
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council
Thursday, 14 August 2025 at 21:00 UTC**

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

The audio is also available at:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/QVsuuhFO4pSeJfUbbEGIB4aq7EoL7H28d-RUsQC2USfuLcH8GA7vbj6s88X2alvRLPyZzH2tEmzJ6s.lrlHwsQrvkQzpFcn>

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/7IK-J_7o3QAwRG2dIDuXpMkSa2Td10SxVC22m1XaVg3mrGld0auWSdrtlio7zOE.9N7NBkhiYVxDm_n6?startTime=1755205257000

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 (first meeting, replaced Greg DiBiase), Prudence Malinki

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou (apologies, proxy to Jennifer Chung), Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal (tentative apologies due to connectivity, proxy to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts), Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert (apologies, proxy to Osvaldo Novoa), Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Peter Akinremi, Manju Chen

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer (absent)

Guests:

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.

Karen Lentz and Jason Kean ICANN PPSAI IRT support staff

ICANN Staff:

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

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) (apology)

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: The recording has started, and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the GNSO Council Meeting taking place on Thursday, the 14th of August, 2025. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Nacho Amadoz?

NACHO AMADOZ: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

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

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

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Samantha Demetriou, she sends in her apologies. So I just want to say a congratulations of why she's not here due to maternity leave. So hopefully we can send some congratulations from around the world. So if she ever goes back to this recording, she has that. So anyway, proxy will go to Jennifer Chung. Ashley Heineman?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. And everyone, this is Ashley's first meeting, and she is going to finish the term for Greg DeBiase. Prudence Malinki?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Present. Thanks, Terri. And welcome, Ashley.

TERRI AGNEW: Desiree Miloshevic?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And Vivek did send in his tentative apologies due to connectivity. So if there is a drop, the proxy will go to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, but clearly he's on now with good connectivity. Yay. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Osvaldo Novoa? I don't see where we have Osvaldo, but we will go ahead and--

OSVALDO NOVOA: I'm here, sorry.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, that's okay. Welcome, Osvaldo. Thomas Rickert, you're welcome. All right. I just want to just double check really quick. We do have tentative apologies from Thomas, but in case he was not here, there was a proxy submitted who will go to Osvaldo Novoa. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Farzaneh Badii?

FARZANEH BADI: Present. And also congratulations, Sam, and the baby.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, thank you. Peter Akinremi?

PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Tomslin Samme-Nlar?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Manju Chen?

MANJU CHEN: Here.

TERRI AGNEW: Bruna Martins dos Santos? I don't see where Bruna has joined.
We will go ahead and see if we can get her on. Paul McGrady?

PAUL MCGRADY: I'm here and congratulations to Sam and welcome, Ashley.

TERRI AGNEW: Anne Aikman Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Justine Chew? Justine? Oh, there she is. I think she's finally got audio. Justine Chew, we'll call her name one more time.

Justine Chew: Yes, I'm present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. And thanks for joining. Antonia Chu. I don't see where Antonia is on. We will have guests today. Karen Lentz, Jason Kean, and Leon Grundman. They are ICANN Org's PPSAI IRT support staff. You do have your policy team supporting the GNSO. So, Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, John Emery, Julie Bisland, Devan Reed, and myself, Terri Agnew.

May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking. As the call is being recorded, a reminder that we are in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors or panelists can activate their microphone and participate in the chat once you have set your chat to everyone, so please do that now. Again, your Zoom chat, change to everyone, for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent

observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphone nor the chat.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN's multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With this, I will turn the meeting back over to the GNSO Vice Chair, Tomslin Samme-Nlar. Please begin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Terri, and welcome everyone to the August 14th meeting of the GNSO Council. As you know, Nacho and I will be stepping into Greg's shoes and leading the Council through this meeting until the AGM in October. Due to Greg's recent departure, as you heard already, Ashley has been appointed by the Registrar's Stakeholder Group to serve the Council from there. Thank you, Ashley, and a warm welcome to you. We look forward to working with you. I just want to, before I continue, just congratulations to Sam as well for the newborn to our family.

So, as a first order of business, does anyone have updates to their Statement of Interest? Seeing no one. I will ask if anyone has proposed amendments to today's agenda. But before I do that, I wanted to note two changes from the original agenda circulated on last Monday.

First, the previous agenda item 9, Agenda Requests, has been moved to the September meeting. Thomas Rickert is the GNSO Council liaison to this IRT, and as he discussed in Prague, he would like to discuss this issue from a holistic perspective and will

do so in September due to limited connectivity today. Thomas plans to circulate a detailed problem statement on this issue to the Council.

And secondly, you will see that we added an AOB item regarding the role of the GNSO Council liaison to the GAC. As you saw from a recent email, Council leadership recently received a question about this, so I would like to discuss this with the Council today. So, we added this to the AOB.

With that said, are there any proposed amendments to today's meeting agenda? Seeing no one, I will note that minutes of the GNSO Council meeting on 11 June, 2025 were posted on 30 June, 2025, and the minutes of the GNSO Council meeting on 10 July, 2025 were posted on the 28th of July, 2025. Our next item is the Consent Agenda, and I will pass this on to Paul, who submitted the Consent Agenda to lead us through that.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Tomslin. Paul McGrady here. Yes, so this is the Consent Agenda. It has several items on here. Those were sent around a while ago, and I think we can just go immediately to a vote, unless anybody wanted to move any of these off of the Consent Agenda for a proper long discussion. Hopefully not. Hearing anybody? Anybody? Great. Terri, can you walk us through the vote, please?

TERRI AGNEW:

I sure can. And just for transparency purposes, Bruna has joined the meeting, so we do have everyone on for the vote that should

be here that have not sent in proxies. So with that, we will go ahead and move forward. 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.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Would councilors holding proxies please say aye. So that'd be Jen for Sam and Osvaldo for Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Aye.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Aye.

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

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Terri. And thank you, Paul. Thank you, councilors. We'll now move on to item number four, which is a vote on the approval of the IANA Review Function Two Final Report. So just as a reminder from the presentation the Council received during

July's meeting, the IANA Naming Function review is an accountability mechanism created as part of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition to ensure that ICANN's IANA work through the public technical identifier meets the needs and expectation of its naming customers. The IFR2 focused on PTI's performance of the IANA function against the contractual requirements in the IANA Naming Function's contract and the IANA Naming Function statement of work.

The report contains two recommendations that will amend the IANA Naming Function contract. The first is a recommendation on the presence of specific domain system security extension, DNSSEC that is, policy details in the IANA Naming Function contract. And the second is identifying and pointing to the appropriate policy authority for DNSSEC in the IANA Naming Function contract.

This recommendation received no objections during the public comment process as a side note. Because two recommendations will amend the IANA Naming Function contract, they must be approved by the GNSO Council super-majority under the ICANN bylaws. So we will go ahead now and vote for that item. I'll ask Terri to lead us on that vote.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much. All right. With that, since this is a super-majority, this will be a roll call vote. So I will be saying your names. Desiree Miloshevic.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I see. Sorry. I see she turned up.

TERRI AGNEW: Sorry, Desiree, we'll circle back to you. Steve.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Okay.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Tomslin. Thanks, Terri. This is Steve. We did not read the resolve clauses yet. We need to do that first. That's all. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Steve. So resolved. The GNSO Council approves the recommendations contained in the IFR2 final report. And two, the GNSO Council requests the GNSO secretariat to communicate this decision to the co-chairs of the IRT and the relevant ICANN staff accordingly. I think we can now proceed.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. I was waiting for hands just in case. All right. Here we go with the roll call vote. One moment, please. Desiree Miloshevic.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: I vote yes. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Damon Ashcraft.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Hong-Fu Meng.

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

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And Osvaldo for Thomas Rickert.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Prudence Malinky.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Yes. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Ashley Heineman.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Manju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Jennifer Chung.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yes. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. And Jen for Samantha Demetriou.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Also yes. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Bruna Martins Dos Santos.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Also yes. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Nacho Amadoz.

NACHO AMADOZ: Yep. All in favor.

TERRI AGNEW: Farzaneh Badi.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Peter Akinremi.

PETER AKINREMI: Yes, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And Vivek Goyal.

VIVEK GOYAL: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. One moment, please. For the Contracted Party House, you had seven votes in favor. For the Non-Contracted Party House, you had 13 votes in favor. The motion passes with 100% in the contracted party house and 100% in the Non-Contracted Party House. Back to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Terri. And thanks, everyone. Next item is item five, which is another vote on the approval of recommendations from the GNSO Council Small Team and Accuracy. Paul submitted this, so I'll pass it on to Paul to lead us in this item.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Tomslin. So this can just introduce the topic. To a certain extent, there is some review here because we've been talking about this for several months. Sorry, I've got somebody outside my door here talking loud. Let me see if I can find the-- Just a few notes I've taken here. On the accuracy small team, everybody has heard me talk about this for quite a bit. But we have four recommendations that we're bringing back to you.

We started meeting in May, and we looked at threshold questions from the SGCs and ACs. And we also took a look at other sources, including the INFERMAL study, which we've talked about. There were a lot of wide-ranging answers, but we focused on the areas of alignment where we believed we could move the ball forward.

We aligned on four recommendations, which we talked about last month at Council and even before that in Prague. And so we are asking the Council to support these recommendations today. The four recommendations are that we believe we should examine the current timeline for validation and verification of registration data under the 2024 RAA to see there was some indication that that might have a happy effect on malicious registrations. And so we think that we should explore that further. We recommend creation of education materials related to the importance of accurate registration data and the safety of that data.

Further consideration is the third recommendation, further consideration of previously approved WHOIS to review recommendation CC1. And it's related to the inclusion of a notation in the RDDS record that the domain name is suspended due to incorrect data. So we're just essentially calling that back up to the collective consciousness. And lastly, we are recommending discontinuing the accuracy scoping team at this time in light of the above recommendations, but while noting that these recommendations represent only a starting point and do not preclude further future work if the Council would like to assign this small team more work.

And so one last note, during the Council's July meeting, a councilor asked if the small team's recommendations considered a recent response from the SSAC, that SSAC response rolled in quite late. The short answer to that is no, we did not. The responses to the Council's threshold questions were due February 14th, which was already an extended deadline. The SSAC submitted their response in July after the small team had already agreed to its recommendation. So we did not consider that. Doesn't mean that the SSAC response couldn't be considered by a future group, but it wasn't considered by this group, but it has been posted with the other responses.

So all that to say, this is a lot of words. We are hoping to get a positive vote on these today. And I also informally send the message to the Council and the community more broadly that nobody believes that we've solved accuracy entirely magically in a couple of months, but these are good starting points. And the Council, of course, has the ability to put together a new assignment document and get a small team underway for additional things to consider and think about. So nobody is going to point to this vote and say, that's it, we're all done. It's a starting point only.

So with that background, I think I read the resolutions and then we open a discussion if I remember procedure correctly. So let me read the resolve clauses. Resolved. GNSO Council approves the four recommendations in the Council accuracy small team summary report. Two, the GNSO Council would like to thank the groups who provided feedback to the Council's threshold questions and would also like to thank the leadership and

members of the Council accuracy small team for the commitment and hard work in completing the summary report on registration data accuracy.

So those are the two resolve clauses, and I will open it up to see if there are any questions or concerns. And I am seeing no hands, which I love. And now I think we go into a vote. So Terri, do you run the vote?

TERRI AGNEW: I do. Thank you very much, Paul. This will be a voice vote. So here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Aye. Aye. Councilors holding proxies, please say aye. So Jen for Samantha and Osvaldo for Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Aye.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. With no abstention, no objection, the motion passes back to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Terri. And thank you so much, Paul, and the work of the small team. Peter, I saw your hand up earlier during the voting. Did you have something to say?

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to like say clarification from Paul. So that is not like had anything. So I already like voted and he just wanted to seek more clarification. And the comment that was not considered, like, did we have a kind of an annotation? So maybe like something like, oh, this report was not considered because it was submitted late. So just wanted to like get more feedback on that.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. So yeah, we did not put that note in any of the resolve clauses. But I did mention it on purpose so that it is here in our Council record. And so in the event that the Council would like for a small team to take a look at that, that could be part of the next assignment document. The reason why it wasn't considered is because essentially, we were done with our work at that point. And there is a need for speed to address accuracy issues. So that's why it came in. It rolled in about five months late. But yeah,

if the Council wants that looked at, that could be part of a new assignment document for a new small team. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Paul. And thanks, Peter, for that question. I also wanted to just note that leadership and support staff will follow up on the actions coming out of the recommendations.

All right. Moving on to the next item, number six, which is another Council vote from the DNS Abuse small team. I will pass it on to Jennifer who submitted the motion.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Tomslin. This is Jen. Just a few things I wanted to introduce regarding this motion. And my screen is now freezing. Oh, now it's back. Okay. Just to give councilors who aren't on the small team a little bit of context. Back in April, the Council reconvened the DNS Abuse small team with a revised assignment form to look at the DNS Abuse mitigation in light of new developments. Previous small team back in 2021, 2022 has identified some enforcement gaps and issued recommendations.

Some of them were addressed through the contractual amendments to the base RA and RAA. These amendments have been effective since 2024, so last year, and it strengthened abuse mitigation obligations. Compliance has since reported on the initial data on the impact, and with these measures in place and new research coming out as well, the small team was tasked to consider these insights and discuss potential next steps on DNS Abuse.

So, we looked at community input, we looked at compliance data, we looked at external studies, and the team was tasked to identify remaining gaps and assessing whether these gaps warrant further policy development. And we have, well, in the recommendation report, we talk about the actual methodology. We looked at gaps in the existing DNS Abuse mitigation frameworks and they highlight as expected, despite improvements, significant improvements, issues still remain in the current DNS Abuse mitigation efforts.

We looked at all of these gaps, we reviewed and we consulted, so the small team members consulted with our respective SGs and Cs using the assessment criteria, meaning that these gaps were important and it's an impactful gap to solve, that it's likely to gain broad consensus and then also ideally the potential solutions seem achievable with keeping in mind the current workload and resources.

So, the top three issues presented in recommendation, I can't speak, recommendation three emerged as the strongest, with the strongest support across the SGs and Cs as reported back from small team members, and were also viewed as best meeting the assessment criteria. At the same time, there were additional gaps when we were going through this assessment and it is outlined in recommendation four.

Some of these gaps come from one or two stakeholder groups and constituencies. They're not as frequently prioritized, so they don't achieve the broad consensus as you see as the top three, but they're still considered very important by several SGs and Cs. So we will look to probably support potential follow-up work,

whether it is through subsequent PDPs or other mechanisms. So, specifically, the small team is recommending for the Council to request an issue report to look into all identified gaps, recommends that the included draft charter for the first three, sorry, the first PDP focus on the three high-priority gaps, and we recommend that the three high-priority gaps are as followed.

Do we have it somewhere in the, oh, there it is, yeah. If we could scroll back up, I think we might have it there. I don't know if we have it in the motion, actually. The three gaps are associated domain check, unrestricted access to API, inefficient coordination of DGA abuse, and the fourth recommendation is that we recommend for subsequent charters, PDPs, that they also consider the other priority gaps listed in the report. So, I think that is the introduction. Do I read the resolve clause before I open for discussion, or do I do that and then read the resolve clause? Not really sure. Steph, what's the best way to do this?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Resolve clause first.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay. All right. So, I'll read the resolve clause. Resolved. The GNSO Council accepts the recommendations as outlined in the DNS Abuse small team report and requests that an issue report be initiated on the topics as outlined by the small team and requests that staff create the report. The GNSO Council thanks the small team for its efforts, as well as the community groups that contributed to it.

I think that's it. And opening it for any discussion. Not seeing any hands. And I'll hand it to Terri for the vote.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. All right, folks, we're getting there. This will also be a voice vote. So, here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

FARZANEH BADII: Terri, I have a statement.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Farzi?

FARZANEH BADII: I would like to make a statement.

TERRI AGNEW: Can we finish the vote? And then I just have one more, and then Farzi, I will definitely get there. So, would the two councilors holding proxy seats, please say aye. So, Jen for Samantha and Osvaldo for Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Aye.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay. Before I read the conclusion, Farzi.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. So NCSG approves the DNS Abuse small team report. However, we wish to formally record our concern regarding the inclusion of associated domain checks as a potential topic to be investigated as a DNS Abuse mitigation measure. While we support effective and proportionate approaches to combating DNS Abuse, we have consistently emphasized the need for due process at registration, detection, and enforcement stages.

Associated domain checks risk enabling overly broad or arbitrary enforcement, particularly if implemented without robust safeguards to ensure registrants are informed, have a meaningful opportunity to respond, and are protected from collateral harm. Such measures could lead to disproportionate takedown and suspensions, and the targeting of legitimate registrants through bulk association-based criteria undermining fairness, transparency, and accountability.

We are also disappointed that due process and access to remedy have not been prioritized by other stakeholders in this work.

Domain name registrants are not inherently criminals, and DNS Abuse mitigation measures should reflect that presumption. We therefore cannot support the inclusion of associated domain checks unless and until clear, transparent, and consistently applied due process becomes a priority for this community. However, this is not to say that we did not approve the motion. We all did. Just wanted to put that on the record. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much for that. And I will be asking for you to send that statement via email to us so we can attach it to the vote. Thank you very much. All right. So with all of that, no abstention, no objection. The motion passes. Back to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Terri. And the statement is noted, as Terri mentioned. We'll move on to the next. Lawrence, you have something to add?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Yes, I have something to add on that item, but I wanted us to conclude the vote first. So otherwise, I should have brought this up when after Jen had presented her report. So the accuracy team did refer to the DNS Abuse small team and a small issue around validation. And the DNS Abuse team wasn't able to, I don't think we're able to do much around that subject matter. Just felt that I should bring this up to our notice. Is this going to require a group looking at it? Or is this something that could also be added to the task for which the issues reports might have to

provide some further information around? I guess my question is, what happens to that bit of the work?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Lawrence. I see Jennifer's hand is up to answer the question.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Tomslin. And thanks, Lawrence, for the question. I think if you take a closer look at our recommendation report, you'll see that it has been noted in the small table. I think it's page seven of the report. And it's especially noted as a priority item for CSG. So in our recommendation four of this report, we also recommend looking at the remaining gap priorities for subsequent next steps. So that is part of our recommendation. It's the four recommendations that we made in the report. I hope that answers your question.

Is this not dropped? As the other priority gaps also identified by other SGs and Cs are not dropped. This is also in the larger gap matrix, which is in the very long appendix you see to our report, which makes our report 73 pages. Yay. That will also be addressed in the issue report that comes out. I hope this is clear.

And I guess since I do have the mic right now, just also noting that the small team did work through the concerns raised by NCSG. And very importantly, due to that, we have added a strengthened language emphasizing that all identified gaps must be examined with due diligence and through careful balancing of rights and responsibilities. So thank you to our NCSG colleagues in the

small team that have raised this and we have strengthened language there. I appreciate that. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Jen. And thank you again, the small team for the work that you did. All right. Moving on to. The next item, which is a vote. On the approval of the review of reviews cross community group charter. A procedure and not defined. I would pass this to Susan who submitted the motion.

The motion from July was originally deferred. However, when Susan supplied the motion for this agenda item, she formally withdrew and submitted a new motion. Because of that, the August motion. Could in theory be deferred until September. Given the timeline of the walk of the review of reviews, this will be a bad outcome. That's the note.

The other thing is that the substance of this agenda item has shifted considerably over the few last few months. As you all know, it was initially regarding an approach to address both the noncompliance issue and as a practical manner, how to move forward with the review of previous project. The discussion then shifted to focus on the ALAC petition, which made the discussion in July more complex. And while the IPC wanted to support the ALAC's petition, no other groups were supportive. The IPC submitted a motion that is to sort to have the Council play a leading role in both drafting a bylaws amendment and preparing the draft charter for review of reviews work.

Now in the lead up to the July meeting, other groups already took the lead on preparing a draft charter. And so the Council smart in which we put together in July met several times to discuss just the draft charter. And in working with the SOHC chairs, nearly all of the Council's small teams suggested edits were duly integrated into the draft charter. The draft charter was agreed to in principle by the SO/AC chairs, though it was recognized that in some cases, for example, the GNSO formal approval may come later. As a result, it was understood by the SO/AC chairs that some late suggested edits could come in that may require adjustments to the charter. As such, any suggested changes from the Council, per the email I have sent in, the list should meet a high threshold, which was that only egregious errors or omissions basically consider any potential changes against a can't live with standard.

So with that background there, I will pass it to Susan who submitted the motion.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks very much, Tomslin. Yeah, and thanks everyone. The motion itself has got quite a lot of background history in it. And that will be familiar as much of that was in the previous motion that we had submitted at the last meeting and which has been withdrawn. But Tomslin has given a much more helpful explanation of the background and where we are and where we've got to. And that is essentially this, when we came out of our last meeting, we realized that there was cross community work to be done to work on a charter for this formal cross community group. And so a small group of volunteers got together and that's been our primary focus with Tomslin and Lawrence taking the lead on

attending that charter drafting discussion with the ccNSO and Board and Org and others.

And so we now do have what we think is a very stable draft charter for a cross-community group to conduct the review of reviews. And it's hoped that we can therefore vote here in this meeting to approve that and also to formally get underway the selection process for the two GNSO member participants of that cross-community group or CCG. In an informal manner, the selection of candidates is actually already underway, but we had included it in the motion just as a formality as well. Obviously, the slate of the members for that cross-community group will be selected quite soon. There's quite a short time turnaround for this because of the need to get the CCG up and running. And then probably at the next Council meeting we'll be asked to formally approve the selections that the SSC make on this.

So I'll just pause in case there's any hands up. I'm not seeing any. Unless anyone has any questions, I'll go on to the resolve clauses. Okay, so resolved. Firstly, the GNSO Council approves the charter for the review of review CCG. And then secondly, GNSO Council directs the standing selection committee to promptly proceed with the identification and selection of two GNSO member participants of the CCG. At least one of whom should be a GNSO Council member.

And then for the approval of the GNSO Council. In making its selections, the SSC should bear in mind all aspects of the charter and including the timing expectations for this work and the expectations that individual members should. Firstly, have sufficient expertise and understanding of the ICANN reviews to

participate in the discussions. Secondly, commit to actively participate in the activities of the CCG on an ongoing basis. And thirdly, where appropriate solicit and communicate the views and concerns of individuals in the group that nominates them. So I think handing that back to you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. This will also be a voice vote and guess what? It's also our last vote today. So here we go, folks. 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.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies, please say aye. So Jennifer for Samantha and Osvaldo for Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Aye.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Aye.

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

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Terri. And thank you, Susan. One important note on that motion, or that topic, is to note that the efforts to address the ICANN's noncompliance with the ICANN bylaws will be pursued in parallel. So this issue has not been forgotten.

All right. Thanks. We'll move on to item number eight, which is about the privacy proxy services accreditation issue implementation work, and the related questions that came to the Council. Paul, being our liaison to that IRT, I'll pass it on to you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Tomslin. Looking forward to giving you guys a brief update on where this work is and to pass along what it is that the IRT is looking for, specifically some input from us. The IRT has been working hard to identify specific areas where they believe they need inputs from the ICANN Council. I've encouraged them, and I think they've done this, to focus their attention on issues that need to be looked at, again, because of changes to law, technology, or internal ICANN policy, rather than attempting to relitigate everything there is to relitigate.

And so I'm happy to provide you all with a little background, and then we need to decide how we are going to handle this work. So by way of background, these issues related to privacy and proxy services were identified back in 2013, and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the Council initiated a PDP, and

chartered the PPSAI, Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group, in 2013. I remember serving on such a thing all those years ago. The Working Group published its final report about two years later, in December of 2015. The policy recommendations were approved by Council and adopted by the Board in 2016.

And the Org worked on implementation until 2019, when the work was paused by staff, and it's an important historic footnote, it wasn't paused by Council, due to overlapping issues around GDPR, data processing, and temporary specification. That pause was controversial, and remains controversial to this day. We are, however, reconvened this group in July of 2024, after the issues of GDPR, data processing, and temporary specification progressed, and the registration data policy was published. So staff restarted the work, and this IRT has been meeting since then.

So that's sort of the background. And let's see if I can, I've got some things ahead of me here. But the bottom line, let me jump to the end. The IRT is assisting staff in developing the implementation details for the Privacy Proxy Accreditation Program to ensure the implementation conforms to the intent of the final recommendations. The IRT reviewed and responded to the provided threshold questions, and has now identified areas it believes requires guidance from the Council.

So we've got three categories, I believe. These are policy, implementation model, and disclosure frameworks, specifically for policy. Are there any policy questions or items the IRT already wants to bring to the Genius Hill Council for guidance? Implementation models. The questions are, can an

implementation model without a new standalone accreditation program remain consistent with the policy recommendations? And on disclosure frameworks, are there specific areas to revisit under new law and policy? And can these frameworks be aligned with existing work on the RDRS, the registration data policy, and other existing procedures and remain consistent with policy recommendations?

So the staff and IRT put together, you'll see it here, a link in the materials, essentially a threshold questions response paper. It is long. If you've not read it, it is good reading, but it's hard work that was put into this. We won't read it now, but we have a handy-dandy, essentially questions and guidance being sought. So I'm jumping down. Saewon, I think you may be controlling the slides. I'm jumping ahead for sake of time to slide 14.

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

For category 2 on the implementation model, the question was, can an implementation model without a new standalone accreditation program remain consistent with the policy recommendation? The IRT believes that answer is yes, and the guidance they're requesting from Council is whether the policy recommendations would preclude the implementation of potential accreditation models for this policy.

And category 3, disclosure frameworks, are there specific areas to revisit under new law and policy? The IRT said no. However, they raised the question of whether the disclosure framework was intended to be purely illustrative. So the IRT is asking the Council for guidance on to what extent the illustrative disclosure framework and exhibit or annex B of the final policy report is a policy requirement or is it illustrative as labeled. So I think just kind of being careful there. So those are the primary things.

We've got another category 3. Can these frameworks be aligned with existing work on the RDRS, the registration data policy and other existing procedures remain consistent with the policy recommendations? The IRT team believes that answer is yes, but they would like for the Council to provide guidance on aligning PPSAI disclosure frameworks with work such as RDRS. We say SSAD, but SSAD has not been adopted. RDRS is not policy, but it exists in the real world and or a successor system to either the RDRS or the potential, I guess, SSAD. And so they're seeking guidance on those things.

So proposed next steps for Council, they would like quick response. In August, we're presenting these to the Council. That's what we're doing now. We need Council to determine the best approach to review and provide guidance to these questions. It is hoped that by September we'll have draft responses to questions, and they can be socialized with different groups within the community. And by October, the Council discusses input received from various groups in the community and finalizes responses to the PPSAI IRT to inform implementation.

Consideration, staff is wishing for my retirement. I am not retiring for any listeners or viewers. I am, however, evaporating from Council with great glee in October. So you all miss me, but I'm not going away entirely. And other considerations, one of the reasons why we're pushing so hard on speed is the evolving conversations about RDRS. And its relevance to PPSAI. I know that you're about to get a RDRS report soon. These two work tracks have proceeded independent of each other, but there's sort of no denying that there is some subject matter confluence. There we go. I don't want to say overlap, but confluence. So the goal, if we can, is to get feedback to the IRT as quickly as reasonably possible.

So what's the ask, I guess, at the end of this? And then we can open it up for questions. Practically speaking, the only way to move this quickly, I think, is to put together an ad hoc small team with a short lifespan to take a look at these questions and draft answers that can then be socialized amongst the Council and then socialized as we noted in September with different groups throughout the community and work over the next three months to get these answers back to the IRT. Obviously, it doesn't have to be a small team, but that does seem to be a way that we've been acting as a Council when something needs to be done quickly.

And so I am willing to lead that small team if we form that small team. Now that the accuracy work has wound up and now that the team 14 work from my own house is done, and I'm most familiar with the work of the IRT, if you guys want to do a small team and if you're looking for a leader. But we don't have to do it that way. So I think at this point what probably should happen is

that we open up the floor to both substantive questions and also questions about whether or not a small team is the way to go. But Tomslin, I don't want to steal your thunder if you have other things, other ideas, or if you think we need to ask other questions. So thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Paul. And I think those two questions are appropriate for us to ask at this time. So I'll open it up for Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, I mean, Paul, thanks so much for your work on this. I think your idea of putting together a small team or just a small group to tackle this between now and September makes sense. I'm happy to volunteer to be on that. So thank you so much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Damon. We have one volunteer and one leadership volunteer. I don't know if there are any other questions for Paul or? Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I do not have a question for Paul. Thank you. That was a great summary. I just want to throw my name in the hat for any small group, team, whatever you want to call it. I'm happy to volunteer. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Ashley. Any other volunteers? I know Vivek is volunteering on the chat. Farzi?

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah. So I volunteer, of course. But I don't want to get into substantive stuff, Paul. But I think that the disclosure frameworks, I believe that we are really like working on these disclosure frameworks in other groups. And I don't know how we are supposed to respond to these kind of questions in the small team. Because in my opinion, the PPSAI should just come up with like implementation of how to accredit the privacy proxy. Because the other recommendations have been, as you sometimes say, been overtaken by the events. So I'm just wondering. Okay. So we can discuss what small team is going to tackle. It's just that I just wanted to know if there is a possibility for like providing an answer that some of these recommendations should not be implemented at all.

PAUL MCGRADY: So, Tom, with your permission, I will tackle that. So these are recommendations made by Council that have been adopted by the Board. And so a small group really can't say to Council, hey, Council, defy the Board. Right? And so I think that we, if the Council wants to have these unadopted, we can think of mechanisms to do that. The Board certainly could un-adopt things. And we've all been working this year to address how Boards can un-adopt things in this community. Right? But I think that the remit of this small group would be more narrow than that.

And looking specifically at the questions asked in light of the recommendations as they are now, adopted by the Board, any un-adoption would have to be a separate work path for us if people wanted to go down that road. I do think that in relationship to the disclosure, yeah, it's a narrow disclosure in those instances where there is a privacy and proxy service in place. That's sort of, again, confluent with the work of the RDRS, which is looking at disclosures sort of more broadly. Right? But, yeah, I do think aligning those two work streams makes sense. But the small group would be quite unambitious in relationship to overturning prior policy adopted by the Board, yeah.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Paul, and that makes sense to me that the small team should focus on the questions that have come from the IRT. And I know that we do have volunteers for that small team. And I think we have a way forward that the small team will look at those questions according to the timelines proposed from Paul's presentation of a September draft response and October discussion and response back to the small team.

Yeah, I think with that, I'm seeing no other hands up. We have a way forward on this and we can move on to the next item. Thank you, Paul, for that. And the next item, which is item number 9, is an update on the outcome of the Transfer Policy Review PDP Human Rights Impact Assessment. I think this one came from Farzi, and I'll hand it over to Farzi to give us a background and an update on this.

FARZANEH BADII:

Yeah, thank you, Tomslin. So, I am just presenting this. This is just to let you know how we went through the retroactively doing the kind of like the Human Rights Impact Assessment for the Transfer Policy Review. And as you know, the human rights checklist, because the PDP was convened before the Council came up with a process on applying the checklist to PDPs, we decided that we are going to do this retroactively, and just like nothing binding or anything like that. So we just wanted to see how it can work.

I don't have a fancy slide, so I do apologize for my very bland and sometimes the font is not very consistent. So I'm just going to take you through what we did and what sort of ideas we might want to work on with regards to how PDPs apply the human rights checklist.

So I'm just going to talk to you about the lessons learned. So if you look at the boilerplate, we have a boilerplate human rights checklist for all the PDPs. It was done by SSCOI and it says that the working group is expected to consider the potential impact of any recommendations on human rights. Based on the information included in the request for an issue report, the WG is expected to further consider whether there is a likely human rights impact. And, if so, who are the groups expected to be impacted and the expected severity of the impact. If an impact is anticipated, the WG is expected to address the following questions: is the proposed action necessary to achieve the desired outcome? Is the proposed action proportionate? Is it legitimate?

So this is actually a comprehensive paragraph, but how can we do that? This is not to prescribe anything because it's an iterative

process. I'm just putting it out there to think about it and see how we can facilitate the work of the PDP in order to apply this human rights checklist. So one idea is that the Chair can add a 30-minute human rights checkpoint to the PDP work plan at the charter level initial report and final report. Use the one-page checklist we have, and escalate only if triggers are hit, like when you answer those questions.

We can also have-- we don't have to have like a separate liaison to be appointed, but we can tell the liaison among their duties is to run the checkpoints with the chairs, keep a one-page risk mitigation, residual risk, rationale, logs, and then coordinate with support staff, flag when triggers require a short Human Rights Impact Assessment. This is based on also like our conversation with the chair of the TPR. He said that it's really important to have the human rights checklist throughout the process. And then also, we can also see if they can have like a recurring 10-minute sync milestone between chairs, liaison, and the support staff, confirm the checklist is done, track mitigation was adopted and any residual risks.

Now, then what happens when recommendations are actually finalized? We can ask for a short human rights attachment alongside the working group's final report. It can be a checklist summary, risks found, mitigation adopted, residual risks, and rationale. And then we can also ask for what was changed to reduce impact. And then there can be also a trigger assessment, whether any triggers were hit. And if so, then it's warranted to do a fully-fledged Human Rights Impact Assessment. So these are like amazing ideas that I'm just putting it out there just to like keep

it in mind, see if you want to do anything with them. We don't want to impose more processes on the chairs and the PDP working groups, but we want to facilitate how they consider human rights.

Another question that popped up was, what should the Council do after this? If the Council is not satisfied with the answers, or still observes residual risks to human rights, what should be done? Could be that we can draft a motion, request a scoping paper, or use the issue report process. Another thing that they can do also is that in the PDP recommendations, they can say that we did the Human Rights Impact Assessment, we want to flag for the Council that probably an issue report is warranted in this case, and then the Council can just suggest an issue report.

So now, when we did the Transfer Policy Review Human Rights checklist, as a result of the outcome, we recommend that the Recommendation number 33, Request to GNSO for further work on Transfer Dispute Resolution, be implemented. And that recommendation says that the working group recommends the GNSO to request an issue report or other suitable mechanisms to further research and explore the pros and cons of expanding the TDPR, creating a new standalone dispute resolution mechanism for registrants who wish to challenge improper transfers, blah, blah. And then the working group recognized that if such an effort were ultimately adopted, this request could be resourced. Okay, fine.

So one thing that I want to ask the Council is to like, somehow, I don't know what process we're going to use, is to request an issue report on the transfer dispute resolution work. And in light of the

human rights checklist that we did, and the human rights impact that the lack of this kind of mechanism could have an impact on human rights.

So these are my two requests. One request is to think about the process that I suggested. And also, that we will talk to other PDPs that were newly convened and we will ask them if these are like helpful processes and we will see what we can do with them. And another request is to, I don't know, somehow we request an issue report on the TDR. I'm not very familiar with the processes of the GNSO Council, I don't even have the excuse that I'm a newb anymore, so I want to know how we can follow up on this and take this further. And if you have any questions on what I'm suggesting, you have the time.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. I will open it shortly for Councilors to chime in and ask questions, but I wanted to note that the Council is meant to have a prioritization discussion after continuation of the prioritization discussion we had in Prague, where we asked staff to help us put some data into some of the topics that were on our table. I assume this request you have for, including the issues report on Recommendation 33 should be part of that discussion. Will that address the request you have there?

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, yeah, I think so.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay.

FARZANEH BADII: I mean, I don't want to take like a year for an issues report request to be submitted. That as well.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. Prudence?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Thank you so much, Farzi, for this update and for your recommendations. I have a question. I just wanted to try and see if I can understand a bit more because I think I'm a little bit confused. So I just need clarification. Would the request of the issues report have any impact to the continued work or timings for the transfer policy and the ongoing work of the Transfer Policy group in their endeavors? Or is it just going to be looking retroactively and won't impede any future progress? I just need clarification because it's not entirely clear what the impact will be to the overarching framework of work. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: So that actually, I think Tomslin can respond. So that's like one of the recommendations. It's actually one of the recommendations of the PDP. So I think that the IRT is going to look into them, so it's not going to impede. It's just that we are kind of trying to say we should look into this recommendation, and if there's an issue

report that needs to be done, we should just request it. But Tomslin, I don't know if you have a comment on this.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Not exactly. My understanding is that-- actually, rather than me trying to address this, let me ask staff to help me with this. Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Tomslin, and thanks, Prudence, for the question. This is Caitlin Tubergen, for the record. To your question, Prudence, the answer is no; if the board were to approve the recommendations from the Transfer Policy Review Final Report, the board would direct ICANN Org to implement those recommendations. And one of the recommendations, the one that Farzaneh has been referencing, is a recommendation to the GNSO Council to request an issues report. And I believe Farzaneh is asking for that to be prioritized when... but it would not affect implementation of the other transfer policy recommendations. I hope that answers your question.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Yes, Caitlin, thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Caitlin. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure, I don't have a question. Just Farzi, thank you very much for this. Just one sort of point of observation. Very important topic. So one thing is, it does seem a little bit complex. And I would hate for us to get into sort of an paralysis by analysis issue with this one. And, you know, remember, I mean, ICANN is a nonprofit, public benefit corporation. And so they're not supposed to do anything that's supposed to harm human rights. And so I think this might be, you know, less is more. So as we go through, we look at this, the simpler and the more streamlined we could make this, probably the better. Thank you, so much, appreciate it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Damon. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Farzi, for the good overview, really appreciate the thought that's been put into it. I had a few questions. I don't think it's this slide. I don't know if we can go back to slide... I don't know which one it is. It might be slide two, slide two, or the first slide, the one after the title slide.

FARZANEH BADII: I totally lost where I was, and I'm just confused now, and I don't--

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sorry, the one after the title slide, the second slide.

FARZANEH BADII: Oh no, it's not that, you are gone busy.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Oh, oh, sorry.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm Zoom channel. Wait, I paused it. I paused it. No, I should have it. No, don't do that. Oh sorry, why is it paused? Sorry about that, I don't want to waste your time, but I have to redo this. Okay, so which one did you want to talk about?

JENNIFER CHUNG: The second slide, the one that's after the title slide.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. This one?

JENNIFER CHUNG: No, go back. Sorry. Yeah, perfect. So I wanted to ask about the - oh, that's not the one I'm looking at. Anyway, I wanted to ask more about the Council appointed liaison, the human rights liaison; is it the same liaison that we appoint to all the PDPs, or is this a new role? That's my first question.

FARZANEH BADII: It's better to actually ask the liaison that has already been appointed to just keep an eye on this because finding other volunteers is a little bit difficult.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay, I'm seeing why I'm confused, because the version of the slides I'm looking at that's linked to our documents seems to be an old version, which kind of [CROSSTALK].

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, I changed that, I changed the idea because, you know, we will have problems -- if we can find a human rights liaison that would follow up, I think that's great. But we can also just ask liaison Paul. Paul, your hand is up. Also, like, what do you think? You've been liaison to IRTs and PDPs and stuff. Yeah, sorry about that. I was pretty last minute. So, Paul, tell me.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Oh, sorry. You're speaking on mute.

PAUL MCGRADY: You can't hear me?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, now we can.

PAUL MCGRADY: Oh, okay, great. So I was going to say, thanks, Farzi. Yeah, I definitely don't think we need a roving human rights liaison, that jumps into everything that sounds like a full-time job. I guess my question about what we do with this from here, I don't think it's a

PDP because, like, we've already got the human rights. I mean, this is a board driven thing, right? Like, we have to do this. Is the next step on this to put together a group to look at the GNSO operating procedures, so that we have this in there and we have a checklist, and we make it straightforward for liaisons to interact with working groups on this, and make it easy for the liaison to know they have our support, and coming back to Council, if they're seeing something off the rails.

I think that, like, I don't know; I don't think a multi-year PDP is needed. I think we should learn the lessons and incorporate this into how we operate. I think it's an operational issue is what I'm trying to say; I'm so long winded. I'm also super distracted because, Tomslin, I love how you're appearing on the screen right now, it looks like you are personally commanding your own submarine. And so it's like *Hunt for Red October* over there. It's distracting me. But anyways, I think it's an operational issue and I think we could take a look at our own procedure. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADII: It's a great idea. I totally support that, Paul. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, and I'm indeed commanding a submarine down here in the Southern Hemisphere. As it was noted in the chat, the HRIA is also part of the PDP process. I agree that it's an operating procedure, perhaps getting the liaison to report more on this aspect of it. Jen? Oh, wow, before Jen, Steve, I see your hand up.

STEVE CHAN:

Yeah, thanks very much, Tomslin, this is Steve from staff. Since it's the first time I'm speaking substantively, I would like to say congrats Sam, welcome Ashley. That aside, I thought it might be helpful to provide a tiny bit of context here, or maybe add a little bit of clarity. Because I think there's probably two streams here. One is the sort of the ongoing way in which the Council can approach the Human Rights Impact Assessment versus the very specific things related to the outcome of the post-report analysis that Farzi and Roger conducted after the fact.

And so I think what might be helpful is to consider what the Latin Diacritics PDP is doing, or at least plans to do. I think that speaks to the first part, which maybe the Council would welcome some of that clarity on the approach taken here. And then, I guess, considering that, determine whether or not there's a need to course correct, or at least let the cycle play through and determine after the fact if there's future improvements that need to be made.

So just really briefly, I wanted to cover what the Latin Diacritics approach is going to be. So what they have already done is during the kickoff for the PDP, it provided just an overview and made sure that the PDP was aware that's a requirement, to go through the Human Rights Impact Assessment. It's also a requirement to go through the Global Public Interest Impact Assessment as well, and also to actually review consensus, policies and any potential impact.

So there's these three impact assessments that are now essentially required elements for PDPs. And so all those were

laid out as not performed, but made sure there's awareness at the working group level that these things need to be conducted. And so it's not just for this PDP, that's going to be an ongoing requirement for all PDPs.

So that said, the substance of the impact assessment, the staff side, what we have recommended, and the leadership team for the Latin Diacritics PDP, they have come to the same conclusion that it makes the most sense to perform these assessments when you have essentially a stable set of recommendations. And so you're able to look at all the recommendations holistically, and not necessarily look at them in a vacuum and on an individualized basis.

And so where we expect to do that is essentially when we're on our path to an initial report, to be able to look at all of these recommendations, consider them against the three frameworks I mentioned, human rights, obviously one of them. And then the outcome of all those assessments will go into the initial report, which is published for public comment. So then that's another opportunity for the broader community to be able to weigh in and make sure that the impact assessment is all the things that they expected to be, robust and considering all the factors that need to be considered.

I don't know if that helps folks consider this topic a little bit better. Like I said, I wasn't sure if it was immediately obvious to everyone that there's two pieces. It's the general approach for the Council versus what the Council might want to do. And specifically, as a result of the impact assessment for transfers policy review. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, I tried to say what Steve said. Well, I even had slides, so hopefully you got what I wanted to say. Now, I think that that's a suggestion that we should consider, Steve, and also Justine, as a preliminary step, we can ask the liaison to the Council to keep an eye on the human rights stuff and also like work on the liaison description. I don't know, to be honest, this is such an iterative process. We are at the beginning, so I don't think we should do anything prescriptive. But one of the things that-- what we should have at least like some lightweight, kind of like best practices, that this is how you do it, because it also differs depending, like, what the PDP is about. Anyway, thank you. So Jennifer, go ahead.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Farzi. You and Paul, and also Steve has answered a lot of my questions. I really appreciate this, you know, especially when we're trying to operationalize this. And I think Latin Diacritics PDP is going to teach us a lot because they are operationalizing quite a few things, impact assessments.

One thing I wanted to ask, and maybe this is, again, an iterative process, because of the work that the board readiness team is doing, we are always thinking about, you know, when the PDP process can be improved, especially with respect to whenever expert advice is needed. I'm seeing here, the third bullet says, you know, flag when it triggers a short Human Rights Impact Assessment. Are we expecting us to kind of call on some more expertise, or is this whole process supposed to be, we're onboarding, I guess, the whole PDP and the Council liaison to be

able to perform this, I guess, internally, or is it something that, you know, when it triggers certain things, we're going to have to ask, hey, we're going to need to get in people who might have a bigger expertise, or greater expertise, deeper expertise on this. Thanks,

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, we need to do this very cost effectively, because we can't come up with a resource incentive. But we will see, I guess, if the human rights impact [inaudible – 01:27:38]. There are many open-source human rights checklists out there that people can use when they're doing their work. Unless it's really something like evident, or like there's a lot of disagreements on how to tackle it and whether the human rights thing, stuff like that, we can get an expert. But as much as possible, I think this should be done by the PDP. Okay, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: I agree with everything Farzi just said that there will be rare instances where the subject matter is really intense, where we probably should get in other people to help us, but the overwhelming majority will be garden variety PDPs and the team, the liaison, the chair can all handle that with staff. But I keep going back to like the informal process that Steve laid out, that the Diacritics team is doing; sounds great, but we got to write it down somewhere, right? Otherwise, we're only-- it's an informal process-- it sounds like my audio still is not doing great. I don't want to beat a dead horse. We should get together, figure out how to write this stuff down in the operations manual. Thanks. All good ideas, but we gotta put it somewhere. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Paul.

FARZANEH BADII: Tomslin, we didn't address fully the second question. Do we have time? I know I took more than what I asked for.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: We have five minutes left on the item.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, so coming back to the transfer policy thing. Tomslin, you recommended that you're doing the prioritization and is there a like a Council...?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Steve, correct me if I'm wrong. I think this is coming up, I think it's in the September agenda of the Council meeting, the prioritization. Steve, is that correct?

STEVE CHAN: Hi, Tomslin, this is Steve, that is correct. That as our intention, to make sure that we have the materials updated and ready for discussion by the Council in the September meeting. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, so we are going to be prioritizing the recommendations by the transfer?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: It will be part of that conversation, because if you remember in Prague, we had a list of topics, that the Council is meant to attempt to prioritize what work should come next on its table. So that should be part of that conversation.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, so we can just raise that next month?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: More than raise that, it should be on the list as well.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, so I'm going to send this on the list and I'm going to request the Council, like, if the Council has objections to the prioritization of this recommendation, please just respond on the list. Is that good? Is that helpful?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, but when I made the list, there was the list that staff has that they put in additional resource requests for us, so that the Council of the [inaudible – 01:32:08] can look at those and determine what it should prioritize. I believe staff is going to add that issue request on that list, so that when it is brought for discussion, the

Council [inaudible – 01:32:26] will make a determination on what to prioritize as the next work.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, so we will raise this issue on the mailing list again, and we can discuss it in September.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Correct.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, great. Paul, is that an old hand or a new hand? It's an old hand, okay. Right, okay, I guess I'm done. Thank you very much for listening to me. And your great ideas.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Farzi. And I believe staff has taken the action items on this. And so we will follow up and discuss this, the prioritization, in September, and also consider the operationalization proposals that have come out of the conversation as well. All right, moving on to the next item on our agenda; waiting for the agenda to come up. Thank you, Terri. We're moving to the Any Other Business item of our agenda, and the first one is the ICANN84 planning and the GNSO draft schedule. So I'll ask Terri to speak to that.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much, Tomslin. And hello, everyone. This is Terri. First of all, I want to heavily thank your SGC support and

other staff members who helped put together this ICANN84-GNSO draft schedule. As you take a look, you'll note there will be conflicts. We tried our best to minimize those conflicts, but as you can see, there were a lot of requests, a lot of meetings that folks wanted to get together and talk about.

Today, we're going to mainly be talking about the GNSO meetings, GNSO-supported meetings. So I just kind of want to start with Sunday. As a reminder, on Sunday, there will be a time change. So that's always fun when we're at meetings, when we have our time change. But in addition to that, to start off our day on Sunday, you'll see right now it shows three GNSO working sessions, starting at the 9 o'clock. We do want to highlight the 10:30 GNSO working session. This is all a work in progress, so we have not removed it yet from the draft schedule.

More than likely, the second GNSO working session is going to go away. In addition, the CPH DNS Abuse Community Update request will be going away, and there will be a GNSO hosted DNS Abuse session taking in that place. It's where those who want to learn more about DNS Abuse will come in. Steve, if you want me to pause so you can answer Farzaneh's question more, let me know.

STEVE CHAN:

Sure. Thanks. Thanks, Terri. This is Steve. The idea is, I think, to try to coalesce around a topic that obviously, a lot of different parts of the community are interested in. As Terri noted, there was already a session request from the CPH for a DNS Abuse session. There's also interest from other parts of the community

to talk, I think, about the substance of DNS Abuse, and with the Council having just requested an issue report, and especially focusing on three specific topics, the idea, at least preliminarily, is to actually try to start setting a basis for the PDP. So, talking about those three specific ideas and trying to actually make practical progress to set the PDP up for success.

So maybe easier said than done, but the idea is to try to take advantage of the fact that people are on the ground and make practical progress to get the PDP on a good footing to make progress once it actually begins. Well, assume, and also, of course, the Council request a PDP in the first place. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And I note, Steve, there are questions in chat, but in addition to that, Jen, your hand is up.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Terri. I think-- oh, there's been some questions in chat from Councilors about that. I guess maybe I don't want to speak on behalf of any of the CPH leadership, but since I am part of the CPH DNS Abuse Working Group, I think the idea is for that session to not be there and replace it with the GNSO-hosted DNS Abuse session. I know that's in the works right now, but I just want to confirm that that is the thinking. And also, the GNSO working session, too, is going to be changed to that GNSO-hosted DNS Abuse session.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And hopefully, that answers everyone's question. If not, please raise your hand and we'll try to get that addressed. Okay, moving on. So what that means is on-- oh, Farzaneh, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm sorry, I'm a little bit unclear how we request these sessions as a GNSO session. Generally, do we do that when there's an upcoming PDP? Or like was this based on the small team work? Was this staff-led, the request, or how did you come up with this GNSO-hosted DNS Abuse session? I know Steve told us a little bit. I just want to know where the request came from.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Terri, go ahead.

TERRI AGNEW: I was just going to say, so I was going to turn it back over to Steve for him to answer, but Tomslin, if you want to, please feel free.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I was going to say that this was a discussion between leadership and staff on how best to address the conflicts and the topics that seemed similar. So that we don't have to have conflict on the agenda on Council slots. That's how the decisions were made. But I will ask Steve to add to that.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Tomslin. This is Steve. I don't really have much to add. I think the sort of tangential response here is that it sounds like you're also sort of asking Farzaneh about the general approach. Usually, we work with the leadership teams of... by the Council or the working groups that are in operation. That's generally how we determine what should be on the agenda. And for the specific one, Tomslin already answered that. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Okay, so moving on. So what that means for Sunday is there will be two GNSO working sessions. One that starts at 9 o'clock and one that starts at 13:15. Within those working sessions, the agenda is still a work in progress. And we work with the Council leadership, so if you have ideas, feel free to write to Council leadership and we can get those in there. But some topics that we will put in the working session agendas will be for our joint bilateral meetings with the GAC and with the ICANN Board. And sometimes, other groups request to meet with us, and we can also typically put those in the working sessions as well.

In addition to the two working sessions on Sunday, you'll notice that we'll have our joint GAC and GNSO meeting as well. And then if we're moving on to Monday, Monday at 3 o'clock will be our GNSO Council informal meeting. During this meeting, we talk over our Council agenda, work out any items that we need to work out, any questions. This is also where we invite our SGC leadership to join us. Also, on Monday, then we'll roll into our joint ICANN Board and GNSO Council. That will be in the afternoon at 16:30. So that's what your Monday GNSO Council duties will be looking like.

We'll move on over to Wednesday. Wednesday is our big Council day. So we have our GNSO Council Part 1. That's our normal two-hour meeting. It's also where we say goodbye to our Councilors. So at the very end, we will be doing that. We take a short, short break and then we roll into GNSO Council Meeting Part 2. This is our admin. This is where we ask the outgoing Councilors to leave the u-shaped table. Always sad, but exciting because we have our incoming Councilors come and sit at the table. This is where we vote on the chair, we hash out our vice chairs, if we have names to put forward for that. So, it's typically a very short meeting, but just come to vote for your chair. We do not have the name yet, but work in progress, so there you go, we have some time. September is the deadline for that.

Then we go ahead and roll into Thursday. Right now, our GNSO Council Wrap-Ups Session is scheduled for 13:15. There may be some changes coming to the block schedule. I don't want to share all the changes that may be coming right now, just in case they don't happen. But if the changes come to the block schedule, as we're being told, then the GNSO Council Wrap-Up Session may need to have a different time, but we'll keep you all updated as that happens. And we have another meeting in September to go over the schedule again.

Okay. So this is what it's looking like so far for our GNSO drafted schedule. In addition, you'll have your SGC meetings. Also, in addition to that, I want to let you know that we've sent out an email and we're asking for a GNSO Council dinner sponsor. Nobody has stepped up yet. So if you're interested in sponsoring the Council dinner, we'd really appreciate it. Just a quick, little helpful

hint. One of our GNSO staff members have already started looking at restaurants, and there's a possibility. So even if you don't know Ireland or Dublin that well, we do have a possibility for you. So there you go. So it might take a little bit off your plate. So anyway, I just want to thank everybody that's been working very hard on the schedule, and we'll see if we have any other questions.

Oh, good. Thank you, Bruna. Yes, the travel emails. The idea was last week the funded travelers were going to receive their emails. Unfortunately, there's just been a little delay with that. Everybody's working very, very hard to get those out. Please continue to be patient. I know everybody's waiting and willing to go book once you get them. So that's the update I have for you. It has not been sent out yet. We're still hoping this week, but again, it's kind of out of our hands right now, so please, please be patient. All right, I think I've answered everything. Oh, Anne, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thank you. The good news is you have a volunteer in the chat, Terri, where Desiree said she can work with the restaurant stuff. My basic question regarding schedule is, you know, how we can be sure that we're not forcing discussions with the GAC and with the Board before there's adequate time for the Council to address things in the sessions. It seems like when we try to finalize an agenda for discussion with the GAC, there's more involved in the working session after that. And it looks like we are once again looking at having to finalize an agenda to discuss with the GAC ahead of our ability to meet in person. Is that the case?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: To answer, Anne, yes, we would be looking at meeting with the GAC leadership to finalize from the agenda before the meeting in person, so that we can have an opportunity to discuss that during the work session.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks, Tomslin. So that would be something where everyone in Council-- I mean, is it possible to put that as a discussion item on the September Council meeting so that we can get some actual discussion on that agenda?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I believe so. Usually, there is a bilateral discussion on the agenda itself. Yes, we might put it on the Council agenda in September to discuss the topics that Council wants to discuss, but I'm not too sure whether we would have the topic from GAC's side then. I don't know if staff can help with that side of things. Do you think we'll know, Seb?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Well, at least we could take a stab at discussing what we want to prioritize on the Council side. Anyway, thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, and we certainly can do that.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks, Terri. So it was just a question. I think the idea on the review of reviews, I think there was talk about having two sessions and then it was down to one. And I think it's back to two sessions again. So do you have any idea where that second session is going to be, which I assume is on the Thursday?

TERRI AGNEW: Great question, Susan. I was trying to wait until that came out to the planning mailing list. But you are correct. Rumor on the street is it will probably be Thursday at that 13:15 slot, which goes against the GNSO Council Wrap Up. So we'll need to take a look at that. If that will be the members joining the review second meeting, or if it's open for community, how we want to handle the GNSO Council Wrap Up, move it somewhere else. So, lots of ideas. We're just waiting for the update to come out.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, super. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Okay, not seeing any questions.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Terri, Farzi?

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, Farzi, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, it's not addressed to you, Terri, but why on earth do we have two cross-community sessions or reviews of reviews? I mean, it's like, are leaders concerned about something? Tomslin, are you in these... like, in organizing stuff? We have other topics that we can discuss.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I can attempt to answer that, Farzi. So the request, or the approach on the review of reviews is, if you've looked at the charter, the fact that there are outcomes that are required to be discussed by the community at ICANN84 as the review of review work. However, you make a good point that the second review of review meeting will already have the review of reviews working cross community group stood up.

So it might be the case that we, the whole of the community, do not necessarily have to participate in that meeting, but rather the two GNSO appointees to the CCG that will need to participate. That conversation about the conflict just came-- we were having it in light of the fact that it conflicts with a GNSO Council meeting, and whether GNSO Councilors would like to participate in that meeting or not, but at the same time, recognizing that there will already be two appointees from GNSO that will be specifically appointed to attend those meetings. So if that's the case, then we do not need to worry about the conflict.

But I suppose that's why Terri is presenting this, because there is a potential conflict with the Council meeting. So we, as Councilors, can agree that the appointees should attend that, and we don't have to worry about the conflict. Sebastien, I'll come to you about the GAC shortly. But I saw Lawrence's hand up and I know that he was called in the small group on the review of reviews, I don't know whether he had a response on that specifically.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you, Tomsin. I just wanted to add that the two sessions was a request from the SO and AC Leadership meeting. What was initially proposed was for one meeting. But the thoughts around this is that at the very beginning of the ICANN AGM, there is that need to have discussions around the review of reviews and brief community on steps taken so far, aside from discussions that will happen as regards to bylaw changes.

It also is an expectation that in the course of the week, there will be different discussions happening inside those, and that there was that need for another meeting, possibly on Thursday, to more or less sever all the discussions that have taken place in the course of the week and also marshal an action plan. Not only for the CCG, for the Board and for the community, based on discussions that have happened in the course of the week. And so basically, that second meeting is planned to be more or less getting community feedback and being able to fashion a way forward. Just thought to add that to the discussion.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Lawrence. Like Terri mentioned, we'll continue having the discussion on this. Terri, I'm mindful of the fact that we have five minutes left. Did you have more to talk on the program?

TERRI AGNEW: No, I do not.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. On the AOB, we had the two updates, the WSIS update and the GAC liaison update. Seeing that we have only five minutes left, if it's okay, I might request that we move these two items to our next meeting so that we can discuss the 10.4 instead, in the minutes that we have left. I see no one raising no objection.

I will move on to 10.4. The Council leadership was recently asked about the appointment of Ashley as the Registrar Councilor and the potential implications of bylaws Section 11.3(e), which prohibits more than one employee from a particular corporation from serving on the GNSO Council at the same time. So as you know, both Ashley, who is the Registrar Councilor, and Sebastien, who is our Council liaison to the GAC, are employed by GoDaddy.

Council leadership discussed this and came to a preliminary assessment that Sebastien can continue to serve as the GNSO Council liaison to the GAC due to the limited nature of this role, while other Council liaisons, like the ALAC and the ccNSO shall participate on equal footing with members of the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council liaison to the GAC is distinct in that it does not have the same equal footing privileges. And also the GNSO liaison to the GAC is from the GNSO to the GAC, rather than to

the GNSO from an SO/AC. So we believe this is another important distinction we considered.

The GNSO liaison to the GAC is a limited role of observing GNSO Council meetings and only intervening on relevant GAC activities as this relates to issues of interest and/or under discussion by the GNSO. Also, part of that role, Councilors are always empowered to raise a concern if they believe a liaison is acting outside of its role.

In addition to the discussion we had, we raised this question with ICANN Org and ICANN Legal recommended that we asked the Council this question: In creating this special category of a GNSO liaison to another entity, did the Council intend to allow for that role to be served by someone who is from the same employer as a duly appointed Councilor, keeping in mind the limitation of 11.3(e)? And if so, what are the protections the Council has in place to mitigate against perceptions of any single entity having an undue influence on GNSO Council matters?

So, as I've noted, Leadership believes that 11.3(e) was not meant to apply to the liaison to the GAC role. And that the safeguard in place is to raise concerns if a liaison were ever acting outside of their role and correct the behavior. We wanted to raise this question with the Council and so I'll open it for discussion, and we'll continue the conversation on the mailing list as well. Yes, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, thanks, Tomslin for this, I know the time. Just wanted to seek some counsel around this, possibly maybe with staff advice. Because I had gone back to look at the bylaws as it was written and I note that specific clause saying that we're not to have two Councilors from the same organization. My question is, was there a precedent set? I mean, definitely with this, we'll be setting a precedent. Has there been a precedent around this before on Council in terms of-- definitely, I know that this won't apply to two full-time Councilors, you might use that word, but we are looking at the Councilor on this instance and the liaison. Do we have a precedent of this happening before, and what was the practice with that, or are we, by this instance, setting a precedent for this particular type of arrangement?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Lawrence. In my knowledge, I do not believe there has been a precedent between the liaison and a Councilor being from the same employer, but I'll check with staff now if they know about any. Steve, do you?

Okay. Maybe we'll take an action item to double check historically, and we'll put that on the mailing list as well. One staff check. Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks, I'll be really quick. I agree with the assessment that Leadership has made. I think that this is a liaison out of the GNSO Council, it's not someone who's serving on Council. And so I agree with the assessment you've made. It did sort of, in my

mind, beg the question of what would be the position in the case of one of the liaisons into the GNSO Council, such as the liaison from the ALAC or from the ccNSO. And I don't think we've ever had the situation arise, but it theoretically could arise. And my sense is that that would be a different matter. But perhaps it would be at some point, and not on this call, we maybe should reach a kind of shared agreement that that's a different matter because it could come up in the future.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Susan. And Anne, are you there? I see your hand raised.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yeah, thanks. I think that Susan is cutting out. But I just wanted to ask one quick question there, Tomslin. What was the second question from Legal? Did they say whether we have any procedures in place that address the appearance of an issue or something like that? Because, I mean, obviously I don't object with respect to Seb and Ashley and etc., but I think, again, as a procedural matter, if Legal is saying to us that second question, could you read that again?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, it was, What are the protections the Council has in place to mitigate against perceptions of any single entity having an undue influence on GNSO Council matters?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Okay. I mean, I think as a procedural matter, it would be good for us to think about how to address that question. I don't think anybody objects to what's happening right now, but I do think it's appropriate for us to address that second question from legal and to make sure we, you know, for precedential purposes, have that addressed. Could you send that question around? That would be great.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I will. It is also in the email I sent, but I will extract that and highlight that on an email as well.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Great, thank you. I had not focused on it before.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No, that's okay. We will take those questions that have come up, especially the procedural ones that have been mentioned, and we will continue that discussion on the mailing list as well. And my apologies for us going five minutes above time, I think. Thank you all for being patient. And I think that brings us to the end of the call.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Tomslin, thank you for your leadership today. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Damon.

TERRI AGNEW: All right. Well, good call, everyone. Thank you very much. The meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Thank you all for your time. Take care. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]