

---

ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting - GNSO Council Wrap-Up  
Thursday, October 28, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 PDT

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Some housekeeping rules. There we go. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Wrap-Up call on Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> of October 2021.

Please note that this is a Council working session but observers are more than welcome to contribute in the chat. Councilors are encouraged to use their microphones for the comments to ensure they're noticed by all. Councilors are also encouraged to use their cameras to ensure the session is as interactive as possible.

Please ensure you remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes. When not speaking, please ensure you mute your microphones, switch off your notifications when not speaking to avoid any background and interference noises.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you, Philippe. It's now over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Philippe here, and welcome to our wrap-up of ICANN72.

---

***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.***

---

So we've got a couple of things to do today. What we'll do is that we'll go through most of the AOB items that we rushed through yesterday and review the list of liaisons to make sure that we have someone appointed for each and every one of them, and then we'll go through the next steps from the actions that we took mostly during the Council session yesterday.

Anything you'd like to add at this point? Feel free to do so at any time. But if you want to add something, that would be okay. Paul, would you like to elaborate just now or when we get there?

PAUL MCGRADY:                    Whatever you'd like.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:            Well, if you would just let people know what that small AOB item would be about, and then we'll put in the list.

PAUL MCGRADY:                    Perfect. Thanks. It occurred to me that one of the things that we can do to increase cooperation is to increase communication. So I have checked with staff, they're agreeable. But I would like to set up a publicly archived listserv for the Non-Contracted Party House Councilors. It would be, like I said, publicly archived, appropriate staff would be on it. But I just think it would be a nice way for us in this house to communicate with each other with a little more ease. So that will be my AOB item. Thanks.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Paul. We'll have a discussion when we get there, if necessary. Thanks for this. Anything else?

I'm not sure we've got it on the agenda as it stands now. I'd like to include something that we reviewed yesterday. That's the project plan for the IDN EPDP. We got it already or not yet? Thank you. I know we did that. We've done it, but just in case, we need to acknowledge that. Thank you. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I have it in the chat. I would like the Council to just have some thoughts about the question I asked yesterday on the expectations of the ODP liaison, the interaction between the liaison and ICANN staff, but also the interaction between the liaison and the Council. Since that activity, hopefully, I guess we'll be starting before, but I'm not even sure, before the next GNSO Council meeting. I just don't want to lose sight of that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks for the reminder. Indeed, we didn't have time to do that so we'll make sure we'll go through that in the AOB. Anything else?

So I think we can get started then with the first item, which is essentially for free information, but maybe that's worthwhile using that opportunity, so a word about the SCBO that will be seeking a vice chair to prepare the chair succession plan for next year. I hate to put

---

you on the spot, John, but would you like maybe just to say a word about this, especially for the incoming councilors and say a word about the SCBO and the call for a vice chair? Would you mind doing that?

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Yes. I'm happy to do so. As a Standing Committee, I thought it would be a good idea to have some continuity and leadership with respect to it. So it's one of those topics that's incredibly important but takes some time to learn. One of my ideas has been to try to make sure that our comments are in the same format and referencing back. Because a lot of times, what we'll say is we really would suggest that ICANN Finance does X, Y, and Z. If you have a new person come on board, they may not recall that, they may not see it in the prior year's comments. And, for instance, sometimes it will get done by ICANN Finance but moved into a different section. So what we found is that trying to keep that knowledge base continuing is going to be useful. It might be something you want to consider for any of our other committees that we have.

The offer that I'll make is—I've got another two years so I'm looking at a vice chair, promote them to chair the following year, and I'll stay on my entire remainder term so that I'm helping that person out, they don't feel overwhelmed, we continue that knowledge base. That's the concept. So it's a great committee. It's short. It's a lot of work within a short period of time, but I would definitely encourage people because with any organization, if you really want to follow its priorities, look at

---

the strategic plan, and then where they're putting their money. So it is a great committee to have, and would really encourage interested parties to step up. So with that, I'll turn it back over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, John. Indeed, there's a couple of recurring, as he said, elements that having a vice chair for a year would certainly help moving forward with the succession plan. So anyone interested in both joining the SCBO and stepping up as the vice chair would certainly be welcome. So that's also a call for the incoming councilors. Thank you. Thank you, John. So please give it some thought.

So with this, I think we can move on. So that's the next steps that we need to take with the response that we received from the Board on the request for deferral of the IDN Implementation Guidelines v4. I don't know whether that's possible to open the response. But basically, the idea is to identify whether there's an overlap or things that need to be removed from the IDN Implementation Guidelines overlap with EPDP. You would recall the discussion that we had during the approval of the charter. So whether there's an overlap with the EPDP's work so that part could be those elements could be removed. And if there is none, then those can stay and can go to Board approval. So it would probably be the opportunity for us to defer to the EPDP for this task, so if you would—approve is a strong word—but anyone who would have a concern with that approach, your comment would be welcome. So I would just ask you to acknowledge that approach moving

---

forward. Any questions on this? I've seen raised in the chat. Would you care to elaborate, Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Speaking about the letter about IDN guidelines, basically, the letter says, if you apply just formal logic, please find what can be done which is not IDN EPDP already. And basically, IDN EPDP is what we thought we can do about it. And basically, I believe the overlap is going to be a null set. I mean, it should be some work done on the other end, not just sending us a letter saying just sort it out somehow yourself. We didn't read these. We're not prepared and we didn't investigate. Thanks. It doesn't look like a good letter. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Maxim. I'm trying to understand where you're coming from. Are you saying that the Board should have done some homework with this and not to defer to us and potentially the EPDP to do that analysis? I will get to you, Jeff. But if you wouldn't mind, I'll go to Maxim just as a follow-up to explain. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

The short version of how we came to this IDN EPDP team, when ICANN try to say that all registrars have to comply with the guidelines for .zero, it came to our mind that it wasn't the policy to comply with because it was a set of papers made by technical experts, not representing constituencies, which added some quite serious legal issues there. Like the same entity which has to own all variants of

---

string. For example, in one language, you have something for boots, and in other variation of the same language, you have another word for boots. And basically the same entity should own it all. The situation where technical experts come to the legal ideas is not very, I think, good. Thus, we ended up with the IDN EPDPs which should sort out all the issues which came out of it.

And in the letter, we have something saying, “Okay, please do something to understand what from guidelines can be implemented as soon as possible.” But we already have the IDNs EPDP. And if you ask what’s left, nothing left, what we could reason to IDN EPDP. Basically, this letter makes me think that the homework wasn’t done by the other side. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, Maxim. Maybe that’s the case. I would just recall that in the previous letter that we sent, I’m not sure we said that the whole IDN Implementation Guidelines would overlap. I think we said there would be a potential overlap that might need to be investigated. I mean, from a purely logical standpoint, that approach of trying to figure out the overlap would make sense. And if indeed, it’s the full guidelines document, then so be it. Maybe that’s the case that there should have been more work before signing the letter. But from a purely logical standpoint, it seems to make sense. Maybe, Jeff, you could help us with this, at least in understanding the logic behind it.

---

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. I think it's actually worse in the sense that at ICANN71, the Contracted Parties House had a meeting with the Board. And it informed the Board or gave background to the Board as to why it was seeking this deferral. And the Contracted Parties House explained that it had reviewed the IDN Guidelines 4.0, and two things. Number one is that everything that there was a need to implement immediately was already being done because it was already an IDN version 3.0. The second thing the CPH sent to the Board was "And the CPH did not find any security or stability issues with deferring the guidelines." The Board told the CPH—and I wish I had the quote in front of me for the transcript—that they would go back and they would review and provide a list of what they thought could be the security issues. That's what the CPH was expecting to get back. Instead, this letter has a very vague reference to, "Oh, we think there could be security issues. We're not going to tell you what we think they are. But we think there are, so go back." The thing that angers me about this letter is that the CPH specifically asked ICANN to tell it why the CPH was wrong in saying there were no security concerns. Instead, the Board comes back and says, "We don't care about your analysis." We think there could be security issues without spelling anything out and it wants us to respond. Maybe you all task it to the CPH representatives on this call that were there at that meeting like Maxim, Kurt, and others. Because this response by the Board is, in my view, just completely inappropriate, given what happened at ICANN71. Thanks.



---

**PHILIPPE FOUQUART:** Thanks, Jeff. I have the same recollection as yours for what relates to the security and stability elements. They seem to be a bit broader, but I think it'd be good if—I don't know if it's through the EPDP or through our CPH councilors. But there's certainly a need to, anyway, to take this letter, read it carefully, and come up with a response even if it's to say, "Look, we've reviewed our previous exchanges and there's some misunderstanding." Everything needs to be taken back by the EPDP and the whole guidelines need to be deferred until the EPDP finishes their work, as I understand the approach.

As I'm looking at our CPH councilors here, given that the request came from you, the EPDP is still an option. And as I said, the other option would be for you to take that on board. Again, read it carefully and propose something as a way forward. Kurt, you have your hand up. What do you recommend?

**KURT PRITZ:** I've read the letter not as carefully as Jeff, but I think we could take this back and talk to the people we talked to in crafting the letter and see if we have a clear response or recommend throwing it over to the EPDP team. We'll do one or the other and have something for the next meeting.

**PHILIPPE FOUQUART:** Thank you. Thanks, Kurt. It would be helpful. As an aside, we'll go back to our exchange with the Board. I seem to recall that it was, to Jeff's point, it was mostly about the security and stability issue that we were

---

expecting some feedback but we'll double check anyway. So with this, I think we can move forward with our agenda unless there are other comments. Okay. I'm seeing none. Let's move on.

Yes, I'd like us to go back to the project plan of the EPDP. You would recall that we approved the charter without mandating a particular timeline, I think. And we had a discussion about having a look at the timeline when the team would have elaborated their work and their resources. There was a pointer with yesterday's agenda. What was it? I just want to make sure I'm looking at staff here. Was the project plan provided to the list if we need to acknowledge that? Are all Councilors aware of that project plan? Steve, can you help us with this?

STEVE CHAN:

Sure. Thanks, Philippe. I believe it was linked to in the agenda. But the project plan was communicated by the EPDP on IDNs liaison to the Council. So Farrell sent it on the 30<sup>th</sup>. I can actually dig up or maybe someone from the team can dig it up, and we can share the link on chat. But it was set on the 30<sup>th</sup> of September. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Maybe if we have some time, maybe that would be helpful. I would hate to acknowledge something that we haven't explicitly had to look at just as a principle. Thanks. This was something that the EPDP committed to providing for us to have a look at. Any comment on this? Or can we simply note and acknowledge that timeline, that

---

project plan? Okay. Seeing no hands. I think this is, for the record, acknowledged. We can move on.

Next steps. Hang on, I'm mixing up things. So the next topic is the liaison to the Data Accuracy Scoping Team or a potential liaison as well as the request from the chair to potentially have alternates and vice chair. So we thought it might be weaving the former leadership. It might be a good thing to have a liaison to the scoping team. Obviously, this is not the PDP. But there are a number of assignments that the team is tasked with and that would make sense to have a liaison to the team. I know that some of you are already a member of the team, so it'd be good if some of you would keep the whole Council informed of the progress of this. Obviously, we don't want to name names but you know who you are. So if some of you would like to step up. I see Olga. You have your hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Philippe. Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you. Yes, I think having a liaison is not an EPDP but it could be good to get the Council informed. I would like to volunteer for that role, of course, if others agree. Also, I think that having alternates, it's a good idea, and also vice chair because that would help avoiding the burnout of volunteers. Thank you so much.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Olga, for stepping up. Unless anyone would disagree, I think we can appoint you as our liaison to the scoping team. Thank you.

As to the suggestion from the chair to have alternates and the vice chair, I think I shared the e-mail with Council. That indeed seems a good idea, at least to me. I'd welcome your views, noting what Olga just said. Any other opinions? Okay. Seeing no hand other than Olga's, but I think that's an old one. So we'll move forward.

Move on to point eight, our review of the liaisons. As I said, a) Accuracy Scoping Team, which is talked about. This one, at EPDP, that's Farrell. Transfer, that's Greg. Curative Rights Protections for IGO, that's John. Phase 2A, that's me, although it's to proof the final report. IRT on Registration Data Policy Implementation, that's Sebastien. SCBO, that's myself. So we get to the SSC. So previously, that was Tanya. The GNSO chair, one of the vice chairs would serve ex-officio and non-voting member of the SSC. To have that link, Tomslin volunteered for that. So we have a liaison now. For the others, ccNSO Council, it's Sebastien. Liaison to the GAC which is reappointing Jeff. And SSAD ODP, that's Janis. And SubPro, that's Jeff. So I think we're all set now. Did we miss anything? Any liaison who wouldn't be on the list? Okay. Let's move on.

Point nine, our response to the GAC communiqué, as usual, we'll need a small team of councilors to review the GAC communiqué and come up with not a response but comments based on providing clarifications and pointers to decisions the Council took, etc. Given

---

that we've got now new councilors, those would like to be on that team would be welcome. Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Philippe. I would like to volunteer back and forth with the leadership of Jeff.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Olga. Jeff, I think you're on anyway.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I just wanted to plug it. I think it's good for incoming councilors. I think it's a good experience. I would love for you all to join. But we also do need some veterans as well, some people that have been on the Council for a couple of years because it does tend to involve looking back at what's happened in the last few meetings. So please, volunteer. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. Takeaway is that it's a good thing for both old and new councilors. So you're welcome. Kristian?

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. Can you just shortly describe how much work that is usually involved and how fast we are supposed to do the work? Is it already for next Council meeting?

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Kristian. That's a good point. Indeed, I think not last time but the one before. Maybe, Jeff, you could clarify that. But it's a few things—

JEFF NEUMAN: The last time I think was the most efficient so I'm going to use that as the example. I think the communiqué came out ... Because of their rules, they have to give it 24 or 48 hours after the ICANN meeting ends. So the communiqué is officially released, I guess we could say just to be safe, by Monday. Then within that week, I will generally send around a skeleton of ... Well, I should say ICANN staff provides a template which is very helpful, then I will fill that in with the information that I know of past resolutions and things like that. And then it's just up to the rest of the team to weigh in. Usually give out about a week, leadership weighs in. The goal is to get it voted on and approved by the next Council meeting.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Thank you, Jeff. Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: Just wondering as well if it's worth for those that are new to the Council to even take a step further back. I'm sure Jeff can speak about that as well. But this initiative comes from, I think, already quite some meetings ago, where I think at some point, one of the Board members

---

said, “We get advice from the GAC that sometimes seems to touch on issues that are within the GNSO’s remit.” So it will be helpful for the GNSO to provide us with insider information on what it has said or decided on certain topics. So it’s information that the Board then has at hand as it reviews the GAC communiqué, and that is something that started quite some time ago and has been going on for quite some time. That’s a bit background to the review effort itself. I hope that provides a little bit of context.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Thanks, Marika. Going back to you Kristian, can we get you on that GAC communiqué review?

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Sure.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. Thank you. So probably need one or two more volunteers. I’ll be on that team, too. Maxim, you have your hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Is it too early to ask about item six?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: If we could have one more volunteer while we’re at it for the GAC communiqué. But since you have your hand up, am I taking that you’re volunteering?

---

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think for the Council, it's way better not to include me there. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Right. Okay. Antonia?

ANTONIA CHU: I think I can volunteer for item four.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. Thank you. Item four? Hang on. I thought we were on nine. We're on the GAC communiqué. Are we talking about this one, Antonia?

ANTONIA CHU: Yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. So you've just volunteered for the review of the GAC communiqué?

ANTONIA CHU: Yes, that's right.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. I just want to make sure that we're on the same page. So we're all set then. And apologies for going through this, but I know that if I'm



---

going back to the list for this, the odds are that the same people—we'll only have those who volunteered during wrap-up. Thanks for this. I think we're all set. We'll get that list going.

Thanks, Jeff. I'm sorry, when you say four, that's—no, I've got my numbering incorrectly. That's the GAC communiqué. The names of the people we have on the screen. Thank you. I forget.

With this, moving on to the next point, the discussion paper on modifying gTLD Consensus Policies. The document that I sent, when was that? Monday. That came from staff. I see Maxim first. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

As I understand in GNSO framework, I mean, the papers, we have lots of instructions on how to update policies. What makes these policies different from others? Because consensus policies is what is binding for the contracted parties. So it doesn't matter if it's gTLD policies or if we invent some behavioral policy on ICANN meetings. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, Maxim. John, you're next. You're muted. John, I think you're double muted.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Sorry. I doubled muted myself. I was volunteering to put myself down. That was an interesting discussion we had. We were on that Rec 27. I'm happy to volunteer for that.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. Anyone else to have a look at this discussion paper?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Please add me too.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: That was Maxim. Thank you. Looking at the chat. Right, that was Maxim. Sorry, I'm having difficulty following the chat. Anyone else? I'm not sure. I'll share to follow which I'll do with Teresa. That's a paper that was informally shared with the Board so far. They're aware of the fact that this was also shared with us. The timeline is—I'll just quote—it's around six weeks. We may want to have a look at this quickly, although I'm sure comments could be provided later on. I see, Jeff, you have your hand up.

JEFF NEUMAN: I was going to say because this goes to the core of what the GNSO does—and you guys can disagree—but I would put in a pitch to ask for some SG and C volunteers, because like I said, this is not just managing the process, I think. I think this gets at the heart—from what I read, it gets at the heart of the contracts and other things. So that's my pitch and you can accept that or whatever.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Jeff. It also goes back to a comment that was made during the—was it the priority session about the need to monitor what happens with the policies that we develop and approve and hand over to the Board? It is something that the SG and Cs are perfectly aware of and some of them at least would welcome Council getting involved in this somehow or at least monitoring the follow-ups.

Shall we reach out either through you or directly to the SG and Cs to form that small team? Well, it depends on how small that would be. But this would have to be done quite quickly. That's the only difficulty. But we could do this in addition to the volunteers that we have here. I see that Thomas has volunteered as well, I think. I can see three names now. Maxim, you have your hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Philippe, can you tell us why is the urgency here to be fast? Because we're changing something very basic and I'd say it changes the balance if not done properly. What is the reason to do it fast and right now? Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maxim. I have no idea. I just asked when that document was shared, and I think that's a good thing that it was because it's something that was intended for the Board. Not a request for comments but request for feedback. I just realized that there was no timeline so I asked for that and the response was six weeks. Ideally, probably, I think that's what was meant. But I offer that and maybe

---

that was offered on the guidance, not necessarily binding. But as to your question, Maxim, where does that come from? I think the intent is to share this officially, not unofficially, with the Board reasonably early and not wait for three months to do that. I suppose that's the intent, which seems reasonable. Tomslin, you had your hand up?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, Philippe. Thanks. I just wanted to say that considering how important this is, could we ask for some more time to respond to it?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. We can certainly ask. What would be good is that we could at least kick start the work and figure out in what timeframe those comments could be provided and then come back to staff with that estimate. But we can certainly do that. Thank you. Thanks, Tomslin.

So we have five volunteers. What we will do is that with your agreement, we'll also reach out to the SG and C leaders to ask them whether they have any volunteers other than their respective councilors to join the team for them to have a look at the discussion paper. Okay. I think we can move on then with the next item, that's Rec 12. Steve?

---

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Philippe. If I recall correctly, I'm not sure we fully covered off on item five, the revised GNSO councilor JD for the Nominating Committee.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'm sorry. Yes, I missed that. That's true. We need to go back to this. We have a list of councilors who stepped up during the Council call but anyone else would be welcome on this. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I am not volunteering for this quite yet. Now, we also discussed the fact that there might be a deadline on this. Do we want to set a deadline for the small team to come back with recommendations before the next meeting in order to meet the NomCom deadline? Or do we decide that this is for an acceleration?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: From our discussion yesterday—thanks, Sebastien—the goal is indeed to have a revised motion for the next Council for the November Council. That's a good point. Thank you. Going back to the team, so we have Olga, Mark, Maxim, and Flip. Anyone else would like to be on that team? Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, I will be on the team. Thank you.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Tomlin. Sebastien, I see that you have your hand up. Is that an old one or are you also volunteering? Okay, old one. Thanks. So we have five which seems reasonable. Anyone else? Last call. Okay. Thank you. My apologies. I think I almost missed that.

Moving on, we'll get to point seven, Phase 1 Rec 12. You would remember that part of the discussion that we had with the Board, I think it was on Tuesday with—correct me if I'm wrong—an offer to work informally on this. The letter elaborates on a number of assumptions, understandings of the implication of Recommendation 12 for registrars, in particular, and the backend systems. I think it'd be good. My takeaway from our discussion with Becky is that it'd be good if a small team of councilors would get together with Becky discuss those assumptions and see how we can move forward on this. That does not prevent us quite the contrary, we need to respond formally. But at the first stage, I think we can be informal to make sure that we understand each other. A small team of councilors would be welcome. Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: I was just going to say I'm willing to volunteer for that. But I see people are doing it and chat.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. So we have Greg, Sebastien. Maxim?

---

MAXIM ALZOBA: The situation about the data being asked if it's a real data and then denied has something to do with accuracy. And we have ongoing accuracy effort, why just don't we send it there? Thanks. Because it's directly relevant.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maxim. Are you talking about one of the seven? I think there are seven points in the letter. What you're saying doesn't seem to be applying to all those assumptions. I mean, there are things about the registrant's information being still valuable when that is redacted from the public WHOIS, etc. That doesn't seem to have anything to do with accuracy. Are you referring to one of the—I'm sorry. I haven't got them off the top of my head. But one of the seven assumptions or when you say it's all to do with accuracy? Maxim, could you clarify that?

MAXIM ALZOBA: One of the items which was about the deletion of the data if it was a check for accuracy, then the answer was basically no answer. Or then the answer was no, it's not real data. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Well, in that case, if there's a dependency with the work that the Accuracy Scoping Team will be undertaken, I guess, that particular point will be deferred to that scoping team or until such a point that they address that. Or maybe I missed a point. I'm sorry, Maxim. I see that, Berry, you have your hand up.

---

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Philippe. To be clear, this Recommendation 12 was from EDP Phase 1. It is one of the recommendations that the Board did not directly adopt because they had SSR concerns about how the contents or the value of these fields be treated. In its original form, it gave registrars the discretion to delete the contents of that field if the value was not confirmed by the registrant for publication. While it uses the word about understanding whether the value is accurate or not, it is remotely far from anything that the Accuracy Scoping Team is working on now, what this letter from the Board is to confirm their understanding about how this field would be implemented. I think they're opening the door to try to get to closure on this issue that the Board had for a while. And it's up for the Council to confirm if their understanding is correct so that it can be sent back to the IRT to complete for implementation of Phase 1, which is really been a critical path item for quite a while. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, Berry. Thanks for getting this straight. In any case, if the use of the word accuracy is relevant in the same way as the scoping team would address that, I'm sure that the small team can figure that out. But given what you said and the context of Phase 1, it's quite unlikely. I seem to remember that indeed a number of those evidence are about the prevalence of registration data when that is redacted from public queries. But still, nonetheless, present in a



---

variable in the backend systems of the registrants. That's a discussion, I think, we had already to some extent.

Anyway, thanks for those who stepped forward. I think we have a small team already. We'll three councilors, four now. I think that's good enough. Thanks to you. Moving on to point eight and the next steps on DNS abuse. I think I see that there have been already quite a few volunteering in the chat. It's five councilors already. Anyone else before we move on? Okay. Thank you. We're getting close. Add Sebastien in eight. Thanks, Sebastien. Feel free, if you haven't already volunteered, to come back to the list and add your name in one of those small teams.

Moving on. It's just a reminder that our next SPS session is on the 9<sup>th</sup>. The reason there will be other materials to be shared in advance of those sessions, so please have a look before we get there, I think it's important that people be prepared for those sessions to be efficient. Thanks for the link. So, Jeff, if you have other topics that—well, the agenda is already quite full, but if you see things that might be addressed during the SPS, suggestions are welcome.

AOB now. So the first point is Paul's NCPH archived mailing list. So I think you said a word about that, Paul. Maybe you'd like to elaborate?

PAUL MCGRADY:

Sure. I got an e-mail today with the deadlines for motions for our next meeting. And I thought to myself, I don't know if anybody has any motions that they intend to bring. Would it be nice if we could talk

---

through them first so that when they're brought, all the kinks are worked out? Then I thought, boy, I really don't know how to get a hold of my fellow Non-Contracted Parties House councilors in an efficient way. And so then I asked staff and they said they think they can set up such a mailing list but it would be publicly archived and not private, nothing going on like that. The staff couldn't get access so they could help us. I thought that might be a really great way to speed up communication within our own house. And of course, there's nothing keeping contracted parties from doing that, too. Although I do think that contracted parties are a little less diverse than we are. In this house, we're a group of different kinds of folks all under the same roof by historic accident or whatever. From my point of view, it makes sense to just be able to reach out quickly to the other councilors in this house. So I'd like to do that. I don't know if that is something that other people think it's a good idea or a bad idea, but I threw it out. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks. Thanks, Paul. Any comment on this? Comments from the CPH? But that's good. Maxim, you're first and then Greg.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

It's not the official point of view of Contracted Party House or RySG. We do already have a public and archived list of councilors where we can send all our ideas. I would like to remind us all that Contracted Party House is because we all have contracts with ICANN. And something we sent can go to Compliance. And since not all of us are

---

lawyers or legal advisors or can publicly speak on behalf of our organizations or companies, and some of us are technical experts, it might wreck legal havoc. So it's not the best idea. I think we have public Council list and it's a good thing to share ideas there. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maxim. Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Paul. Sorry. Can you—maybe I missed this—clarify what the utility is and having that subset of the Council and not the full Council on these interactions? If I missed that, I'm sorry.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Greg. I think the utility is fewer e-mails for everybody to sort through that may or may not be relevant to them. In this particular house, there are ISPs, there are folks who represent end users, other interests, nonprofits, business, IP interest, those kinds of things, and there may be particularities on a particular idea or motion that would be best hashed out. But most importantly, just a speedy way to communicate with each other. It could just as easily be that we do that in a group e-mail address. It just has less transparency and less history for folks to be able to come through in the event that the archaeologists never care about what we do.

---

I'm not trying to do anything super complicated, literally just to try to set up a way to communicate quickly. But if people feel excluded, we can not do it on an ICANN list. We can just have private e-mails. That seems to me like it's more exclusive rather than less.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Thanks, Paul. Well, I'm not sure I should qualify that as a concern. But to me, that's an exploder. As Paul said, you could use individual e-mails for ease of use and having an exploder would make sense, at least to me speaking personally. But if people have a sense of exclusion, certainly we can avoid that. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Philippe. If I recall correctly, one of the topics that came up in a past PDP 3.0 discussion and I think also related to what was actually during the Strategic Planning session from probably a couple years ago was actually some councilors lamenting the fact that the NomCom appointees didn't necessarily have an easy way to communicate with their fellow councilors. I'm clearly a staff not advocating one way or another but I think for some of the new councilors, I think that's maybe something could take into account that that is a thing that got brought up in the past.

If you'll indulge me, I have a tangential point, which is Paul was talking about Council planning and coordination. So I just wanted to plug something, again, for some of the new councilors and maybe even a reminder for the past councilors that we actually share a Council

---

Meeting Planning document. It's a Google Document that's publicly available. I think for the most part, it just ends up being staff and leadership planning in that document. But we'll make sure we share that link. But just as a reminder, you're all involved and have a place in suggesting topics by telling us the topics that we're proposing are maybe not the right ones. But just for new and old, just be aware that that document is available. We welcome all of your input in helping us schedule and plan meetings. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Steve. That's a good reminder that any inputs to the future Council calls would be welcome. Again, from NomCom appointee's perspective, I think we can all appreciate the ease of use that that search list might have. But again, if there are concerns with this. Okay. Not much apparently. So I think we'll try and put that in place then. Thank you. Thanks, Paul.

Moving on with our point B. Expectations of the ODP liaison. Maybe, Jeff, you could elaborate. Well, that's quite straightforward. But I think the starting point is the reports that we have from Janis on the SSAD liaison and a question for Council as to whether this is the sort of things that you would expect for SubPro as well. What other items would you like to be in this report? How often would you like to see those reports? We normally have a report after each meeting with the ODP team. Is that sufficient? So that's normally once a month, so at each and every Council meeting, we have that report. I would put this in the AOB for potential inputs or comments. I think a couple of times

---

we had comments. Other times, we have none. It was only duly noted, etc. So that's I would think the sort of things that you would like to hear from Council. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. So it's interesting because the communication frequency, the type has never really been a discussion amongst the GNSO Council. We sort of thrust upon it by the way that Janis had agreed to deal with ICANN staff during the SSAD ODP. It occurred to me that that's probably not the most effective way to decide the only mechanism that the Council has or insight into the ODP.

Let me go back a step. My role is strictly as a conduit of information to bring back policy questions, if there are questions from things that weren't addressed in the previous policy process, etc. So this is not about what I would do within the group. But my question more relates to, are you happy with the transparency you have with what's going on in the SSAD ODP? Are you happy with the level of information that even Janis has given to bring back to the Council and the community? If you were at the GAC discussion where Karen Lentz gave an update on the SubPro ODP, Karen phrased the role of the liaison a little bit different than what's in the role description or the process paper. Karen said that the ODP liaison is only contacted if there are policy questions that they believe were not addressed in the report or where they believe there is an interpretation that they need some input on. That's very different than the ODP liaison bringing back to the Council complete transparency about the ODP.

---

So my question is for the Council to indicate do you want more transparency? If you look at the mailing list currently with the ODP liaison, you will see a few e-mails in October, less in September, even less in August. And it's rarely used, which tells me that Janis is not getting very much information. So yeah, it's up to you all, I take my instructions from you all. You can tell me how extensive or not you want it. And that's the discussion. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks. So let's hear from what councilors have to say on this without charging what's done for the SSAD ODP, but what are your expectations for this for this SubPro ODP? Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you very much. I think NCSG expressed quite a bit of concern when the whole concept of an ODP surfaced because, quite frankly, I'm not of the view that you can divorce policy from affordability and cost calculations. Basically, the ODP design phase is to figure out what can be done. Well, inevitably, there's a lot of stuff lands on the cutting room floor when you start looking at the budget. So I don't think we have enough transparency on this process to begin with. So if we're not getting a regular feed of information, not just questions, whenever they want an answer from us, then we've lost all control of the policy process.

That's a view that I think many of my NCSG colleagues share. We made a lot of comments on it at the time that it was being implemented and

---

that didn't do much good. But certainly, the role of the liaison from my perspective is to pry as much information as possible on an ongoing basis. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Stephanie. Any other inputs? Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks again, Philippe. I guess for what it's worth, in the background, one of the things we're looking at trying to do is to try to document the frequency of communications how they take place for the SSAD ODP, just to make sure we have a written record of what it looks like for Janis. I think we're all aware this is only the second ODP. So there's probably some things that we can take away from how the first one goes and having a document I think maybe helps determine if there's any gaps or any changes that the Council might want to entertain in how it engages for the SubPro ODP. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Steve. Am I right in saying that the mailing list, the archive is public, Stephanie?

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. I'm just going to add. It is public. It's just not really used much if you go back and look at it.



---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. Thank you. Thanks, Stephanie. Any other inputs on the ODP liaison? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I don't know what the frequency needs to be and I don't know how, but I tend to agree with Stephanie. The job spec, for having it read myself before putting my name on it, read like very much a liaison from the ODP to the Council. The ODP needs that question answered, will ask the liaison, the liaison goes to the Council and comes back with the answer, and not at all a role where that liaison always is putting their nose and into what the ODP is not needing. So I don't know to what extent. I mean, this is a new process, it's to be invented. But it is also because it's a new process, a good occasion for us to put up or down where we wanted and say, "Well, no. We need to hear somebody that has a voice that has something to bring and an alert to raise when need be when things are going the wrong way, or if it's just about listening and waiting to be called for a question." Again, if this is a pilot, if this is a process that we're trying, let's also give our input and say how we would like for it to happen.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Thank you, Sebastien. Indeed, the difficulty here is that each and every PDP being specific to some extent, the role of the liaison will have to be specific as well. So it's probably difficult to double guess what the SubPro ODP liaison would have to do based on what happens for the SSAD ODP liaison. But with this, I think what I'm hearing is that there is at least for the very first stages of the SubPro

---

ODP and given the importance of the topic, a need for Council to be informed of how that goes in proportionate way and provide information that can reasonably be processed by Council. But certainly not, as you said, Sebastien, pry into what the ODP team does for things that are not related to policy. I see that you have your hand up again. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Maybe this is a note for Jeff. So, the other way around. I think that given your knowledge of the background of this whole topic, you know it like the back of your hands, whatever the natural tendency would be to answer questions as soon as they arise, and you'll have the answer on most of those things. I don't have anything particular against it, but just also in that sort of speed of action, to make sure all that is recorded for the Council, I think it would be very interesting for the Council to understand where these false routes are taken also or where these assumptions on the work that we did are taken. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thank you, Sebastien. And transparency, yes, indeed. If there are policy elements that need to be repeated, even if they don't need to be clarified, but they are part of, say, the report but need to be reiterated to the team. Even in that case, I think it'd be useful as information for Council to know that just for the sake of transparency.

---

Jeff, I hope that is useful input. If staff has started drafting something on the form that the report might take, it would be useful as well. As you said, you can also use the format that Janis used, but hopefully that will help you and we'll learn as we move along, I think, with this one. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. Very helpful. I will provide any updates as soon as I hear from them. I don't know if you've fully have to send a letter or whether it's done by the secretariat to ICANN staff to officially notify of the appointment. But once that happens, I will reach out and get a description of the process from them, bring it back to you.

I appreciate what Sebastien said. I probably have some answers but that's not my role, really. It's to bring back the questions. I will also recommend to you all potential answers, but you are the ones that dictate what goes on.

The only questions I foresee not necessarily coming back before getting an answer is if they say, "Did the working group discuss so and so?" and I could say, "Yeah, look at the initial report pages, blah, blah, blah, blah," without providing any substance. But other than that, you will be on everything and I'll figure out the mechanism to do that. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, Jeff. And even saying that, there was the reference provided to the ODP team this useful information and the mark of

---

transparency. So that would be useful. Thanks. And to your questions, staff being where they are, the information was provided last night after our vote to the ODP support staff, as Natalie put in the chat. So with this, thank you. Thank you, Jeff. Before we go to the group photo, Justine, did you have information or something that you mentioned in the chat?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. Thanks, Philippe. It wasn't a comment. I actually want to post a query. This being my first Council meeting, I would like to tread gently. But it would be nice to know if the call for volunteers of any of those things on the list that you see in screen would be open for liaisons rather than just councilors. Could you take this on to the list if need be? Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

As a rule, I think the small teams are open to councilors, maybe. Well, it really depends on the topic, but usually there's a topic that is related directly. Think about the GAC communiqué. It will make sense not to have the GAC liaison in the GAC communiqué small team. So as a rule, if there's a link, the liaison is certainly welcome. If there is, as a rule, only councilors would take part. I think so far, that's what we did. If I'm wrong, please tell me. We can take that offline. That was my understanding.

So with this, I think we've got just about five minutes left. We can take that Council photo.

JEFF NEUMAN:                   What happened to yesterday?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:       Yeah. Did we—no, I'm hesitant to use that word.

ARIEL LIANG:                 It's basically to get councilors' and liaisons' consent to publish this photo on the GNSO website. That's traditionally done when we met face to face. And usually we have that photo but in current circumstances, we only have the Zoom group photo. So we want to double-check whether that's okay. If I may, I can show everyone the photo on the screen very quickly. Thank you. So let me do that very quickly.

This is the photo. Another disclaimer is that we have five members that were not in the photo, they were not present yesterday. So I have to basically Photoshop heads a little by inserting the photo we took from previous year into this collage and also grabbed another photo that's on the public website of one of the councilors. So I just want to double-check whether this is okay to publish it. And if we have the consent, then we will publish that on the website. And also we have a GNSO Twitter account and I will publish that as well. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:       Thank you, Ariel. My apologies. I thought we had to do it again. But certainly fine with me. If someone has concern over using this on the

---

website, please shout, or let staff know very, very quickly. And if you don't, then, Ariel, you can use this, I think.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Ariel. So with this, I see that we have three minutes left. I'm not sure we can use that as an open mic. We had a brief one. I'm hesitant to using it. But if there's one question, let's try that, the three, five minutes left. Anyone from our audience? Okay. Thank you.

So with this, I think that concludes our wrap-up session. Thanks, everyone. I hope you're all well. We'll get together soon with our SPS, and by then have some rest and stay safe. Speak to you soon. Bye all.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining today's wrap-up session. This concludes the end of the call. Have an excellent rest of your day, evening, night. Take care, everyone. Bye. You may now stop the recording. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**