking the views from their membership into it. So I think that's something to keep in mind.

The other point I wanted to raise is, I think we should be open to the idea that these two PDPs are not necessarily going to look exactly the same, both from the perspective of what charter questions and how many charter questions they answer, but more importantly, from the perspective of who should be involved. I think even to Prudence's really good point, given the diversity of registrar business models, the composition of a PDP that looks at API access is inherently going to be different than looking at just associated domain checks, and I think we as Council should be aware of that and be willing to have even the model of who is on the PDP look a little bit different between these two. So just a suggestion.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Sam. Very nicely put. Very clear as well.

I'm going to move on in the queue. I see Damon. Please go.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure, thank you very much, Jen. Thanks for all the work on this. I do have a concern that just having two PDPs is gonna make it longer than it needs to be, and is gonna make it more inefficient. There's no point in talking about that unless there are other people that have that same concern. So I'm just sort of curious if others have that concern, if you could just send me an email or put it in the chat. I'm wondering if it's just me, or if others might have the concern that we might be able to streamline this. That's all. Thanks so much.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Damon. I think both in the public comments and also the community session in Dublin, that there are multiple input and voices that mentioned they preferred the two PDPs. I think in any case, we are trying our best to look at streamlining, staggering, any way that actually allows us to be effective and efficient without, of course, sacrificing everything that we need to be doing, looking at charter questions correctly, looking at human rights impact assessments, all of those things. So, hopefully we can get some more details when the final issue report comes out. Farzi, please.

FARZANEH BADI:

Okay, so this rep open model and stuff like that, I have forgotten how they work. So can you point me to a document that says what model is

what? And I have a revolutionary idea. I think that we can have an open PDP for a few months, and then we close it down. It's not a joke, it has been done before in other spaces. But, if people are worried about open PDPs, we can also do that.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Farzi, for your revolutionary idea. I like that it's revolutionary, but also I think if it involves any of the charter changing, I think in our operating procedures, we are very reluctant to change the charter of any kind of PDP that's in flight, unless there are very exceptional circumstances. But of course, staff, please correct me if I'm wrong. Hong Fu, please go ahead.

HONG-FU (TOM) MENG:

Hi everyone, this is Hong Fu speaking for the record. I just want to go back on to what Damon just touched on streamlining things. I feel that touching everything one topic at a time, going through them one PDP at a time, is in a sense a streamline, so that we can go through things on a focused basis, trying to streamline things and move things as quickly as possible, so that we are focused and efficient. And also, by doing things sequentially, we can focus our energy on the target hand and not to get mixed up, or to get carried away, on the parallel working of PDPs. And also just restating that the RrSG still would like to go for a PDP process. Just wanted to put that in the record. Thank you very much.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you so much. I know we're a little over the time for this particular issue. So, Peter, if you wouldn't mind terribly, if you can put your question in the chat so I can hand this over back to our chair, Susan, so she can run the rest of the meeting. So, handing this right back to Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE:

Lovely. Thanks very much, Jen. And thanks, Feodora, as well, for the really useful presentation. So, I think all we all have our marching orders here. We have the updated issues report coming in a week or so. And we already in any event have a preview of what it says in terms of the slide deck. So we've got until next meeting to get our input from our groups, and the earlier we can all do that, the better. Let's see if we can engage in some conversation on our email list as well, rather than waiting until our next meeting.

Thanks very much. I'm very conscious of the time and I'm not running a tight ship here. So, we'll move on to our next agenda item, item 6, which is the Council discussion on the Registration Data Request Service RDRS Standing Committee findings report. We are a few minutes late. I'm hoping we can catch up. So I'm going to hand this over to Seb, who was the RDRS Standing Committee Chair, and he's going to talk us through this.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Susan. This is Sebastien for the record. And yes, I'll endeavor to go as fast as I can. So, next slide. I've already presented these in the past, I believe, but or something very similar. Over the past two years,

we've run a pilot on RDRS, as you know, but over the past year, we've decided that we had enough data after one year of pilot to start working on our Standing Committee report, which we did starting in January this year. And essentially, the Standing Committee drafted a report, put it for public comment in August, between August and October. And during ICANN in Dublin, we were able to take back the public comment feedback and reincorporate it.

So the Stand Committee developed six recommendations, and I'll go through them in a moment. The standing committee was chartered to put a report that is not policy, it's recommendations with a very small R. It's advisory in nature, it's there to reflect our learnings after a pilot, there will be a policy phase to come afterwards. And you will be in charge of chartering that again. So no policy, whilst there was a lot of policy matters discussed during the exercise, no policy was built, changed, or in any shape modified.

As I said, the report was published for public comments in August. The public comments came back, we closed that in the first week of October. The public comments were reintegrated in the report, but essentially didn't change the nature of the report. We found that most of the public comments came from the groups that had participated in the exercise, and had already expressed their views, and were just reaffirming them and documenting them, which is interesting, and was integrated in the report, but didn't change it in nature. Next slide, please.

So the first recommendation was to continue the RDRS beyond the pilot. This is a recommendation, so essentially to keep the system

running as we've left it at the end of the pilot, at least until a successor system or another solution or the full policy suite is reviewed, and we're able to know where we're going with this. This is not a recommendation—I'll talk maybe a bit at the end about it, but this is a recommendation that was discussed until the very last moment. There was a group that was less interested in seeing it running because they deemed it not fit for purpose, and were reluctant in justifying a further investment in it, knowing that running a system, even if it's a system that stays as is, costs money. But this is still the recommendation that we had. It still meets consensus, if not full consensus, and it is in the report as such. Obviously, for those that followed the proceedings in Dublin, you would have noted that the board has already taken a decision on this by voting a two-year extension on the budget for RDRS. This doesn't mean that the system needs to keep on running, but let's say that once the board has put a budget on it and has said that it should, we can assume they will. Next slide.

So, the standing committee recommended to introduce authentication system for groups, for user groups that wanted it, starting with law enforcement agencies. This is essentially a system that would engage an external party to authenticate a group and then pass on a token, a flag, any information to our system, and say this is indeed the individual, or this individual comes indeed from that community, and so on and so forth.

Compared to what the SSAD was envisioning, this is not authentication by ICANN or by the system itself, but it is a third party. In the case of law enforcement, what we're looking at is for them to authenticate themselves, and once they have done that, to come back to us just with

a flag. This has a huge cost impact if ICANN doesn't have to pay for the authentication. It makes quite a difference. I'll take the questions at the end, just so that I can keep the clock and not lose my track. I think we're ready on the next slide. I said pretty much everything that I wanted to.

The recommendation three is to implement some key enhancements. Top of mind, I don't know that the budget that the board authorized would include these, but we're talking about, or to be checked, sorry, we're talking about APIs. So, the facilities for registrars to connect to the system, and for requesters to connect to the system, and plug in their own system. It's been a long discussion, particularly from the registrar point of view. A lot of registrars already have running systems to do the exercise of taking requests and evaluating them, because it's part of their contract. So, a lot of them have mentioned, first of all, that they weren't keen on participating in IDRS, because they had already something. And then, in terms of API, whilst there is interest, there was a lot of interest in seeing how it goes, and how it moves, and stops moving, more importantly. When you're a developer, you want to work and plug into a system that's not going to change after two weeks.

Improve the request form, just a user interface design issue, but we need to look at this in a better way. There's still too many clicks, too many hoops to pass, to formulate a request, and at the same time, you want to make sure that you've gathered all the information that will be important for a registrar to do the exercise. The optional participation of ccTLDs, we've been talking about it for a while. There's demand, particularly from the requester side, to have ccTLDs joining. Now, I haven't personally heard of any ccTLDs ready to join. That's communications also to have with them. It would mean quite a bit of

changes in the flow of RDRS, particularly because right now, the requests come in, and we check who the sponsoring registrar is, in order to redirect that request to a registrar. In the case of ccTLDs, by all accounts, that would mean sending a request to the TLD manager rather than the registrar. ccTLD has a very different construction there, and that would mean changing a number of things, particularly the fact that ccTLDs don't use RDAP as much as they use WHOIS. And right now, the way we check where a name is registered is through RDAP.

And then, last but not least, because it was my idea, the inclusion of a link to, as I said above, for registrars that do have a system that is already working. Maybe we should find a way to redirect those requests before even filling the form directly to their system. That implies also having a bigger back and forth with the registrar to try to capture at least some information on the traffic to be able to gather the same type of information, usage information that we're gathering with RDRS, but it's conversations to be had with the concerned registrars. But it could be a way to ensure a broader adoption by registrars who would be adopting not so much by using RDRS, but by being present on that central node that RDRS is in order to be able to dispatch requests that come in their name rather than saying, sorry, can't do a message to the users, to the requesters. Next slide, please.

So recommendation four is about considering further policy, particularly on privacy and proxy, and there's work to be done right now on this. So that's more of a chunky policy, as you would imagine. There's years of work already in this. And then the second one, much easier, actually, but all registries and registrars in their RDAP response should be able to include a link to the RDRS so that anybody that is using RDAP, or WHOIS

for that matter until it fully dies, should have a quick note in there saying, if you can't find the information that you're looking for, you may want to request it through RDRS. This is not something that we could do easily now because there's a lot of policies around how these things present, but there should be an easier possible way to make that. Technically, it's not very difficult. We just need to make sure that it fits in the current contractual constraints.

Recommendation five, that's the bigger one, and that's the one that is going to be of most concern to you as a council. So we reviewed all the recommendations. We looked at the 18 SSAD recommendations, the big R, those, and considered how we should tackle them or how the council should approach them.

Now, the first thing and most importantly, these recommendations were clearly presented as a package. They're all interconnected, they're all interlinked, and so we shouldn't pick and choose which ones stand or which ones need to be modified. Whilst we have gone through that exercise and know which ones need more attention than others, it is as a package that they should be considered, and for that reason, we are strongly recommending for the board to send back to council all those recommendations as a unit, as a package, and for council then to open it back up and review it as it needs rather than leaving half the recommendations with the board and have to work. This is not my opposition, but contrary, for example, to what was done with SubPro, where there was only, I don't want to say a handful because it was 30 full recommendations and 18 months of work around it, but it was only a portion of it that we reviewed. In this case, we would recommend to receive the whole package back.

Of the 18 recommendations, there are eight that we see could be kept roughly as are, and then 10 that need a change. Now, obviously, not everybody would be fully familiar with the 18 recommendations by numbers, but let's take a bit by random. One and two, for example, have to do with accreditation. There's a lot of work to be done there. We would have to review that policy pretty deeply.

Recommendation 14 has to do with the financing of the system. We think also that there should be work done there. The new system that we're envisioning has a whole lot less costs, but it's still something significant enough to look at. The report mentions already several million dollars invested between now and the time that you'll be reviewing this for the board.

Next slide. And then we went through the exercise of also trying to evaluate the difficulty of the effort estimated. Now, this is not the effort specifically for council or specifically for the team that is going to look at it policy-wise. It's the effort in general all the way through to implementation. Some recommendations are low efforts. Some others are more. I'm happy when, if we look at questions, to give you examples, but I don't want to take too much time here now.

And then the last recommendation is, recommendation six is, please don't get rid of us so fast. We remain here and stand here at your disposal to inform the council further through its discussion with the board and beyond. Obviously, I'm wearing two hats here in this instance, so I'll be around. I can see, for example, Farzaneh, who was on the group and is also a councilor. There were other ex-councilors that

now moved on that were part of the group, but in general, the group is standing and ready to take questions from the council and the board.

This is my last slide. I'm more than happy to take questions. And I don't know if I should run the queue, but I see Farzaneh's hand.

FARZANEH BADII:

Hi, Sebastien. Thank you. So, my question is that in light of the, if I'm not mistaken, there is an IRT that is asking the community the question of whether authentication of the requesters should be done through a policy. So now I cannot, I know I was part of the group, but I should have probably raised it on the mailing list. But what is the plan? Are we changing, modifying the recommendation based on this call? And also another thing that we have to make sure is law enforcement, they can do their own authentication, but it's not that they will just do their own authentication, they come to our DRS and tell us to implement it. As you know, there is a group, the practitioners group, I'm a part of and is a part of, a few of us are there, and they used to have meetings with PSWG. And then so we were discussing what are their processes, how do they want to do this, what are the accountability mechanisms in place and stuff like that. And we need to get clarity on those things. And before it can come and be implemented in the RDRS. So, that's it. Caitlin's hands up and she always corrects me.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

If I may, so first of all, the recommendation here is indeed to say we're open to other parties proposing authentication systems. Not everybody can come with theirs because it has a cost of implementing any other

system as. It is understood that the one that law enforcement is working on will be integrated with. The group recommends to be open to other groups doing that, but again, to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis because integration has cost.

In terms of policy, again, this group is not, it wasn't a policymaking group. So I'll throw the ball out on this one. This said, I have mentioned that amongst the 18 recommendations of SSAD, there were two that were related to authentication. One on authentication in general, and the other one specifically on government and law enforcement. So the successor group on this will have to look at it in a policy way too. Absolutely.

As for the group, actually, they've just sent an email this week, received an email from Fabien, inviting us to a meeting later this month. If you haven't received it, I'm happy to share it. And I hope that answers your question. Caitlin, go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Seb, and thanks for the question, Farzi. As Seb noted, the recommendation from the standing committee is in relation to the RDRS and the SSAD recommendations. So the SSAD recommendation was about crediting all users, and the standing committee is noting that due to the expense of that might not be needed, but we do recommend accrediting slash authenticating law enforcement users to start, so that is in relation to RDRS SSAD. And the question that's currently out for public comment is related to the recommendation 18 from phase one, which is about disclosure and urgent requests more broadly. So the two

issues are related, but they are not the same. So I just wanted to clarify that if folks are interested in the updated registration data policy language, that's currently out for public comment, and there's language about urgent requests. There's also a question about this authentication work that is happening, and if that would be policy or considered implementation. So there's more detail in the public comment forum, so I would direct everyone to that, as the council hasn't had a discussion on that issue yet. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Caitlin. Justine your hand up.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Sebastien. This is Justine for the record. Now, Caitlin mentioned two public comments that's been opened recently. I wanted to ask about the RDRS request policy alignment analysis public comment that's put out by the board. I'm not quite sure how they are related to the standing committee's recommendations, and I was just wondering whether, and probably the second part of my question may not necessarily be answered by you. I was just wondering whether council was going to respond to the ICANN board's public comment call, or whether it's going to be up to the SGs and Cs to do that. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So you're right. I'm not going to answer the second part of your question. I'll let Susan do that. And the first part of your question, they're independent views on the same problem. The board requested

from staff to put a paper on the differences, but it's from a staff, from an operation. My understanding is that from an operational point of view, I haven't read the report yet, and I should. I've had enough time since coming back from Dublin, but I haven't yet. My understanding is that it's two different views to the same problem.

Susan, I'll give you the mic back, particularly if you want to answer. I have one last point to make afterwards, but go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Well, I think it's to be determined whether we think as a council that we should be putting in a comment on that. Certainly, I think probably many people maybe have not had time to fully digest it having come back from Dublin, but we all, I think, should take the opportunity to do it. And I think we'll be looking for views on whether we think council should respond in addition, obviously, to our respective stakeholder groups and constituencies.

SUSAN PAYNE:

And then I think we do need to wrap this one up, I'm afraid.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So in closing, just shortly, 10 seconds, we have run this week a consensus call on this report. We closed it last night. We sent it back to the standing committee. We are in consensus on this report. We're just shy of full consensus, but we'll share all that now with council. And again, I'm happy to take any questions as they come.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Excellent. Thank you so much, then. Thank you for the presentation and also obviously for your sterling work, serving as the lead on this standing committee for the last two years or so. Really appreciate your work on this. So in terms of next steps, obviously we'll have that report coming out to us very shortly. Again, it's one for councilors to review and digest with their respective groups. And the hope is that we'll be coming to our December meeting for a vote on that. And just a reminder that the IRS standing committee report isn't policy recommendations. And consequently, when we're voting to accept the report and confirm that we'll be taking that report as input for us in our ongoing discussions, including any discussions we have with the board, as opposed to us accepting the recommendations, the councilors themselves as policy recommendations. So it's a slightly nuanced, but it's not uncommon for council to vote to accept, acknowledge, recede, and that we will take that input on board as we think most appropriate. So that's the plan for this, for our next meeting.

So watch the mailing list, basically. I'm going to move on. Our next agenda item is, I'm afraid, also one for Seb. But this is for us to have a quick presentation on the GNSO liaison to the GAC's annual report and for any questions to him. But I will just pause and perhaps I'll see what you think, Seb. I'm very conscious we're a few minutes over time and we really only have until about quarter to the hour. Do you feel that's enough time? I don't want to rush any discussion on this. The alternative would be we could move this to our December meeting.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I've submitted my report. I'm open and ready to take any questions, but I don't need to belabor it, particularly if you need time. So I'm very happy to yield.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, well then, all seen Seb's report. It's been circulated to our mailing list. So why don't we just take it from there then and open the mic if anyone has any questions for Sebastien on that report or the work generally of his role as being the GAC liaison. And there is one question.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It's not about my report, it's about the last discussion that we had with the GAC during the bilateral, I assume. And yes, I can follow up, no problem.

SUSAN PAYNE: Super. Okay, alright, then the queue is open for anyone, if there are any questions or points for discussion on Sebastien's report. I guess I had a quick question just for you, Sebastien, in terms of your desire to move to more of a closer relationship between the GAC and the council topic leads. Do you feel that is on track? Do you need any assistance or are there any concerns about getting that closer collaboration underway?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, as I've put at the end of my report, which is the lessons learned and what we can do better, I think that we can deepen that relationship. Now, we're presented to each other. People know who their

counterpart are. In terms of the, there was one particular group on internet governance and because of WSIS this year, that was very interactive and met every time and shared and etc. That was great. The others, less so.

I saw Jen's hand up for a second. I think that she tried particularly on DNS abuse to have these conversations, but the GAC is still reluctant to do that. They haven't said it officially, it's just that it hasn't started gelling. Work to be done, work to continue pushing. In the case of DNS abuse and in the case of accuracy, these groups have met only six months ago really and the summer has taken its toll on these sorts of discussions. So, something to push again and something I'd like to continue pushing.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Sebastien. That sounds good. Thank you. Any other questions for Sebastien? Not seeing any hands, in which case thank you very much for your service, Sebastien. Thank you for your report. Very much appreciated. And we appreciate what you do and for your shepherding of things like the response to the GAC communique and also for all of the efforts that we know you do in terms of ensuring that the meeting with the GAC that we have at the regular ICANN meetings goes as smoothly as it possibly could do.

Then I think we will move on to our next item, which is AOB. There are a couple of items on here. We'll see if we have time for them both. So, SPS Planning.

TERRI AGNEW:

Hi, Susan. This is Terri and I can speak quickly on the SPS planning. Councilors, ICANN travel team have sent out emails to you. If you don't see them, please reach out to me, or ICANN travel, and we can get those resent, depending on who you were, depending on what information they were needing from you. Some of them were booked now, and the deadline has already come and went. So, please, let's get our travel booked, our airfare booked. It will help with cost savings. If you have any questions, again, this is Terri. Reach out to me on that matter.

Our welcome reception, agenda, and activity building are all still work in progress, and we will continue to send updates as everything comes together. That was my very quick update. Seeing no hands or questions, I'll turn it back over to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Terri. And our other item relates to the expiration policies, and again, I think this one I can cover just quite quickly. Just a quick follow-up. We had the presentation in Dublin from Org about the policy status report, the updated version on the expiration policies, and so I just wanted to quickly clarify something, which is that when we discussed that, we talked briefly about how to proceed, and there was a suggestion that maybe we needed a small group to review that PSR and so on. I think what we actually think, having reflected on this a little bit further, is that we really, I think the next step, at least initially, is for each of us to share that updated policy status report with our respective groups and see if our groups believe that there is any further policy work needed or advisable on the expiration policies.

It could be that there is some work needed, or it may be that groups feel that no work is needed, and so I think we want to have that input from council members first of all, with the input from your groups, and then if there are groups that believe that we have policy work that is needed, we can then add that to our prioritization document and determine when and if that work is taken underway. So first step, please, take that updated policy status report back to your groups and get their input on whether there is a feeling that more work, new policy work is needed on those policies or not. I will pause there just briefly in case there's any hands. I'm not seeing any, and so I think this can take us then to our final agenda item, which is the consent agenda item, the motion to commemorate Rubens Kuhl. So I will hand this back to Jennifer, I think, who is going to lead this.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Susan. Council colleagues, we have circulated this motion to commemorate Rubens Kuhl. It doesn't require a formal second, but it is noted here that it's seconded by all the members of the council. I will be reading the motion in full in its entirety. And then at the end of that, we will pause for a moment of silence. And we will also ask if any councilors wish to share any thoughts for Rubens Kuhl and his family and we will pass all of this over to them.

Motion to commemorate Rubens Kuhl. The council was informed earlier this month of Rubens Kuhl's passing. We wish to recognize Rubens's significant contribution to the GNSO and the ICANN multi stakeholder model during his tenure, as well as his professionalism, his friendship and mentorship to many. He will be greatly missed.

Whereas Rubens Kuhl joined GNSO council on the 21st October 2015 as an elected representative of the RySG from the LAC region. He served two full terms between 2015 and 2019. As GNSO councilor, Rubens brought his professionalism, his deep knowledge of the GNSO council's best practices and history, his experienced thoughts on topics to serve the registries he represented, as well as council as a whole. Rubens made significant contributions to ICANN and was a strong and respected community participant. During his tenure, Rubens participated in activities as a councilor that initiated the EPDP on the temporary specification, GNSO guidance process initiation request, select SubPro topics, Applicant support team, IDN small team, modifications to GNSO operating procedures relating to elections and motions, GNSO council liaison to the translation and transliteration of gTLD registration data IRT, discussion group on new gTLD subsequent procedures, next generation gTLD registration directory services to replace WHOIS, new gTLD subsequent procedures work track one, work track four as co-leader, subgroup B, subgroup C, IDN scoping team. Rubens was also an active and valuable member of many ICANN initiatives outside of his service to the GNSO council, including but not limited to activities as a community participant in the EPDP phase one and its IRT, registration data policy implementation IRT and IPT, geotlds.rio, ccTLDs.br and many Brazilian city campaigns at the second level, Latin American and Caribbean islands regional At-Large, LACRALO, name collision analysis project, new gTLD Applicant group, executive committee vice chair, chairing skills program, ccNSO IDN policies preliminary review team, RSP sub-track, subsequent procedures implementation review and ASP sub-track, EPDP on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data drafting team, gTLD marketplace health index advisory panel, enhancing

ICANN accountability workstream two, new gTLD subsequent procedures.

Rubens was a well-respected and much appreciated member of not only the GNSO, the CPH and the registries but of the broader ICANN community. He was a friend and quiet mentor to many who were able to trace back to when they first encountered him. Rubens was also an active member of the community of ICANN participants within the LAC region and a representative of NIC.br, able to both share the dynamics of ICANN community to his region and a Latin American perspective to the ICANN discussion. Rubens's passing is a great loss to many people across the ICANN community who had the pleasure to work and interact with him and for his many friends at ICANN, the loss is significant. In addition to this devotion and set of accomplishments, Rubens endeared himself to those in the community by his willingness to help others and unselfishly give of his time to teach and mentor others. His work is missed but he is missed more.

Resolved. The GNSO council wishes to recognize the significant contribution Rubens Kuhl made to the GNSO council and the ICANN community during his tenure and his achievements during this time. Rubens's presence, professionalism, and commitment to the ICANN community will be dearly missed. On behalf of the current and previous GNSO councils represented today, we offer our deepest and heartfelt sympathies to his family and friends at this most difficult time. I would now like to call for a moment of silence to commemorate Rubens's death.

Thank you very much. Now we are opening the floor for all councilors who wish to share some thoughts for Rubens. Bruna, please.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Hi, Jen, Susan, everyone. First of all, thank you so much for the words. It's really undeniable that Rubens was a very valuable member, not just of the Brazilian internet community, but also rather ICANN community. And I do hope that this can be translated. I'm putting myself forward to help translate this to Portuguese and help share with the Nic.br folks and his previous team, because I do know that they would appreciate it. So just adding a word of thank you to you and my offer to translate it to Portuguese. That's it.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Bruna. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI:

I just wanted to mention that Rubens's work was fundamental for keeping the internet global and open. And he truly believed in human values that are universal, such as privacy. And he really worked with us to operationalize what he believed was good for people and for their access to the Internet. It goes far beyond ICANN. And he contributed so much to the internet system as a whole.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Farzaneh. Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you for this. I just wanted to add just what a great human Rubens was. No matter when you approached him to go over and say hello or saw him, he always took a moment to say hi back and was never in a rush to get away from you. And just a great human. And he will be dearly missed across the board. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Terri. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Jen. I just wanted to add a few thoughts as well. I didn't know Rubens as well as many people did. I didn't have the pleasure of serving on council with him, sadly, but I have worked alongside him for many years in this community, particularly on things like subsequent procedures. And I greatly valued him for his willingness to put the work in and his quiet expertise, particularly on operational and technical matters.

I know I always personally felt that if Rubens was looking at something, then I could feel confident that we would catch any issues because Rubens would catch them. Rubens was never strident, but you always knew that if he said something, that you should listen to him. He always had something valuable to input. He'll be greatly missed. He was, as Terri said, a lovely human and a great member of this community and will be sorely missed.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Susan. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Jen. I'll be short, but I wanted to mention Rubens's contributions on the Name Collision Analysis Project because as Susan mentioned, he was just really good at issue spotting and getting the working groups to consider issues that he knew would arise when it was time to give comments on reports, issues that would arise in implementation. So really, we, on Name Collision Analysis, very much appreciated his analytical abilities. So thank you, Rubens.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Anne. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you, Jen. Thanks for leading us on that. Do we need to vote?

TERRI AGNEW: Just to close the gap, let's go ahead and do it. How about that?

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay.

TERRI AGNEW: 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. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. With no abstention or objection, the motion passes. Back to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much. On that rather sad note, we're at the end of our agenda and close to time for this November meeting. So thank you all to everyone. And Terri, are there any closing words you need to say? Or can we wrap this meeting up?

TERRI AGNEW: No, just the meeting has concluded. And I'll stop the recording and just connect all remaining lines. Thanks all. Take care.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you so much, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]