ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council
Thursday, 10 September 2026 at 05:00 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/FFQFhFctMNZfgjrVgjpe4iCt-h7XamswauzyyYuJZezqGQRo4ym2iShN-EoQkUVb6KngClrxlHqL49k8.k0BCjZbSHAorAXs0

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/CVYhi4di5XTA17eODBuRfjMXsQpkMptPUHWA3WvysiZfs22OfT0599GDgek63kJ5.cZlrKr2MT9skUwLq?startTime=1789016485000

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, Volker Greimann
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 (joined after vote), Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi, Benjamin Akinmoyeje, Tapani Tarvainen (apology, proxy to Julf Helsingius)
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Christian Dawson
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Greg Shatan: ALAC Liaison (First meeting)
Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC
Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests: Michael Bauland, Chair of the Latin Script Diacritics PDP

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

ICANN Staff:
Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations (apology)
Caitlin Tubergen - Senior Director, GNSO Policy Development Support
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Andrew Chen - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO) (apology)
Devan Reed - Policy Operations Senior Coordinator (GNSO/Programs and Operations) (apology)

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 the 10th of September 2026. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Nacho Amadoz?

NACHO AMADOZ: I'm present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Hong-Fu Meng?

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

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Samantha Demetriou?

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

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Ashley Heineman?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Volker Greimann? I don't see where Volker has joined. We will try to get him on. Gaurav Vedi?

GAURAV VEDI: Here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE O-ROBERTS: I'm here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL: I'm here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm here. Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: I'm here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR: Hi, Terri. I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Farzaneh Badii?

FARZANEH BADII: I'm mostly here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Peter Akinremi?

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Tapani Tarvainen has sent in his apologies and the proxy will go to Julf Helsingius. Benjamin Akinmoyeje? I don't see where Benjamin is on. We'll try to get him on. Bruna Martins dos Santos? I don't see where Bruna is on. We'll try to send her a message. Christian Dawson?

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

TERRI AGNEW: Anne Aikman-Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: Hi, Terri. It's Greg Shatan. I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, Greg. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Our guest today will be Michael Bauland, Chair of the Latin Script Diacritics PDP. You have your policy team supporting the GNSO in the room: Caitlin Tubergen, Julie Bisland, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Andrew Chen, 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 are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat. If you could please take a moment right now and set your chat to everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor the chat.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest. With this, I'll turn it over to the GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Terri. Well, hi, everyone, and welcome to our 10th of September 2026 call. First up, as usual, does anyone have any updates to their statements of interest that they want to flag? I'm not seeing any hands.

Okay, in which case, does anyone have any proposed amendments to the agenda? And again, not seeing anything. We've got a fairly packed agenda today, but let's see how we get on with that.

Okay, then I will just quickly note that, as usual, the minutes from our last couple of meetings, the minutes from the 13th of August, were posted on the 27th of August, so we have them finalized now. And then we'll move straight on to the consent agenda, which I'll hand over to Peter for.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Susan. So, for the consent agenda, for this month we have just only one consent agenda. And this consent agenda was sent to the Council with regards to the elected members and liaisons for the Customer Standing Committee for the Council to review and approve that.

So, this was sent by the ICANN org staff that support the Customer Standing Committee for the GNSO Council to review the elected member and liaison and also to approve that, and this is in the fulfillment of the ICANN Bylaw. So, this was sent to the Councilors for review prior to this meeting. So I'm sure that the Councilors reviewed the elected members and the liaisons for the approval of these in fulfillment of the ICANN Bylaw. So, without any comment and seeing any hand, I will ask Terri to move us to a vote on this one.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Peter. All right, before we start the vote, Benjamin, I have sent you the additional Zoom prompt to move over to panelist. If you could please accept that so we can get your mic activated, I would appreciate it. Also, for the vote, I'm taking one last look. It looks like, Benjamin, I'm sending that Zoom prompt to you one more time.

It looks like it keeps timing out. Before we take the vote, it looks like we are missing one councilor, Bruna Martins dos Santos will be absent for this vote. All right, Benjamin, I'm not able to get you moved over, but I did activate your mic in the attendee window, so that should work. Here we go for the vote.

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?

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies please say aye? So that's Julf for Tapani.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Aye.

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

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Terri. So, the consent agenda for this month passed. Back to Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Sorry, there's my mic. Great. Okay, fantastic. Thanks, everyone. So, now we're on Council agenda item four, which is our discussion item on the ICANN87 joint GAC-GNSO meeting agenda. We will be meeting with the GAC during the ICANN87 meeting. In preparation for that, we asked our GNSO liaison to the GAC, who is Sebastien Ducos, to coordinate with the GAC points of contact and help to develop a proposed agenda for that bilateral meeting that we'll be having.

We've got four topics which you can see there in the agenda that have been proposed: DNS abuse, the 15-day verification/accuracy, what the current situation is on the SSAD, and priorities for 2027 on both sides. So, I think I won't waste time. I will hand over to Sebastien, who is going to walk us through that. And with that, I think just straight to you, Sebastien, if that's good with you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, perfect. Thank you, Susan. So, we had indeed a meeting with our topic leads and the topic leads on the GAC side last week on the 2nd of September, yeah, just over a week ago, to review the topics that we will see in Bali. We had run a quick poll both on their side and on our side before to make sure that the right people were on the call to review those topics.

So, DNS abuse, been a topic forever. We will discuss that. Obviously, we're in the interim between two stages of our DNS abuse PDPs. There was some discussion from the GAC to be able to participate in the chartering of the new PDP, arguing that if they participate in the PDP, they'd like to be part of the discussion also to charter.

We kindly reminded them that that was a GNSO prerogative, that we as the GNSO are responsible for the management of the PDP and as such, also for its chartering. We will, if I understand well, circulate that document with them and more widely with the different participants in the community to make sure that everybody's on the same page with the chartering, but that remains an exercise for the GNSO.

Anyway, so that discussion will take place in Bali. On the second topic, there was a topic that the GAC raised prior to Seville. It has been a discussion topic within the GAC for a little while now on the 14-day… so this is the 14-day verification after registration, bring it forward from the current requirements. So, this is a discussion that we will have in Bali. We will have also a discussion prior to that. They asked if they could have a more sort of focused discussion, and we'll have that before Bali.

I don't have a date yet for it. We sort of agreed it would be the end of this month or very beginning of next month, knowing that Bali will start early. There's a number of workshops that will happen starting on the 14th or 15th of October, so it will have to happen the week before, because people are going to be traveling early.

And so, the exact topic of discussion for the plenary will greatly depend on that previous meeting, on that call that we'll have before. Obviously, councilors will be invited. That's a discussion between Council and the GAC, but the GAC will be able to explain further what they're looking for, and they were greatly focusing particularly on the contracted party to sort of bring arguments for and against, and making sure that they get a full picture of what it means to be able to enforce that sort of 14-day mandate.

On the third topic, which is the SSAD, one of the reasons some of us will come to Bali a bit early is because there's an SSAD session early or the week before. And so again, the exact line of topics will depend maybe on what happens on that day, but in general, as we've seen, the GAC has been very active in this process for years already and very keen on interacting with us. And as Susan said, there was a last topic that they raised on our call last week asking to have a discussion on priorities.

Again, the GAC wants to understand how we set up our priorities on topics, want to share also their vision on priorities. We'll see exactly how that works out and how we can match our agendas there. That was pretty much it. I'm open for questions if anybody has them. I see a hand from Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, thank you, Sebastien. So, when you started as the liaison, you came up with this great idea of GAC not so we won't be just responding to GAC's questions and requests, and have more of a conversation than being interrogated.

So, I think that having a few questions that we can ask from GAC as well would be good, and I would like to very much see how they envision the issue of transparency, remedy, and data protection play out in DNS abuse and these verification and the accuracy requests that they have, especially for SSAD as we are talking about law enforcement requests and disclosure of people's private information to law enforcement.

So, I don't know if we have time to put forward a few questions, but I believe that it's a part and parcel of this conversation. When we talk about any kind of policy, we need to think about at least these three issues. So, we can also ask about what are their priorities? And of course, they can advise, but I don't think that they can set something for us to be a priority.

They can give us advice, but yeah, so I think having a conversation would be better than just hearing their requests and telling them how we are accommodating them. And if the group agrees, we will send a few questions about those elements of transparency, remedy, data protection. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, on the questions, we actually discussed that. Manal reminded that there was an ask, and of course, we can send questions. I'll only ask two things. First of all, if I can have those questions in writing so that I pass on the exact questions, the exact wording. And second, if we can do that quickly, in the sense that we've been pushing the GAC to have their points, their talking points to us as early as possible, and we can't really pull a swiftie and send them hours at the last moment. So, the quicker the better, but I'm happy to share and they're expecting that, too.

On the question of priorities, this is very much a discussion. We're not here to just take their notes and adapt our agenda to it. It's a discussion, and indeed, they will share their priorities and we'll see how that works with ours. We've clearly restated again on the discussion about chartering and in general, that it is a prerogative of the GNSO, and it's not just a prerogative, it's also a responsibility to manage the PDP, manage the working hands in the community and be able to make sure that we have trains on time and availability of people working on, etc., and all these things happen not by changing priorities all the time, but by managing them.

So again, if you can send me those questions, or anybody, the GNSO Council in general, I'll be more than happy to pass them on. I'm managing a queue here. Susan, I hope it's all right, but Vivek, I see your hand.

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you, Sebastien, and from what we have heard for GAC, I think you're doing a great job, so thank you so much for all that you do. I'm sure managing governments is not the easiest tasks, but thank you. I understand that we have an update on topic one, topic three, topic four, of course. I'm just trying to figure out on topic two, is this a discussion or are they expecting us to say what we are doing, because as far as I know, and I may be mistaken, we have not done anything on this as of now. And what are we going to say? Will this be a PDP? Will this not be a PDP? How are we going to play this? Any thoughts?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Not for me, because I'm not a councilor, and you guys are organizing that show. So, this is a topic of discussion from them. They would like for us to indeed start doing some work on it without being very clear as to what they would like at the end is to have a verification happening much earlier on day 14. What we'll start with is that discussion, again, end of month, beginning of next month.

We'll spend, I don't know what, an hour, an hour and a half in seeing exactly and clarifying a bit what they want. That's the endgame that they're looking for. I don't know that they have any particular view on the path other than, as always, they want everything happening fast.

But no, they're very conscious on the fact that we haven't started any work on it and are right now saying that what they would like to hear is from us and particularly from the contracted party, how that could happen and what it would imply.

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you, Sebastien. This is not a comment to you specifically, but I would think it will be better or helpful in whatever format we can to explain to GAC members that any change they want done can be either done at a contractual level with the registries and registrars or has to go through a community process.

So, it's very clear to them that they cannot write a letter to the Board and say get this done. This is not how things will happen. So, they will have to follow the community process and which is what we are all bound by.

It will temper their expectations a little. Maybe you can put it in softly instead of us trying to do it the hard way with a letter or something. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Peter, I see your hand up.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thank you so much, Seb. Peter for the record. Thank you so much for coordinating this process and it's very important for us to ensure that we align and what is to be discussed. Two things from my plate. The first thing is regarding this topic leads conversations and how we ensure that GAC members actually stick to relevant topics and discussion during our meeting with them.

I just want to hear from you on whether this was discussed during the topic leads meetings and with the GAC, and ensure that there is no surprising question during this meeting. That's the first one. And the second one is on the fourth topic, which is the priority, the SSAD one, do we have an ideas of the priority of GAC?

So, while we are doing our due diligence and working on these, then do we know theirs, or so they're working on their own and would they share that with the GNSO so that we can sort of align and prepare before the meeting? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, on their priorities, I think it's the three topics that you see here. I think that they have less interest of conscious of the rest of the work of the GNSO. All they see is PDP and the result. As always, the GAC has been for a number of years now saying that we're too slow, so that their priority is possibly for us to work faster, but again, for us to explain maybe the complexity and the intricacy and also the time it takes to get the whole community involved on any topic, to remind them why things move at the pace they move.

But the priorities are basically those topics. Again, I think the rest of the work that you guys do and the rest of the interaction is a bit obscure to them, so maybe might be also an occasion to explain that. And I hope that that answers your question.

Yeah. I see Ashley's hand, too, and I think I was given only 15 minutes on this, so I'm watching Susan to make sure that we're good on time, too. I see a thumbs up. Ashley, go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi, thank you, Seb. Ashley Heineman, representing Registrars. Yeah, not to pile on too much, I did put this in the chat, but just to make sure it's fully on the record. It's really important that we get some additional feedback from the GAC on what exactly they want to discuss on the 15-day verification issue.

We faced this problem leading up to Seville, and we did not really get final confirmation of what they wanted to talk about until about a week and a half before the session. And that was, I think, it really put us in a difficult position as Registrars in particular, because what they did ultimately ask was very detailed and heavy on the provision of data.

We're happy to engage in conversation, but we need to be prepared for that conversation. And it puts us in a very awkward position when there seems to be this expectation that we know what they want without being told what they want. I think this time, they said, "Well, you should know what we want based on our communications to the Board."

And while it's nice that they have something to point to, but it really is not helpful at all, because we did cover those points with them already. So, in order to make this as constructive as possible, having precise talking points as soon as possible, specifically since, well, we don't have it and I guess getting something agreed to in terms of timing as well would be really helpful as well, since we are coming up already, we're almost mid-September and yeah, I won't belabor the point. I think you get it. Thanks a lot.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, for everybody, obviously, Ashley, as a topic lead, was on the call last week, and that exact same question was asked to the European Union as the spokesperson. It's not just a European Union question, it's as the spokesperson for that request. And that's exactly the answer that we got: "Just go and check in our filings, in our conversations with other groups, and you'll see exactly what we want." I think that the bottom line is that they want to see whatever verification is in place moved forward to 14 days after registration, absolutely.

What they really, really want is us not to pass a registration or make a registration operational until verification is done. To be clearly honest, this is exactly what they want, but they know that this is probably a bit too far. And they're baby-stepping it as they see it and trying to bring the current verification requirements to 14 days. This said, because they said, "Go and see in archives," and we'll do that. I will do that.

I'm currently on leave, but next week I'll be back at my desk and I will work with John on our side and Fabien on their side and do a bit of digging, and going back to take their advice and going back to their filings and records and dig up all these points, and make sure that I have that to Council before we have that call organized with them, so we know exactly what they want, or at least what they've said they want on the record. I hope that helps.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Seb. I think at this point, I have to wrap the conversation up for now, but obviously it's an ongoing conversation. So, thanks very much for that. Thanks for the questions. I can also see in the chat, folks are putting some good comments and suggested questions, perhaps even something that might be thought of as talking points in the chat.

It'd be super helpful, I think, if you have made some of those suggestions, to share them on the mailing list just to make sure we don't lose them. It is, as Seb has been trying to achieve, more of a dialogue, and so that's great. But we may not ask the question in the exact form that it's been proposed, but I think between us we can come up with something which is a sort of question or a talking point we can bring to the GAC as well, so that there is a sort of sharing of information and not just a one-way sort of request for on our side.

Okay, let's move on, as we do have a pretty packed agenda this month, having had a quiet one last month. Okay, we are now on to a discussion on the Latin Script Diacritics Policy PDP final report. And this is wonderful. This is a PDP that was initiated by Council in November 2024. You will all have seen on the mailing list that the final report was delivered to us in Council on the 31st of August 2026.

So first off, I think it's really important to congratulate the members of that working group for their tremendous work on this PDP, which they worked very efficiently and they've delivered their final report a few months ahead of what was anticipated in the schedule for that. We are planning to, as we always really do, I think we're having a presentation here and we'll hear from Michael Bauland, who was the Chair of that group, shortly, running us through at a sort of high level the recommendations from that PDP.

And then the anticipation is, if possible, we will have that on the agenda and vote on it at the October Council meeting, if possible. So, I said we have Michael here. I want to thank him for his work on this and for leading this effort, and hand over to Michael now, rather than take up too much more time. So, Michael, thank you for being here with us, and over to you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Susan, for the introduction. Yeah, hello and welcome, everybody, to this PDP report. Thanks for having me. My name is

Michael Bauland, I'm chairing the PDP. As a very brief background, I've been active in the IDN topics for several years now. I've been part of the IDN EPDP, the ccPDP4, and I was a member of the Generation Panel that created the Latin part of the Root Zone LGR.

Today, I'm pleased to provide an update of the final report on the Latin Script Diacritics PDP, also short LD PDP. The detailed recommendations are available in the final report. Today is about providing an update on the overall policy framework.

Next slide, please. So, for today, I'll start with what problem we were asked to solve and provide an overview of the PDP. Then I will cover what the working group concluded with, focusing on a small number of priority recommendations, since we won't have time to look at every detail of this PDP. I will summarize the community input and what changed through the public comment, followed by an impact assessment and next steps. And at the end, we'll open the floor for discussions and any questions you might have.

Next slide, please. Let's start with the overview. Next slide, please. So, the issue we're dealing with here is quite specific and narrow, and this is considered somewhat exceptional to the current rules. Under the current rules, there is a high likelihood that an ASCII gTLD and a version of that string containing Latin script diacritics cannot both be delegated because of visual similarity.

At the top, you can see two examples just under the orange line here, which can help illustrate the issue. First, we have .cafe / .café. One is the ASCII version, one has the 'e' with an accent. The second example is

.facade / .façade. And as you see, the first one is again the ASCII version and the second one has a 'c' with a cedilla. All of these are diacritics.

These strings can be closely related visually, but under the current Root Zone Label Generation Rules, the vast majority of these Latin script diacritics are determined not to be variants, and thus they don't fall under the IDN EPDP rules. Current policy therefore lacks a mechanism that would allow these strings to be simultaneously delegated, and this is why this process would be considered exceptional to the current IDN policies.

And this created policy questions at the center of this PDP, namely, to examine under what circumstances should an ASCII gTLD and its Latin diacritic version or versions be permitted to be simultaneously delegated? Because this is an exceptional process, the working group naturally leveraged previous existing IDN policy to determine character eligibility, the requirements that would apply to an LD set, and the measures and safeguards necessary to mitigate any associated risks.

As in our standard process of PDPs, the working group also considered potential impacts on the global public interest, the human rights, and existing consensus policy. These analyses were initiated since this LD PDP. As an outcome, the result: we have 57 outputs, 45 recommendations and 12 implementation guidance, and all of these 57 outputs received full consensus of the whole working group.

One concept that will be important throughout today's briefing is that the working group has recognized and treated this as an exception process, as opposed to the standard process when dealing with IDNs and variants.

Obviously, this understanding has influenced many of the safeguards and constraints contained in the final recommendations.

Next slide, please. This slide shows where we are in the overall policy development process. As Susan already mentioned, the PDP was initiated in November '24, and the working group began its work at the ICANN meeting in Seattle. Following its deliberation, the working group published its initial report in January this year, and after the public comment period, the working group thoroughly reviewed the comments received.

This took several months, and we then incorporated those comments where appropriate and required. Finally, upon full consensus by the working group, the final report was completed and submitted to the GNSO Council, as Susan mentioned, by the end of August. And as you can see and hear, I'm now reporting this to you. Next slide, please. About the final report.

Next slide. This section is about what the working group is actually recommending. As mentioned, we developed 57 outputs, which aim to provide an exception path for the LD sets, Latin diacritic sets. This means making it possible what currently is very unlikely to be possible. And since there are so many recommendations, I would like to emphasize again that it is more useful for today's discussion to understand how they all fit together under each topic, as you can see here, where the outputs are organized across eight policy topics.

The first five topics, which are in the red boxes, relate to the top level: so what constitutes a set, what is its same-entity requirements, how do application and contracting work, and delegation and removal of the TLDs. And the remaining three topics, 6 through 8, are about the second-level rules: domain sets, against same entity on the second level, and LGR harmonization and domain lifecycle management.

The sequence of these topics mirror those from the IDN EPDP Phase 1 and Phase 2, where Phase 1 was about the top level and Phase 2 was about the second level. And while the recommendation under each topic are modified to be applicable for the LD sets, the intent and language was tried to remain consistent with the IDN EPDPs and the rules for variant sets and their management at the top level and second level.

So, we very much tried to be in sync with the IDN EPDP. Basically, the policy follows a simple policy logic: define the set, keep it within the same entity, establish how TLDs enter and operate in the DNS, and establish safeguards throughout the lifecycle. If you remember one principle from the recommendations today, it should be the same-entity principle and that everything is managed conservatively. Again, reminder that all of these 57 outputs received full consensus.

Next slide, please. As key takeaways, I will mention here four key points. First, the majority of the outputs, as I mentioned, mirrored those of the IDN EPDP Phase 1 and Phase 2 outputs. We follow the sequence of the topics, and particularly, technically, EPDP-wise, there will be no difference in handling Latin diacritic sets from IDN variant sets. This makes adoption for contracted parties much easier. Secondly, the working group remains centered on the same-entity principle, as guided through the working group charter, which is a central safeguard both at the top level and at the second level.

Third, as we mentioned multiple times now, this is an exception process. The nature of the PDP is designed from the start to accommodate exceptional circumstances, namely to enable the delegation of strings at the top level that otherwise are highly unlikely to be delegated. This is an addition to the standard process, and therefore, the working group remained grounded in the conservatism principle, and this was also in light of the public comment as a result from ICANN org's comments.

Lastly, through the whole process, the working group maintained close engagement with the liaisons from org and the Board, and especially throughout the public comment review period, we received timely input and incorporated those helpful suggestions where appropriate.

Next slide, please. Now I would like to highlight some priority outputs. As I mentioned, I can't go through all the 57 outputs, but the most important ones we will take a look here. We will start with those related to the top level. First, the working group defined the eligible characters and determined the requirements for the ASCII LD gTLD set. This is in Recommendation 1. The ASCII LD gTLD set defines the eligible characters where the LD string must have the presence of a diacritical mark, and they must be bound by the Unicode table. We'll talk about that later in some more detail. The set also requires an ASCII gTLD as a base, and none of the gTLD strings may overlap with a variant TLD set.

Then there is only one exceptional path. This is covered by Recommendations 5 and 6. So corresponding ASCII and gTLD strings seeking to coexist must proceed together only as one set. It's not possible to apply for them separately or independently. This removes some uncertainty in the process and gives a clearly defined outcome, again, very similar to the TLD variants.

Then we deal with this all conservatively with regards to existing cases. This is in Recommendation 7. So, this makes exception rules for the preexisting standalone gTLDs, while ensuring that existing exceptions have a defined path towards resolution. So, we say that it's not allowed to apply for an ASCII TLD and its diacritic TLD in two separate applications, but of course, such situations could already exist through 2026 round, and for that, we made exception rules on how to resolve these.

We also deal conservatively with the application fees. This is covered by Recommendations 15 to 16, noting again that this is an exception process and permitting the gTLDs to coexist in the first place rather than promoting their existence. Therefore, the application fees remain governed by cost recovery and ICANN org's operational determination. Finally, we preserve the stability if a string leaves the set.

This is covered in Recommendations 37 and 38. Removal of a TLD in general is possible, but this framework we created includes a 10-year cool-off period, some protection against reassignment to another entity, or more precisely, out of the set. Such a policy was necessary because unlike with IDN variants, the same-entity requirement at the top level that we have made, it's not baked into the Root Zone LGR.

There's no clear technical -- it's just part of our PDP, and that's a big difference to the variants. But still, if TLDs used to be run in a set, they should not be run separately afterwards for at least 10 years. This is to avoid user confusion. So, the bottom line here is the top-level rules are designed to make the exception controlled, predictable, and difficult to create confusion.

Next slide, please. For the second level, I would like to highlight also some priority outputs. This is where the working group needed to ensure consistency through the actual domain registrations. First, Recommendation 41 defines the ASCII LD domain set, which is the concept across the relevant TLDs and their valid second-level labels and variants under each TLD.

For the IDN EPDP, we did not need such a definition because the set was already predefined by the LGRs in place, but this is not working for our LD case because the TLDs themselves, they are specifically not variants of each other, so there is no technical relationship via LGRs. In Recommendation 42, then we outline criteria and requirements applicable to the second-level LGRs for the gTLD registry operators that manage such an ASCII LD gTLD set. It asks ICANN org to create a conservative second-level LGR baseline that will serve as a template or minimum requirement, including the treatment of diacriticized versions of the ASCII letters from the list of eligible characters as blocked variants. We'll revisit this later when we look at the public comment.

Recommendation 43 applies the same-entity principle at the second level: allocatable names within the domain set must stay with the same registrant and using the same sponsoring registrar, again, similar to the IDN variants. Recommendation 45 outlines the exception rules for the existing domain names, similar to the top level.

There may be existing cases that do not adhere to our policies. This will protect any registrations that existed before the PDP came into action. The policy is not retroactive where existing domain names do not conform. Those cases are exempted and protected.

And Recommendation 53 finally emphasizes outreach that must be conducted by ICANN org because stakeholders, including registries, registrars, registrants, dispute resolution providers, they all will need to understand how these new sets operate, and potentially also how this impacts potential dispute resolution proceedings. The bottom line here is at the second level, the objective is consistency for users without creating confusion and disrupting legitimate existing registrations.

Next slide, please. And we will take a look at the community input.

Next slide, please. It's important to note the public comment process here, because the final outcome looks somewhat different from the initial report following the public comment, as it materially improved the framework. In short, the initial report, which contained 54 preliminary outputs, was open for 40 days for public comments, and we received input from 16 commenters, including substantive comments affecting 29 of the 54 outputs.

The key concern that drove much of the subsequent work were here, as you can see on the bottom line. Character eligibility concern was that the initial scope was too restrictive, focusing on decomposability and leaving out some important diacritics. Conservatism was an important point, particularly ICANN org's request to strengthen the exception framework second-level consistency to ensure that the top-level and the second-level rules and principles align.

And then finally, a fee policy, distinguishing policy development from ICANN org's operational and financial discretion. The working group also received positive feedback on conducting the GPI and human rights analysis. The public comment did not change the fundamental policy objectives, but it strengthened and refined the policy rules.

Next slide, please. We'll take a look what exactly changed since the public comment. It's important to note four material outcomes since the working group reviewed the public comments received. As mentioned before, the scope of eligible characters was broadened beyond the initial scope where it was centered on the decomposability in Unicode.

Although there continues to be a limit, the scope has extended to include all characters which are labeled Latin small letter X with Y in their Unicode definition. This is defined in Recommendation 1. And through Recommendation 41, the same-entity rules have been extended to cover diacritic second-level labels. Without these changes, characters that are clearly considered diacritics, for example, the O with a slash, had been excluded, and with the new rules, such characters are now also included. We strengthened the exception process.

The new Recommendation 6 establishes the LD PDP as the only path to apply for ASCII and their corresponding LD TLDs together. They cannot proceed separately because the outcome would be unclear. It depends on the string similarity evaluation panel whether they decide those TLDs to be confusingly similar or not, and such an uncertainty is never good in such a process. Then we added some safeguards. Exemption rules were added through Recommendations 6 and 7. Application scenarios were laid out through IG 9, and second-level LGR baseline was added through Recommendation 42.

Finally, we clarified and removed recommendations and policy on fees. Application fees remain based on the cost recovery principle, while the initially proposed registry-level fee recommendations were removed completely. This was because the working group recognized those matters belong to ICANN org's operational and financial discretion and not to our technical exception process. This is why the package now has moved from 54 preliminary outputs to 57 final outputs.

Next slide, please. Next slide, please. As you are all aware, the broader policy impact assessment is now a standard process of the PDPs, and these analysis began with this working group. The working group considered the potential impacts on the global public interest, the human rights, and existing consensus policies. For GPI, the overall assessment is generally positive. Our policy enables a more diverse and multilingual internet while maintaining security and stability safeguards.

For human rights, this was also assessed as a positive rather than negative policy. The working group did identify implementation risks around cost, complexity, awareness, and underserved communities, but the current recommendations try to address all those concerns, and the impact analysis has also addressed those areas that needed improvement, which has now landed us in a good place, I think. And then the existing consensus policy, there we determined that the overall impact is low, while most policy have minimal to no impact.

The UDRP and the transfer policy were identified as areas that may have potentially low impact, but the current recommendations align with the existing policy rather than having any conflict or changing its substantive standards. We found that the major reason for this overall low impact is that the framework largely builds on established IDN policy and adds safeguards rather than creating an entirely new policy architecture.

Next slide, please. So where are we now? As you know, we are at the Council review stage. The anticipated next step is Council consideration of the final report in October, as Susan mentioned. If the report is approved by Council, the recommendations would proceed to the Board in the form of a recommendations report, followed by a Board-initiated public comment, which is anticipated for November this year. In summary, I would like to end with the fact that overall, the working group seems to have landed in a good place.

We achieved full consensus on all the 57 outputs. This PDP addressed one narrow policy gap, and the working group developed a conservative exception framework building largely on the existing IDN policy, which was strengthened substantially through the public comment.

Thanks for listening. Before we start with the Q&A, I would also like to thank first and foremost my ICANN staff support team. They took much of work from my plate, all this boring and tedious stuff, creating this presentation here, so that I could really concentrate on the fun parts of this PDP. This was also the first time that I took a leading position with an ICANN, and while I felt confident about the topic, I was not so sure about the leadership part, but with the help of Sarmad, John, and Steve, and of course my vice chair, Mark, it all worked out well.

Then of course, a big thanks to the whole working group. We had some very involved and controversial discussions, but it always remained constructive. Everybody respected each other, the tone was always polite. For me as a chair, always the carrot was sufficient and never had to use a stick.

And final thanks both to the Board and Council liaisons: Prudence, Christian, Amitabh, and the late Alan. You all helped the PDP in having a direct connection to your respective group. Overall, it was a new, but fun and very satisfying experience for me. So, thanks to the GNSO Council for trusting me with this job. And with that, I can open the Q&A. Should I manage the queue, Susan, or do you want to do that?

SUSAN PAYNE: Why don't I manage the queue for you, Michael. Thank you very much. Just before we start on that, I also want to just add my thanks to you, tremendous achievement and really appreciated. And it's lovely to hear you talking about the fun side of the PDP, so it seems this was a positive experience all around.

And you sort of stole my thunder a little bit. I wanted to thank both Christian Dawson, who was the most recent Council liaison and sort of stepped in about halfway through and helped sort of shepherd this through to the end, and also Prudence Malinki as well, who was formerly the liaison to this group from the beginning and was a tremendous support, as I understand it, to that working group.

So now I think we have an opportunity for questions. There have been a few questions in the chat. I think it's likely, especially when he was presenting, that Michael won't have had any opportunity to keep an eye on the chat. So, if you do have questions, now's your opportunity to put them to Michael.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Susan. Yeah, wasn't able to follow the chat at all, so...

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. All right, we have Farzaneh's hand up and then Volker. So, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you. Thank you, Michael, for this, and I'm sorry for raising my hand. I thought I mostly will be listening, but I got totally confused with how the group decided that after the initial public comment to apply the conservative framework.

And also, this is a little bit and this is because purely I haven't looked into it closely, but also applying this conservative framework, and then to the second level at the request of the org, so the working group decided to consider a few policy tweaks or modify or add policy recommendations about that, if you can clarify that. And then another thing is that when you decided to add this conservative framework, was this before doing the human rights impact assessment or was it after?

Did the working group do a human rights impact assessment after this was applied, especially because we're talking about second-level domains? And we've had many conversations about second-level domains, when they get reserved, access to these reserved blocks are hampered, and so there are questions about a second-level domain. But if you can clarify, I'm not questioning the whole thing, I'm just asking for clarification and correction. Thank you.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Farzaneh. Yeah, good question. So, the conservatism principle was always in the back of our minds, but it wasn't until the public comment that we actually went through all recommendations to check whether they are okay with that. The problem is this is an exception process.

This is not something where we want to encourage people to do something new, but this is just a situation which technically theoretically would already be possible now, but it's very unlikely due to string similarity rules. And we wanted to make this possible, because at the moment it's highly unlikely to be possible.

But at the same time, we need to take care that the rules we put in place, that they don't cause any issues, they don't cause user confusion, they don't cause technical problems, stability of the root zone. All of this had to be considered, and so for the policies, we looked at what do we need to have, but not more.

What's the minimum requirement to make this possible without causing any potential issues? About ICANN org, that was their request to generally check that this conservatism is sufficient. There's no exact definition of how conservative something has to be, and there were some recommendations where we said, "No, no, we can't make this more conservative because it would leave out cases that are important for the public."

So, we even extended some policies, the definition of the diacritics, what is considered to be a diacritic. After the public comment, we said that we need to enlarge this, because otherwise we would exclude certain languages or certain people. But on other cases, with the fees, we said, "Okay, it's not our job to define anything about the operational fees. This is not part of this PDP. We are making the rules to make it possible to run the TLDs, but not how much they should cost. That's up to ICANN org." So that's basically what we've been doing. Does this answer your question?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Okay, Volker, I have you and then that's probably all we're going to have time for.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, so I have two questions. One is a very short one. You said that to dissolve a contention set, then it would be basically a 10-year cool-off period. What made you land on that time period? Why 10, not 5 or 20? So just curious what the reasoning behind that specific number was. And the second was is that you said that the policies are closely modeled on the IDN policies, but there were some modifications as well resulting from the public comment.

Are there any divergences now that even minor? And is there anything that you learned during the discussions here that might influence future policy work on IDNs that maybe turned up in information that wasn't available back then or that would make the IDN policy even better?

MICHAEL BAULAND: Thanks, Volker. Yeah, you said dissolving the contention set. You probably meant the LD ASCII TLD set, because contention set is exactly what happens when two TLDs outside of our policy would come into contention in the application process. So yeah, the 10 years, we discussed about that. What we took as an example here is the ccPDP4 in the ccTLD world.

They also have these policies where they say that when an IDN TLD is removed from the root zone, discontinued or retired, as they call it, they have this 10-year period. And we said that this is a nice precedent. Our case is similar in that sense, so we also kept with the 10 years here. Also, this is a bit more conservative than putting this at one or two or five years.

After 10 years, when no TLDs have been run as a set, it's unlikely that people still remember that they used to be a set and could be confused with this. About the second question about the IDN EPDP, we tried to be in line with the IDN EPDP as much as possible, because this will make it easier for people to understand our policies. They can just see, "Oh, it's working the same way as the IDN EPDP." But there were some things where we just couldn't copy that, because at the top level, we don't have variants.

Our TLDs, the ASCII and the Latin diacritic TLDs, are especially not variants of each other, whereas at the IDN EPDP, we have variant relationships both at the top level and the second level. So, for that, we needed to adjust our policies to still have the same same-entity requirements and to still have a similar behavior.

But really, if you look from a technical point of view, you will see that basically the same EPP extension that will be possible to support IDN EPDP will exactly work the same way for our LD PDP. So once the TLDs are delegated to the root zone, the average person won't see any difference in behavior between a variant TLD set and our LD ASCII TLD set. They will behave exactly the same. The adjustments were just really necessary to cover some things that were different, but still needed to be dealt with similarly. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Michael. I'm afraid we've sort of run to the end of the allotted time for this, and I'm not seeing any more hands, so that's also positive. I think just want to say again, thanks to you and to your vice chair and to all of the PDP working group. And for councilors, we have the final report.

Take some time to review it. Talk to the members of your SG or C who were participating in this group. If you have other questions, that's another an avenue for you if you have things you want to seek clarification on. The team would be happy to help if there are any concerns. But take some time, discuss it in your own groups, and we will look to vote on this in October. So, yes, thank you again, Michael, and thanks for the great work.

All right, we have to move on, I'm afraid, to the next agenda item. We don't really have time to spend more on Latin diacritics today, unfortunately. So, our next agenda item is item six, which is our Council discussion on the prioritization exercise. And I think we have a bit of a slide deck on this.

So, while that's there we go, while that's loading, just a reminder that the discussion today is to try to bring together the work that we've been doing over the last several months. And we discussed in Seville how we would try to handle this process. Overall, a conversation on how should we prioritize our workload has been a conversation we've been having for a significant number of months.

So, we all know how we've got to here and what we're doing. A reminder again that we went through this kind of scoring exercise, which all of the groups have now done, and that this is our opportunity to look at the outcomes from that, but just as a reminder again, the intent from this is to give us a more sort of structured base for discussing what work should happen next, and not to not to just assume that the scoring is determinative.

So, if we go to the next slide, I think it's just giving a quick overview of our discussion. So, we'll have a bit of a Farzaneh's mentioning the pilot element of it, absolutely. We'll have a bit of a kind of introduction, won't spend too long on that, and then staff will take us through an overview of the spreadsheet with the results. And we'll then quickly talk next steps, but most importantly, really, we then have 25 minutes or so to move into a discussion on this.

So, without wanting to spend too much time on this first introduction part then, if we move to the next slide, oh, and again, just a reminder that the idea of this is to help support an informed conversation on what we prioritize. It's not to use the numbers alone. The figures aren't replacing Council's discussion and decision.

Obviously, if we have particular projects where it seems there's a strong degree across the board of sort of alignment, that does tend to suggest that when we come to discuss it that folks will see those as ones that maybe warrant taking forward earlier, but that's part of our discussion process.

And if we go to the next slide, yeah, just again a reminder that this was a test run or a pilot. It's not a perfect methodology undoubtedly. It was we'll take some learnings from this. We'll have a discussion on whether we think it was worthwhile and whether we think it has been helpful to do this.

But the idea was for us to look at our overall sort of workload or the items that are on our list and anticipated to be worked on, and to make a bit more of a structured assessment in our groups on these five factors of importance, community demand, complexity, level of resources required, and deliverability of a likelihood of delivering a decent outcome.

And so, it's to help shape our discussion, not to make the decision for us. And if we go on to the next slide, how to read the numbers. Definitely, as I mentioned in my email earlier this week, there is an assumption that we have all reviewed the submissions, both the kind of individual submissions and that master matrix that was shared last week.

The slides are to try to help us see if there are high-level signals or and also areas where there might be more divergence and perhaps a more fruitful for a discussion, and to try to understand why differences appear in some folks' assessments on the numbers. And really, it's again just to give us this starting point for that conversation.

The numbers are an important indicator, but it's more about how we can then use them to try to understand better where our alignments and differences are on what's a priority. I think I should also mention you'll have seen, and you'll see as staff take us through, that the NCSG did allocate zero figures or zero scores to complexity, resources, and deliverability.

I think I'm right in saying they did this across the board. This does have some impact on the overall and weighted scores, but because I think that approach was adopted for all, it essentially, I think, has the sort of something of the same impact on all of them. I'm not a statistician, and I know if Tapani were here he would immediately correct me on that, but I think you understand what I'm saying.

I think essentially from what we have, we see that the NCSG have prioritized based on importance and community demand only, effectively. I'm sure when we come to discussion there'll be an opportunity to better understand that thinking. And at this point, I think

I'm more than five minutes, and so I'm going to hand over to I think it's Feo who's going to take us through the slides on the preliminary results.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Susan. Yes, this is Feodora from ICANN org, and on the next slide, you will see just a little bit context on the master metrics and the aggregated results. So, the scoring should be read as one part of a broader base, not a standalone answer. As Susan said, this was a test run, and some differences in how criteria were interpreted are useful lessons for improving the guidance and examples in the future.

So, to understand, five or high-scoring means actually favorable to those specific criteria, so important topic, high demand, manageable complexity, resources, and likely timely delivery. However, as noted, a group submitted data outside the score of 1 to 5, which does impact the results, and another group may have misinterpreted what a high score means for complexity and resources, because comments indicate that it's highly complex, but the numbers do not point to that.

So, that was something we saw, but that does not necessarily undermine the value of the exercise. It just shows that it's important to look at the patterns and directions rather than at the numbers alone. In the following, you will see we have created a weighted overview and a no-weighting overview of the aggregated results. Weighted results apply a Council house model and exclude ALAC and the non-voting NomCom appointee in the numbers, but not obviously throughout the whole thing, but yeah, as requested by the Council.

That is why we move to the next slide that shows, as you can see here in a table form, when we look at the aggregated data with all the submissions received, there seems to be a clear upper tier in the unweighted data, which is DNS abuse and the transfer resolution, TDRP. Both of them represent different kinds of signals, though. DNS abuse is stronger on importance and demands, and TDRP seems to be more balanced across importance and readiness.

The middle group should not be read as less important, but the comments in the submissions show or indicate that RPMs should be discussed further on scope and resources concerns. Expiration policies show some disagreement on whether work is actually needed now, and in the new gTLD topic, there were comments and numbers regarding timing and readiness concerns.

So, what we see here, and as noted previously, we see here the results from high to low, but this is not intended to present a ranked list that the Council needs to follow. The Council made it very clear that a ranking methodology is not wanted. So just look at the numbers that we provided and we try to look at the pattern and the signals that it sends us.

The following slide shows the weighted results. What does this difference make? So, in the weighted view, the numbers change slightly, particularly between TDRP and DNS abuse, moving TDRP up and DNS abuse slightly below. TDRP continues to show a relatively strong combination of priority and readiness compared to the others based on the submissions. DNS abuse still remains very strong in terms of importance.

RPMs and expiration continue to present the same questions that would need further Council discussion, and new gTLD work remains also now a bit higher, but still amongst something that needs further Council discussion.

On the next slide, we noted that zeros do affect the results, so here is just an overview how it impacted it in numbers. But in general, the answers or the signals stay the same, as Susan noted. Some numbers might move up a bit or go down a bit, but in essence, the signals or the patterns that the groups wanted to show to Council remain so far the same. However, for the purpose of this exercise, zeros were not the most helpful, but hopefully during the discussion the Council can better understand what those mean.

On the next slide, you can see the areas of emerging alignment and areas requiring potential further discussion. So there seems to have been already some common ground and some discussion potential. Alignment based on the comments does not always mean start work now. Sometimes the shared view is that an issue matters, but the timing or next steps are not right yet.

So, as you can see, areas of alignment is DNS abuse in terms of importance and demand. However, there is no agreement on what the methodology or what work should be done there already, noting that there is work in this area happening already. TDRP in the area of alignment, as also seen in the tables before, seems to be quite receiving balanced numbers across the board, and the range is also quite narrow, meaning many groups have scored similarly on TDRP.

And new gTLDs seems to also across the board have, let's say, weaker signals in terms of doing work now, but rather monitoring it for the future. In terms of areas requiring further discussion, RPMs has received much more wider range in terms of scoring, which shows some divergence in what groups perceive this topic to mean, or if work is needed now or how important it is. The BC scores, for instance, 25, while other groups scored it around 9, so that shows some different views. I think that is definitely something that would benefit from further input.

On the next slide, you can just see, and final before I hand over to Susan, what we also saw in the submissions and in the comments and pointed also towards the numbers, is that priority does not necessarily mean launching a PDP. Several submissions distinguish the priority of the issue from the right timing, scope, or mechanism. Especially a good example is DNS abuse, where some groups call for further prioritization on the remaining issues from the issue report, and others suggest completing current work before deciding what comes next on this topic. For expiration policies, the comments point to testing the problem first.

Some groups see no immediate need for policy work, while others suggest looking at whether implementation or operational improvements could address the issues before considering a PDP on this one. And in RPMs, similar, the message is more about preparation than questioning the importance.

Some suggest that a narrow scope supported by the WIPO ICA report could help in prepping this work, while other comments from groups highlighted the scale and resources needed and commitment needed for this. Hope this gave you some insight on what we received and some pointers for discussion, and now I hand over to Susan to discuss the next steps.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Feo. Okay, very briefly run through some proposed next steps, and then we can open the floor for input from folks. So, I think the idea here is to not asking Council to kind of settle every decision on each project today, but more to have a discussion and hopefully get some sense of direction from that discussion that leadership and staff can then take away and come up with something a bit more concrete for the follow-up discussion.

We have there are useful questions of not just is something a priority, but what's the next step and is it right for us to take it at this point, or is it something that we need to perhaps monitor or do more work on first? But so today, as I said, we'll discuss it. We'll bring something back to the October meeting, and I think we're looking probably to be spending some of our time on our working session in Bali continuing this conversation.

If we go to the next slide, a sort of proposal for moving us away from the kind of 1 to 5 scoring part onto sort of next steps. Really there are kind of three possible categories: items that we believe collectively are sort of ready to initiate or advance in the near term; the second is those that we prepare, so maybe there's important further work on scoping or resource planning that could start to be done before something gets to the proceed point; and then the third level is something which maybe needs to be monitored for now and can be revisited in perhaps a future planning cycle if it doesn't rise to one of the other levels during the course of the next planning cycle in 2027.

Okay, and again, I think the idea is that not everything is necessarily ready to go right now, and some of the feedback from groups was making that point. If we go to the next slide, in terms of learnings, we're still in the middle of this exercise, we haven't finished it yet, but I hope others agree. I found it when I was looking at the matrix that I think this exercise hopefully has been useful.

I felt that it caused within my group certainly a bit more of a sort of nuanced conversation where we were considering not just do we want to do this or do we think this is a sort of important for us, but also to think about some of those other issues, what level of resources this is going to take, do we think there'll be a, what prospects does this have of getting a decent outcome, and those kind of conversations that I think we found quite useful.

And it's been interesting as well to see some of the alignments on the numbers, again not taking the numbers as determinative, but where areas where it has been, it was quite interesting to see that there are some topics where actually there's a really, quite a strong feeling from most folks of very similar sort of scoring allocations given and that kind of thing.

So again, this is just the numbers. They I think they were helpful, but the exercise as a whole is not just doing that scoring part, but the conversation and the seeking to understand how others were scoring things, and sort of seeking to work out what we things are what we do think as a group are ripe to take forward and when.

I will go on to the next slide. I think. Oh, okay, yep. All right, and then I think there might be one more after this, but that may be a wrap-up one. Yes. Okay, this is, I think, to help that conversation, some of the things to think about, why did groups score the way they did?

As Feo mentioned, there may have been a couple of cases where the kind of comment doesn't necessarily align with the scoring, and so that might indicate a kind of misunderstanding of the 1 to 5 part for some of those items, particularly the resources and that kind of thing, that we maybe will be able to explore a little bit. Anything in there that is a surprise?

What's the explanation for some of the areas of divergence, and as we talk this through, does that change anyone's thinking? And then we can, hopefully after this, the leadership team and staff will try to, as I said, pull something together for a more concrete suggestion of what we take forward next, and again for further discussion. I am conscious of the time, and so I do want to give some time for folks to share their thoughts.

So that's what we can do now. And obviously, if you want a particular slide pulled back up, or one of the particular pages on the master on the on the either the weighted or the other overview of the results, just ask and staff can put something back on the screen if that's helpful. But I think at this point I will stop talking and I will see if we have any hands. Oh, lovely. Thanks, Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Thank you very much, Susan. And first off, I think this exercise was fantastic, and the fact that we got through it so quickly was great. We talked about this in Seville in June, and we've made this much progress by September, so that's great. I think from the IPC level, we're really in alignment with kind of the weighted results for the most part. I think the things we would really like to prioritize would be DNS abuse.

There's a demand for that. Let's also face it, we also are very experienced with DNS abuse, so I think we can continue those discussions and those PDPs along those lines, and the GAC is really asking for it. And so, I think there's also a really good chance of having a very solid result from there, so it does fit our criteria. The other one would be priorities for the IPC would be transfers, and then also for expiration policies.

We actually ranked expirations above transfers. However, seeing the weighted results, probably makes sense, I guess, from our perspective to really rank transfer policies as high up there as well, as a high priority for us. Again, that's fairly focused. We can get a good result on that, and that is something that does affect a lot of people.

So, I guess there was one slide on here where you said, I think it was ranked 1, 2, or 3. I think from the IPC's perspective, we would put DNS abuse and transfers in the one category. And again, this is a very efficient way of doing things and really support it. So, thank you very much.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Damon. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Again, thank you. I remember discussing this in the strategy meeting in January, and we've reached here, we have the results in front of us, so great. And I think this exercise helps, because when we go in front of GAC or we go in front of community and they say, "How do you decide what you're going to do next?" we have solid data to show to them that this is the way in which GNSO Council works and this is how we decide on priority.

It's very transparent and open for everybody to put their information in and their feedback in. We absolutely are on DNS abuse. We believe it's absolutely critical, and we are already working on it. The one topic where we have seen such divergence is in the RPM Phase 2. The reason we ranked it so high is because UDRP has not been reviewed since it was started.

It has been very, very, very long, and it has been deferred time and time again by the Council to say, "We will look at it later, we will look at it later." A lot of good work has already been done, which can be utilized now to make it even better and see based on what has happened in the last few years to see how we can improve it.

UDRP also in a way helps businesses and brand owners and others protect, so it's kind of an abuse mitigation exercise as well, and that's why BC believed that we should rank it higher and it should be something that should be prioritized and taken up. While we were putting in scores for different categories and different areas where we had to score, we believed that we can only prioritize and give numbers based on the requirements and the importance for BC.

We cannot judge for the whole community. That is why if you see our scores are similar across different weight categories, because it's very hard to decide what the community want, because we can very well judge what the BC wants, and what the community wants will come out based on the aggregate scoring that's happening here.

So that's my input. And thank you again, Feodora, for the wonderful presentation and making sense of numbers, that's always a challenge. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Sorry, just struggling to get off mute there. Thanks. Thanks very much, Vivek. And I like your comment on the scores from all of us help to give insight into what the whole community is thinking, and that's a good point to bear in mind. And obviously that is what, something that gets reflected by the different scoring that different groups have assigned. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, Farzaneh Badii speaking. Thank you. So, none of our feedback was considered during this exercise. What we asked for: so first of all, we did not want to submit scoring, because we did not have enough information on the complexity, on the financial things. So, we said that, okay, so this is an exercise, we can give you feedback, but we were told that we have to assign scores.

So, we assigned a score of a zero to the things that we didn't know and it was not clear to us what the situation was and background information was sparse. Another thing that we asked for, and we wanted to also discuss with the Council the inclusion of a remedy for the domain name registrant when they get their domain taken down and suspended or any other thing, and we wanted to add the topic of transparency.

But the process did not allow us in any way, and it did not appear on any of these slides, these two topics that we wanted to discuss and understand where the Council was at. And another thing is that we continuously say that, oh, this is just ranking, it's just one data point, but from what I see, from this whole presentation, I do not see any other thing that has been considered.

It was just the scoring that was considered, and of course, DNS abuse got prioritized. And the last point that I want to make, the arbitrariness of the scoring became apparent when the CSG decided to score based on constituency, and we always do comments and provide feedback as NCSG, we do not do constituency-based scoring.

So, I would like to understand was NCSG considered as one group and CSG was considered as three groups? Because that would skew the numbers and would give CSG more weight in scoring. So, I would like to understand that as well. We raised that issue as well. And yeah, that's about it. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you, Farzaneh. There is a queue, but I will just respond to a couple of those points quickly. First off, the scoring is absolutely a data point. Why you've had a presentation on the scoring is because that's the stage in the process that we've just completed. But this is the conversation about that.

This is the opportunity, and we will move on and there'll be further discussion probably. I think it's highly likely that this is not the end of the discussion. It's not just the scores. The presentation is presenting the scores as they currently exist, but this is the point for us to determine whether actually there are other things to consider, whether the scores are reflective and are helping us to prioritize which ones we take forward and when.

But this is all part of that exercise. Because we're showing you what the scoring says at the moment, that doesn't say, "Oh, we're doing this, oh, we're doing that, we're not doing the other." So just to be clear, this is all part of the exercise. We haven't finished the exercise. But the second point on the CSG, as you know, the CSG is three constituencies.

You're very well aware of that. And so those three constituencies have very different perspectives. They are lumped together in the GNSO structure, but do not align on every topic. And I think the scores that they've given actually reflect that. But that is why we not only have those overview figures, that is why staff did the weighting to take into account that fact that there are three different groups in the CSG, the NCSG tends to put in its results in one block. Registries and Registrars likewise. So, the weighting is exactly for that reason. And so, I hope you understand that. Thanks. Anyway, rest of queue. Bruna.

BRUNA DOS SANTOS: Thank you, Susan, and hi, everyone. Perhaps more of a format question, a format comment and a question. I think the way the exercise is structured doesn't really allow us to give more substance to the scores that are given to each of the topics. And as Farzi highlighted, I think it's a missed opportunity that we don't necessarily get to add more stuff besides the ones that were being requested to score.

And then a question for Council and to you, Susan. I think as much as we have really tried to make this exercise within this year and so on, the results is coming at a rather later stage. So perhaps, and I'm really just concerned that if we move towards using this or the later discussion plus the scores as a suggestion of prioritization for Council, given that we're about to have a change in the cohort and a change in leadership, it would only be seen as a kind of recommendation from the previous cohort.

So perhaps my suggestion here would be that if Council agrees, we can offer this as a tool instead of offering the results to the prioritization, because I still think that there's way too many questions around, and also the change in the cohort makes it a bit difficult for them to have enough background or even for them to just purely adopt the prioritization kind of results once we're preempting them from having the chance of doing their own prioritization exercise. I'm not sure if I'm being clear, but just kind of a concern in terms of the format and the time point, I would say. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Bruna. I understand what you're saying. Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi. Thank you, Susan. Ashley Heineman here, Registrar Stakeholder Group. And just wanted to give this a little bit, and I'll be very brief, with respect to the experience. So, I'm not going to comment so much on substance and what we should be prioritizing, but overall, Registrars found it to be a useful exercise. It gave us a tool, I think, to be able to engage with our members who are not heavily engaged in Council.

But I will also say probably one of the biggest challenges was explaining the process to other registrars so that they could understand how to proceed, particularly with the scoring. And I'm still not convinced we were all on the same page. I think the numbers worked out the right way, but it wasn't very intuitive, and I think there was recognition of that before we even started.

But also, in terms of the resource readiness in particular, generally felt it was not very well defined and, again, one of those areas where it wasn't clear that we were all kind of working under the same understanding of what resources were necessary. So, I don't know if this is something that perhaps we could get a recommendation from staff as to what the expected resource expectations would be associated with each of these.

So anyway, just wanted to provide some feedback there. I would be hesitant to use this as gospel. Probably not the best analogy, but that's how we say it in the US. Only because I'm not convinced that we all did it correctly. I'm not convinced that the Registrars did it correctly, so just putting that out there. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Sorry, I didn't get off mute there. Thank you for that, and I appreciate the feedback. Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks. Jennifer Chung, Registries. For the record, just checking that my audio's still okay?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, we can hear you fine.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay, perfect. When the Registries went through this exercise, we were lucky enough with the timeline that we actually had four calls to go through, because we really do have weekly calls with all of our membership, but it was really interesting because, again, I think I'm echoing a little bit what Ashley said, so I will be as brief as possible, a lot of the Registries are not following Council work very closely.

But actually, we also found that, of course, when we started talking about certain subjects, we also got a varied response from the Registries, and we had to talk out certain things depending on the actual topic, and I'm not going to go into detail there either. I think we can have a fuller discussion when we go to our working sessions in Bali, but it was really useful to actually understand and give us a heat map about what our entire stakeholder group were thinking about.

When we actually got to certain categories, and again, I think it was actually useful that I was part of creating a lot of this prioritization exercise framework, we were trying to explain the scoring to the stakeholder group, and it took a little while to actually get that through as well. And within the councilors in the Registries, we also had some discussion ourselves about looking at certain categories, especially with resources, when we were thinking, okay, we can assign a value here, however, we probably do need some more information from staff.

And we also relied on the projects list. I think there was a really good background information there. I don't know if everybody was able to refer back as they were looking at it, when there was some information that was already provided by staff on certain aspects in this process.

And then finally, I think when we finished, for the Registries, the councilors also kind of took a lead in kind of giving a draft format to test and be a bit provocative when we were asking the full SG about what do you think about this if it's ranked here, and then we actually had to adjust the scoring afterwards.

And I think that was a good starting point for us to get some conversation around certain topics. Of course, certain topics enjoyed more discussion than others. And then finally, I'll end with, I know I think certain councilors have raised about DNS abuse being already prioritized, but remember we only prioritized three items in the final issue report, and we have a list of gaps that we still need to address and work on. Thank you very much.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Jen. I'm really conscious of time. We do have some AOB items we do need to cover as well, so I'm going to close the queue here and I'm going to ask you all to be super quick, please. Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Thank you so much, Susan. I just wanted to address: the IPC did rank the UDRP lower, and Vivek obviously had a difference of opinions with the BC. From our perspective, and I can just tell you as a person that handles and has filed hundreds of UDRP complaints, it works extremely well. The recovery rates on those are practically near 100%, so it works really well for complainants.

And with respect to registrants, I've filed hundreds of these, I've recovered thousands of domain names, I can count on one hand the number of times when I've gotten any response at all from a registrant, whether it be a formal response or even an email back. So, this is a system that's working well. It probably would be very complicated to mess with it, and don't fix what's not broke. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Damon. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE O-ROBERTS: Thank you, Susan. More or less, in order not to speak to issues have already been addressed, one thing that we took away from this process is the fact that this got our members engaged and excited that they were contributing directly to the Council's working process. And so, if there wasn't any value from this mechanism, the fact that we could have our stakeholder groups get excited or get behind a process where they're making contributions to what work Council actually does is a plus.

And I think we should seek to enhance this process. For us also, one other feedback that I want to leave, knowing that we had far more issues on the burner of the Council, we saw these five topics as topics that probably could get resources and whatever was needed to mitigate them quickly done.

When I know that there are a number of other topics that are not listed that the Council has been discussing over the last two years, and so for us this was also one way of saying these were burning topics that we needed to rank, more or less.

It might help to have a mechanism, probably before we start voting, where if a councilor is interested in adding one or more topics that is not on the list, they can have an ability to do so that would still go through this process of each constituency or member of the GNSO ranking and trying to put on top of the list that which is very important to them.

We in the BC have no objection to that, but this was a very valuable process, and I think that we should look to improve it in any way we can for the best use of the Council. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Lawrence. Okay, I have almost no time. We're over time on this. Volker, if you and your subsequent speakers could be super quick, please. Sorry.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah, just two concerns. One, this has the potential of becoming a popularity contest. I think it was a good exercise, but there's some warning lights as well that appeared when we went through that. Most particularly, we were not always sure what we were voting on.

If you have a broad topic like DNS abuse, this could be everything and nothing. If we want to prioritize anything, then we have to have a concrete subject matter that we are voting on, not a very blurry envelope term that basically could mean any possible kind of work. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Volker. Benjamin.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yeah, thank you, Susan. Just like many have said, the exercise helped to some level of engagement. However, I'd like to ask, was there any reason why some of the views that NCSG shared were not considered, owing to the fact that we're experimenting at this stage, and also the outcome we gave was out of the conversation in our stakeholder group? Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Benjamin. I don't think that we've excluded anyone's views. The spreadsheet captures the feedback that people put in. And again, just to reiterate, the scoring was only part of the process and then there is the discussion element, which is what we're seeking to do.

Farzi, you've been raising concerns about the weighting point, and I'll try to reach out to you separately and see if we can reach an understanding, because I'm not really understanding your concern and I think it's been addressed by the weighting, and so maybe if we can take that offline, we can see if we can understand where we're not understanding each other.

Apologies for this. We will reflect on the feedback we've had and perhaps come up with some suggested next steps. And again, this is not the end of the discussion, it's an ongoing exercise. So, I'm sorry to say we have to canter on, and I have done a terrible job on managing the timing for this meeting.

So, we have some AOB items. I'm looking at them and thinking about what we can speed up on. I think Review of Reviews item is the first one. I'm just going to quickly flag it. It was posted to the mailing list. It's also been shared with all of your individual groups at the leadership level.

So, I think you're all aware that the Review of Reviews are seeking input on what the number of representatives should be from each group. So, from our perspective, should there be two from the GNSO or three from the GNSO? I'm aware that a number of you have been talking about that. Can I ask people to please share those thoughts on the mailing list today?

Sophie and Osvaldo have until tomorrow to give that feedback in from the GNSO. Obviously, if everyone is very aligned on one of those, then that will make their job easy. If there's not alignment, then it will be more difficult and they will have to reflect that lack of alignment back as well.

Next AOB item, and I'm sorry to rush through this, the review of the GNSO liaison to the GAC role. As you know, we talked about this at our last meeting. Sebastien's current term comes to an end at the AGM, so at

ICANN87. He is eligible to be reappointed and has expressed a willingness and desire to do so, should we want him to.

We asked for feedback from the GAC, and you will have seen that shared quite late yesterday my time, where we heard back from the GAC with positive comments, fairly brief, but expressing again their support for the role and their support for Sebastien should he be reappointed, and willingness and happiness to work with him.

So, I think we have not heard from any councilors either on the mailing list or when we've been discussing this previously any concerns about reappointment of Sebastien, and I think indeed there's been a lot of positive feedback. So, I think the intent would be for us to reappoint Sebastien in Bali unless there are strong views to the contrary which are expressed in short order really.

And obviously with great thanks to Sebastien for his work on this. And so again, any concerns, please, I think we have to take this to the mailing list now, but we have had some opportunities up to date for people to give that feedback. I'm getting a bit of feedback in the chat as well, which is helpful, and I'll take some time to look at that subsequently.

And then our final AOB item was flagging the Accuracy Small Team educational materials. We don't have time to go through them here. And there is quite a history to that, but I think you'll recall that there was a recommendation from the Accuracy Small Team to have some particular materials, and the Registrar Stakeholder Group had volunteered to take that on as something that they were interested in doing anyway.

So, Hong-Fu shared on the 18th of August on our mailing list some draft materials, and I think all I have time here to do now is to just ask people to take the time to look at them and share your feedback. So please do that, and we'll discuss them on a future meeting.

Okay, I haven't been able to keep an eye on any of the chat while I've been just quickly sort of really cantering through those. I've got one hand. We're over time, but Anne, very, very quickly.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Very quickly on Review of Reviews, I do believe there was some discussion in that process that GNSO might be likely to choose those reps via the Standing Selection Committee process, and the question was posed in the chat about that. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. I think would be up to the GNSO to decide how we did it, but it would be a reasonable possibility that that would be the path, yes. Okay, I'm very sorry, everyone, for running over by a couple of minutes and for having to rush through the AOB items, but thanks very much, everyone, especially for joining this at what is for some quite a challenging time of day.

So good discussion. Keep an eye out on the list for further thoughts on how we take the prioritization discussion forward. Thanks very much, everyone, and we can stop the call now.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone, for joining. As you heard, the meeting has been adjourned. I'll disconnect the recording and all remaining lines. Take care. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]