

---

ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO Council Meeting Part 1  
Wednesday, September 21, 2022 – 13:15 to 15:15 KUL

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting, Part 1, on the 21<sup>st</sup> of September, 2022.

Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you so much.

Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kurt Pritz?

KURT PRITZ: Present.

---

**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.**

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:            Sebastien Ducos?

I don't see Sebastien in the Zoom room yet.

Theo Geurts?

THEO GEURTS:                    Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:            Greg DiBiase?

GREG DIBIASE:                    Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:            Desiree Miloshevic.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC:            Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:            Marie Pattullo?

MARIE PATTULLO:                 Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Mark Datysgeld?  
I don't see Mark in the Zoom room yet.  
John McElwaine?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip Petillion?

FLIP PETILLION: I'm here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Philippe Fouquart?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'm here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thomas Rickert?

THOMAS RICKERT: Present.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady?

I don't see Paul in the Zoom room either. Wisdom Donkor?

WISDOM DONKOR: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Stephanie Perrin?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Manju Chen?

I don't see Manju in the Zoom room either. Farell Folly?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Manju is away from the mic. She's here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Oh. Thank you very much. Farell Folly?

FARELL FOLLY: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Juan Manuel Rojas?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tomslin Samme-Nlar?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Olga Cavalli?

OLGA CAVALLI: Present, Nathalie. Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Jeff Neuman?

JEFF NEUMAN: 75% here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Justine Chew?

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Justine. Maarten Simon?

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

And just for the record, we have Sebastien and Paul who have just joined.

Our guest speakers today during this session will be Lise Fuhr, chair of the PTI Board of Directors, Michael Palage, Chair of the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team, and Dr. Ajay Data, Chair of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group.

From GNSO staff, we have staff present remotely and in the meeting room.

I'd like to remind you all to state your name before speaking. This call is being recorded. When in a Zoom webinar room, Councilors as panelists can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once they have remembered to set their chat to Everyone so all can read the exchanges.

---

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers. So they do not have access to the microphones right now. They do have access to the chat. There will be an open mic at the end of this session where attendees will be activated.

Please note that private chats are only possible amongst panelists in the Zoom webinar format. So any message sent by a panelist or standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session's hosts, co-hosts, and other panelists.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with expected standards of behavior.

Thank you ever so much, Philippe, and it's now over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Nathalie. Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to this AGM Council meeting. This will be the final meeting for the term of the seated Councilors. This will then be in two parts. We will have that final meeting for Part 1, have a break for 15 minutes, and we'll then proceed to Part 2 for the seating of the elected Councilors, as well as the election of the new chair.

So, with this, I think we can proceed with our agenda as usual. Any updates to the SOI that people would like to make?

Okay. Seeing no hands, any changes to the agenda?

Okay. Moving on, we'll just note the minutes of the July and August meetings and then move swiftly to Item 2 and our usual review of the

---

project management tool suite. I'll just refer to Berry's e-mail on September the 12<sup>th</sup> and hand it over to Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Philippe. If we can get over to the project list, this first page here is, of course, a summary of all of the in-flight projects that have been initiated by the Council. A couple of highlights from this is on the agenda. The RDA Scoping Team has submitted its Assignments 1 and 2. You'll recall this project was behind on delivering its milestones and has steadily been downgraded over the last few months. This is now at consideration for the Council. And, depending on what the next steps are for when the scoping team reforms, a project change request will be required to reset what the work of the scoping team will be and its respective project plan.

The second thing I'll highlight is the EPDP on IDNs. As you may have heard from updates earlier this week which were also mentioned in the project list, it does look like a project change request will be submitted next month in October. I won't go into the details around that, but there's a good explanation further down in the project list around that.

When we look at the projects that are sitting at the Board vote phase, I won't go into any of these in detail, but I do believe they were discussed in one form or another, especially across a few sessions with the ICANN Board that would be of good information.

Then, finally, with the projects in the implementation, you received an update from our GDS colleagues about the projects and implementation, I believe, on Sunday.



---

And finally finally, on the bottom of the project list here, on page 1, you'll see the new initiation of the GGP that the Council adopted, launching at its last Council meeting.

So let's quickly move over to the ADR (the Action Decision Radar) here. A couple of points that I want to make about this particular tool—first and foremost, the unplanned section. You'll recall, throughout this Council year, we've had several items here, and we should start to see this normalized next month in October. As it has turned out, every one of these have become their own mini project. And in addition, each one of these is launching additional work, which can be found in further detail in the portfolio tool. But I don't think I'll go as far as saying that these unplanned activities broke the ADR. But the original intent is that these kinds of things wouldn't have sit as long as they have—thus my pointer to them being many projects in and of themselves.

So the DNS abuse item there ... I believe we got an update or there were several updates about the small team here, and they'll be delivering their report, I believe, next month or the month after. The modifying consensus policies work, I believe, will be absorbed into the PDP improvements work that is also a part of the agenda. And then of course, the closed generics facilitation will be spinning up here in the new future.

So as we move a little bit further down into the zero-to-one-month range, in addition to our usual operational type of activities as we move from one Council year to the next, you'll recall that what's currently on the plate for the Council to consider is the policy status report and determining next steps if there's going to be any policy work around

---

that particular topic. And of course, in addition, which is in the one-to-three-months range, there's also the Council's consideration for the expiration policy, which we're still waiting for some initial information back from Compliance for.

So just some closing comments here. Our staff is starting to reset these two work products for the new Council year. And finally, now that we have a few new Councilors coming on and a little bit of changes across the leadership teams and the stakeholder groups and constituencies, just a quick reminder that myself and Steve Chan created webinar that shows how all these tools work together. So we'll take the action to redistribute the link to that webinar so that Councilors and leaders across the GNSO can view it at their leisure. And just to remind you, we do have an open invitation, should the groups have any additional questions for how these tools work.

So I'll stop there and hand it back to you, Philippe. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Berry. And indeed, we can only encourage Councilors in general, not only new Councilors—we always learn new things with this—to have a look at the recorded webinar that you put together with Steve and go back to you if need be.

Any questions to Berry?

Okay. Seeing no hands, thank you. Thanks very much, Berry.

I'm sorry?

---

THOMAS RICKERT: There's a question from Kurt in the chat.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Kurt, I'm sorry. I didn't see your hand. I've got to fix my screen. Kurt?

KURT PRITZ: It was really a rhetorical question. I think I was pointing out the ... For example, the Board projects were all green, but we know some of them are years behind. And so if we're really going to measure ourselves, we should measure ourselves—so that's one example but probably across the board—against original timelines as well as the most updated version of the timeline, reset the timeline and say, “Hey, we're on schedule.” So we should think about being a little more critical of ourselves.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Kurt.

Berry, on the caveat with the colors, maybe ... I don't know how we should read them, for the Board and for the others, I guess. Berry?

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Philippe. It's a good point, Kurt. And certainly, staff welcomes input.

But to give you some background about the status and health indicators that you see now, it becomes a little bit more challenging

---

because the GNSO Council is no longer the sponsor of these projects. As they move to the Board, the ownership changes. The status and health conditions for at least the latest IGO working group are carried over from when the Council finally adopted the consensus recommendations. All of the other projects were there before we'd initiated this whole new framework for judging the status and health. But because at least the policy staff aren't involved directly with the specific projects, it's difficult to pass down or have them adhere to a status and health. So there are a couple of options here that we removed because we don't necessarily control them.

And secondarily, I'll note that the last two in the Board vote section are on hold because the Board did resolve ... I can't remember when, but it was a while back. Basically, those items were on hold until it received the outputs from the specific curative rights protection so they can all be considered together.

But good point. And staff will take that back and try to figure out a way to reflect a status and health to those kinds of projects that aren't necessarily within our scope here.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Berry. So food for thought for the next team to figure out the time reference as well as the semantics associated with the colors in the radar. Thanks, Kurt. Thanks, Berry.

So with this, I think we can move on to the next item, which is empty. That's the consent agenda.

---

So directly on to Item 4. And that's an update from the Public Technical Identifiers (the PTI), formerly known as the Post-Transition IANA, which is the oversight by ICANN of the IANA function. And for this, we have the PTI Chair, Lise Fuhr. It's a pleasure to have you here with us. So over to you, Lise.

LISE FUHR:

Thank you, Philippe. And we also have Kim Davies to help me do a short presentation. But first and foremost, thank you for inviting us to give you a short update. This is also going to be my last meeting as the PTI Chair, as I have timed out my mandate on the PTI Board.

So one of the first things I would like to update you on is that we will have a new PTI Board composition. We will have Tobias Sattler joining instead of me. And he has more than 15 years in the industry and has been working for United Domains. He has also been the Vice-Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and was on the NomCom last year. So he's no newcomer to our community. So I hope you will welcome him like you did with me.

Just very briefly, for the first time in, I think, three years, we had a face-to-face workshop in July. It was lovely to actually be able to see each other and discuss also during the breaks and just to interact in a more dynamic way.

We discussed several things. We discussed a bit on governance, of course our strategic plan, and also what are the emergent risks and trends we see out in the technology community, but also that we might

---

look into aligning ICANN and PTI's operating plan and budget planning cycle, plus also the strategic planning cycle.

We did discuss a bit on our outreach plan and our communication plans because that's one of our important tasks, not as the Board but as PTI. They need to do a lot of outreach apart from also making the root server running. But we discussed the outreach not only in the naming but also in the numbering and the protocol community because we serve all three communities. The staff is doing a lot of outreach here, so that's not any issue. But maybe, should the PTI Board be more active? And should we do more outreach here? We think it's a good idea, but we're still in the making of a plan here. So you'll be updated later on this.

Then, last but not least, we discussed IANA staffing and how to make sure that we have a resilient team, meaning that, if people leave, we can have someone taking over with short notice, both in the matter of duplicating but also in the matter of being more staffed than we are today because it is a very small team.

So out of our strategic or strategy workshop, we had three suggested changes that we will discuss also with the community. One is to try to align PTI's four-year strategic cycle with ICANN's five-year strategic planning cycle because we are depending on ICANN's strategy. We might as well align them. I think it was a minor glitch in the IANA stewardship mention that we made it four-year, and ICANN has it five-year. But we will try to correct this and of course consult everyone, both the ICANN Board in the making of this. And we need of course to consult the communities on this.

---

Then we also think it's a good idea to start looking the timing of the operating plan and budget for PTI because we currently start doing this nine months before the fiscal year starts. And that's a long time gap before it actually starts the budget. We think nine months is too much. That's also going to be something we will discuss and consult, of course, with the different constituencies.

Last but not least, with what I said before around the IANA team, we need to make sure we have a future resilient team. We have an excellent team now. We want to keep it. And we need to make sure they keep being a stellar team.

Then we have sent out the draft for PTI's fiscal year '24 operating plan and budget. As I said, we need to send it out nine months before. It starts the fiscal year. That has been sent out for public consultation. It's open until the 31<sup>st</sup> of October. I will urge you all to submit comments if you have any. And the budget is a slight increase in the spending, but we think it's a prudent one. We are having the following assumptions, that our strategic objectives remain the same, we have very high customer satisfaction, but we still believe you need to keep getting better, and so we foresee incremental changes in our systems to improve our services. We still think there is uncertainty due to COVID, but we have assumed that we will resume face-to-face meetings both with ICANN meetings but of course also with IETF and the numbering communities. So those will of course cost more than it has done the past two years traveling.

Last but not least, you have to be aware there are some projects and also activities that have been suggested by different groups. They still

---

need to be approved by the ICANN Board, so we haven't put those in the budget. So there might be some deviations with this, but we have a buffer in that we have a small contingency fund that can take care of this part.

So with that, I'll conclude the PTI Board presentation and then hand it over to Kim Davies to do a bit on the operational part.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks, Lise. Hi, everyone. Just a few points to add on top of what Lise just shared. Within the IANA team, we're currently culminating a multiyear project to build a next-generation root zone management system. I think the key takeaway I want to share with you now is that, if you're a gTLD manager or operator, you don't need to do anything, but once we launch this system, we'll actually provide you with a lot more flexibility and options in terms of dealing with IANA in a way that we think will help gTLD operators interact with us much more efficiently, particularly gTLD operators that manage multiple top-level domains.

We gave a few presentations throughout the week here, but we're also planning to do additional engagement at the summit in a few months' time. And we're very happy to sit down with our customers to walk through the changes that are being made, explain them to you, and work out how you can make use of this new functionality. The launch of the new root zone management system will happen later this year. And, again, we encourage dialogue with our team if you'd like to learn more.

We have some other evolutionary technical initiatives that we're looking at, including advancing the way we test conformance of TLD



---

managers' infrastructure as part of a root zone, and are also looking at how to conduct an algorithm rollover for the root zone. This is something that will require a lot of research and development to make sure we can do it in a satisfactory way that doesn't adversely impact stability of the root zone.

Both of those efforts are kicking off later this year. On the latter (algorithm rollover), we're going to put together a design team and we'll be soliciting community volunteers to participate in that work. Both of these initiatives we're going to kick off at the ICANN DNS Symposium in November. In fact, we have a dedicated day dedicated to our IANA issues on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November. So I would encourage those who are interested in those topics to attend if possible. And if not, we will be conducting online consultation and engagement beyond that date.

Lastly, I wanted to highlight our annual engagement survey with the community. It's important to us that we understand the desires of each of our stakeholder groups. The gTLD registries are an important part of that—and indeed, gTLD registrars, to a certain extent. This survey will be coming out in October. We segment the survey by stakeholder group. We had a low response rate from the gTLD segment last year, so I would encourage you, if you receive an invitation for that survey, to take the time to provide us some feedback. We ask some important questions for us, for our forward planning, particularly relating to how we engage with our customers, what we can do. Is this, for example, discussion we're having right now a useful way to communicate with you? Or should we use other mechanisms? This feedback helps us

---

formulate our future approach, and we very much appreciate the input into the survey.

And then as I close, I just wanted to acknowledge that, as Lise mentioned, it is her last week as Chair of the PTI Board, but also, she's the last inaugural board member. So she's the last remaining person that's been involved since Day 1, since PTI was established. Lise has been instrumental in setting up board norms and processes throughout that time. She was Chair for most of those years. So we're very thankful for the service she has put in. And she has really set us up on a path for success. I think everyone would agree that PTI and IANA have really stabilized following the transition. There's often nothing to remark about in that respect, and that's in no small part to Lise's contribution.

With that, thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you both. So I think, to your last question, this is at least a start. It's really useful. I think we're all aware of the importance of your job. What we do within the GNSO wouldn't make sense if you weren't here. But it remains a bit arcane sometimes, so I think this sort of outreach is really useful.

I see two hands on Zoom. Maxim, you're first.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I have a question about the new RZM. This portal is of utmost importance to registries for natural reasons because it's where we can make some changes. Is it possible to ensure that the new version of the

---

portal is accessible to the gTLD [inaudible] switching to the new portal if the old one doesn't work? It might mean we won't be able to do things or do not know how to do things.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Maxim, you're breaking up a bit.  
But did you get the gist of the question?

KIM DAVIES: I think I got the essential part.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay.

KIM DAVIES: Yes, we've received some feedback along those lines as well about pretesting and so forth. We don't at this time have a beta program or anything along those lines but are very keen to test the environment as much as possible. I think our strategy here is we'll work individually with certain TLD managers that want to explore that with us.

So I would encourage you to reach out to me, and I can put you in contact with our team so we can set up some time online to talk about what you'd like to do. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. And thanks, Maxim.

---

I see a queue forming. So given the time, we'll cut the queue after Stephanie. Thank you. So Tomslin, you're next.

**TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:** Thanks, Philippe. And hi, Lise, Kim. So like Philippe mentioned, this update was important, but my question was out of what was presented today, I just wanted to check with you especially because I was the Co-Chair from the GNSO to the IANA Function Review Team, so I just wanted to check if you have any update on Recommendations 3 and 4 from that? Thanks.

**KIM DAVIES:** I really have to apologize. I can't recall what 3 and 4 were. If you could remind me.

**TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:** Yeah. 3 required an ICANN bylaw change of Section 18.12(a)(2). This was, if I recall well, regarding just the remedial action procedure, which had a duplication of that in the bylaw. And then Recommendation 4 was the unnecessary requirement of saying that the monthly reports should be setting policies in the IANA contract. Thanks.

**KIM DAVIES:** Thanks for the reminder. Apologies. My understanding is that a package of bylaws changes is being prepared and will be out for public comment next month. So that work has been ongoing behind the scenes, but it is forthcoming.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Stephanie, you're next in the queue.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. We just had a very interesting presentation on Internet presentation in the plenary. And Ram Mohan was saying that, for him, the focus had to be on the seamless, smooth end-user experience. It appears part of the problem with end users is they don't really have a clue about what goes on at ICANN, it seems to me. This is my opinion, anyway. It's certainly not the opinion of the group in general.

Have you thought about ... We really appreciate getting these updates—those of us who don't focus on this stuff on a general basis. It reminds me of what you do. But have you thought at all about the importance of public education? And I do realize that's a huge topic and costs money, and nobody wants to know about until they do, until something goes wrong and they want to know about it. But it does seem that part of ICANN's image problem is that a lot of people are unaware of all the work that is done behind the scenes. So just a quick a thought on that if you have one.

LISE FUHR: I can maybe give it a first go. I think part of the public education is what ICANN does. And I know Kim and the team are doing a lot of educational outreach, too. So we have discussed it in the PTI Board to a great extent, and I think there are some fine lines between what we should do as PTI

---

because we should do anything that is around the technical part but not as much ... The political part is more to ICANN.

But maybe you want to give it a go, Kim.

KIM DAVIES:

I think that's correct. The IANA functions represent really an essential service under the umbrella of ICANN Org, but it's only a part. And insofar as we have an operational role to fulfill, the bulk of our engagement is with our customers that actually utilize the service. But there is a role and greater understanding of the IANA functions generally, the role they serve, the benefits of unique identifiers and consistency and so forth. And that's a mandate shared with the broader ICANN Org. So ICANN Org has a lot of engagement and resources, and we work closely with them to support those efforts—the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, the Technical Engagement Team. They identify opportunities that we can participate in to further understanding of the work that we do. But could we do more? I'm sure we could.

So if folks have ideas on where there's gaps or where there's opportunities to further that understanding, I think we're very receptive to take that input so we can factor it into our planning. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Kim. Thanks, Lise. Thank for this update. I think if, moving forward, that could be reproduced regularly, I think, given the questions that we've had, it wouldn't be a waste of time. Just a suggestion.

---

So with this, I think we can move on with our agenda. The next item is our discussion on the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team and the write-up that was distributed to Council a few weeks ago. As you would remember, the scoping team was initiated in July last year and tasked with four assignments that I think the Chair, Michael, will remind of us in a moment. A project change request was submitted in May to Council and approved. And in the write-up, there were two proposals that relate to the first two assignments, notably a survey and an audit to be sent and collected.

And just two notes as we will go through this discussion. The goal of this is to start the discussion on the next steps, obviously. And the other assignments that will be proceeded by the small team—sorry, I'm still jetlagged to some extent. And moving forward, there will be several options for Council. But I will also—and I think Michael will allude to that—stress the fact that there will be a decision for Council as well on the chairing of that scoping team.

So there's a lot to think of for the future of the scoping team as well what can be read of the results in light of the degree of involvement, I should say, and the contributions that were put to the small team as opposed to the expectations in the first place. And I'm sure Michael will cover that.

So with this, I'll hand it over to you for that update, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Well, thanks for that introduction and introduction to this topic. I believe the report that Council has received is self-explanatory. As I

---

said, we've completed Assignment 1 and 2, and there are a number of recommendations that were included in our report.

As far as next steps, there are some challenges, and I would encourage the Council to read the report and appreciate the challenges that this group dealt with. The first challenge is we were unable to reach an agreement on the definition of accuracy. Now, that's kind of humbling. We have text that discusses it, but the mere fact of defining accuracy was a challenge. We were able to do that, and, again, I'm fortunate, for those who participated, that we were able to complete this.

One of the other challenges that I would ask this Council to do is, while the contracting parties were always there in force, a lot of the non-contracting parties were not, and that created difficulty in times moving forward. And I can appreciate that, though, from the other side. As I said, concurrent with our discussions, there's work going on in NIS2, now Article 23. And it is challenging when members of the ICANN community are spending more time in other fora trying to solve a problem as opposed to trying to solve that problem in ICANN.

When I took this chair, one of the things I did is I cited to the fact that I served as the second chair of ICANN's Working Group B. It was the second working group ever formed within ICANN. I chaired that. I thought I could try to bring back or help invigorate. Unfortunately, I would have to say I failed in that in the fact that I was not able to achieve what I thought I would. And I don't know what I could have done better. And this is something that I think the Council has to look at.



---

Right now, I know there was a lot of discussion about there being a pause. Right now, there are some built-in buffer points. There's going to be a registrar survey that we have proposed be undertaken that gives you some time to reassess next steps. And there is also the potential engagement by the ICANN Org with the European Data Protection Board, which also gives it some additional buffer points.

But, again, I would really call on the Council to take a look in your prioritization of your work and ask yourself, was the original charter drafted in a way that actually was designed to have an outcome to actually drive towards a solution?

And I guess just the last, final point I would leave here is, when I served on the ICANN Board, the chair of the GAC at that time was Sharil Tarmizi. I met Sharil earlier this week and had a discussion with him. And he came to me and he says, "Mike. I just came from the GAC. They're literally talking about the same stuff that they were 15 years ago." And I go, "Sadly, yes." And I don't know what to do because, if we as the multistakeholder model cannot find ways of solving problems and finding a way to move forward, I'm concerned about that.

So with that, I will take any questions that the Council has.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Mike. Before we do, I know that most people would have read the write-up, but I think it'd be good, in addition to the difficulties that the group, for the reasons you gave, had to address, to go through the first two and the suggestions that are put forward for the first two assignments.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Sure. If we can have our ICANN Org colleagues pull that up, that would help. On the screen. Okay, there we go. So basically here, there were two sets of proposals that we were looking at. There was two that involved non-access to underlying registrant data. So, again, this was one of the challenges of GDPR before there was an accuracy report that ICANN used to do periodically. As a result of the GDPR, that was no longer accessible.

So what we've done here is we have talked about looking at a registrar survey. We have started to do some of that work. That was started earlier this week. One of the challenges with this registrar survey is that it is voluntary. So the ability to ask questions that will garner a return are somewhat gated by the registrars. If the group asks questions that they don't like or they don't want to answer, then they don't have to participate. So that's one of the balancing and challenges that we'll have to undertake.

The second was talk about the option of conducting a potential registrar audit. There was some discussion that you will in the report about the use of potential synthetic data as a mechanism to determine the reporting mechanisms. And what was interesting is that Lori Schulman, from the IPC, before she became an attorney, used to work as a bank teller, and one of the things she used to do as a bank teller is the bank would actually put counterfeit bills into her drawer to see if she, as a bank teller, could identify it. It was, if you will, how she was tested.

---

So that was kind of the genesis of what we were looking at trying to use synthetic data to test. Unfortunately, ICANN Org viewed that as potentially problematic. So, again, that is something that's out there. Part of the discussion there is, what else could be done to perhaps look at some type of audit? Again, we ran out of time. Perhaps this is something that the Council or the group, as it continues its work going forward, could look at.

Getting down to the proposals that do require access to data, as I alluded to, right now the ICANN Org has reached out to the European Union for assistance in engaging the European Data Protection Board. That communication was sent. To my knowledge, no response has been received. So, again, that is a potential barrier. And one of the requests that this Council may do is to reaffirm that priority to the ICANN Board to follow forward. But again, as most things within the GNSO, as we all recognize, the GDPR has been impactful in ways that have made a lot of our work and obligations challenging.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Mike, for this update. So as we move into discussion, and just to maybe frame the potential next steps that people may want to think about, there are obviously several possibilities for the future of this group, as well as for the conclusions. The group may consider that we should proceed as planned and then figure out how the position of the chair can be filled but also, in doing so, making sure that that the problems you've highlighted are properly addressed, and make sure that we don't reproduce the same mistakes, as you call them, I think. Council may also decide to pause this and even go as far as reject the

---

first two proposals if they consider that the relationship between the two other assignments is too strong. I just want to throw that out there for Councilors to think about, as well as the potential need for outreach, as I highlighted in the report.

Having said that, I see that Theo, you've got your hand up.

THEO GEURTS:

Thanks. So while I was reading the report, a couple of pointers, comments, and questions popped up. The first one is that the team didn't seem to be able to reach a definition on what accuracy is. And I think that is a little bit worrisome in the sense that, if we want to move forward with this group, without a definition, any work on this will be extremely difficult.

On the survey, it seems more that it is a survey on how registrars verify the data, not in the sense of if accuracy or not. And there's also the issue there or potential issue of how do you get 2,500 registrars to respond? So with any data you will get, there is going to be a lot of different data there. And I'm not sure if we can get anything substantial there or something that is going to help us move forward.

On the audit part, I was a little bit personal about it because, when the WHOIS ARS program was still functioning, we would, on occasion, get notices from ICANN Compliance, where we had to correct the data, but in addition, we had to explain how we were complying with the requirements of the RAA 2013. You had to explain to ICANN Compliance how do you check the telephone format, how do you know it is within the E.164 format? How do you do that?

---

So countless registrars had those questions, and we all had to go through that process. So the survey and the audit ... I think we already have that data. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Theo. To address your point on the definition of accuracy, perhaps I could explain the following. I literally spent a half a day at a library with about 20 dictionaries, looking up the word “accuracy.” And one of the things that was very interesting is that accuracy falls into one of two buckets. One version of the definition of accuracy is “without error.” It’s a very binary decision: is it accurate or inaccurate? The other grouping of definitions views accuracy on a continuum or a scale. And because of those two definitions and how people within the group were interpreting them, it made things very difficult.

Since I will be resigning as Chair, I will perhaps take off my neutral hat and I will offer my opinion. As someone who has spent the last five years involved in the area of identity, I believe that the latter definition about a continuum is probably the better definition. As Thomas will appreciate, under Europe with eIDAS, with identity, it’s low, substantial, high. In the U.S., there’s NIST identity assurance 1, 2, 3. So it’s not a 1 or a 0. It is a continuum scale. And I think that is part of the problem: understanding what accuracy is. And for those that were following the various iterations of Article 23 within NIST, that itself was also reflected.

So that, to me, Theo, is probably one of the biggest challenges.

Regarding an audit, one of the things that we tried to do, and one of the proposals that was floated, was the idea of taking a sampling of data

---

from the DAAR reports. And the thought process was, under a legitimate interest, the fact that the domain name was somehow used in illegal activity would probably be the best case to sample that data. Unfortunately, there was pushback within the registrars about whether that was biased or a full representation, but I do believe there is the opportunity to perhaps engage in an audit that could be done within the legitimate interests under Article 6 of the GDPR.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Mike.

I see Greg is next. Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Mike. So you kind of just touched upon my next question. So the survey and audit are what can be done now, but it seems to me like both of those things would be more effective after DPA agreements are finalized between contracted parties and ICANN and they get feedback, if they can get feedback, from the European Data Protection Board. Does that make sense to you?

MICHAEL PALAGE: As someone who's participating on the negotiating team on behalf of the registries and getting the data processing agreement in place, yes, yes, yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Mike. Thanks, Greg.

---

Any other questions or comment?

Okay. So I'm just going to thank you, Mike, for the update and just point out that, moving forward, not only the substantial elements that Mike highlighted but also the formal aspects of the way the scoping team was built and framed and the expectations that were there in the first place and the disconnect with the commitments from the participants or the proponents of the activity. There may be food for thought for Council when the time comes to determine the future of this exercise. Just want to float that around. It would make sense. And vice-versa. We want to make sure that we have the workload. Talking about prioritization all the time, we want to make sure we have the manpower to address the tasks that have been identified for the scoping team.

So with this—Thomas you had your hand up. I'm sorry.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yes, indeed. And I'd like to make two quick points. Sorry I wasn't fast enough raising my hand in the Zoom room.

The first point is that, while we are looking at the report from the small team and while we're thinking about how this plays out in the long run, I think one important piece of information is that, when we're talking about accuracy and measures that should be taken in order to increase accuracy, we do know by now that roughly 50% of what we see as DNS abuse is actually done via compromised domain names. And if you have compromised domain names, it's perfectly legitimately registered domain names where the hosting is compromised.

---

So we have to bear in mind that, whatever we do strategically, there might be an impact, or there might be less efficiency, in the accuracy work for compromised. And also, if we increase accuracy, that might push perpetrators to do more on compromised domain names. And I had just spoken to a security researcher this morning and he said, “Well, you guys should be thinking hard about what the consequences of what you are doing might be on the actions of the perpetrators.” This is just an additional piece of work while we are discussing this.

And the second point is that I’d like to thank Michael for his hard work as Chair on the small team and the efforts he put into shepherding this group with this difficult and challenging topic. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Thomas. And just to second what you just said, I would say even more so since we knew at the very beginning that the task in and of itself was really challenging, not only because of the workload but also because of the nature. And thank also for highlighting the dependency with the activities around DNS abuse, which is something that we’ve always struggled with. So food for thought for the next Council to determine the future of this Accuracy Scoping Team.

So with this, I think we can move on to the next agenda item, if we could have that on the screen. Thank you. So that’s Item 6, an update on the proposed changes to the GNSO operating procedures as a result of the work of the CCOICI (the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement), the pilot of which was tasked with two things: the update of the working group self-assessment as



---

well as our SOI procedures, which led to proposals for changing our operating procedures. And for this, I'll turn to Olga, as Chair of the CCOICI, for this update. Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Philippe. It took me some time to say CCOICI quickly, but now, after some months, I can handle that. So we have some slides. Thank you, staff, for that.

So if we can go to the next one: CCOICI and GNSO statement of interest taskforce. So for this GNSO framework for continuous improvement pilot, we initiated the work in June 2021 to determine whether the framework could serve as an approach for dealing with the various projects that are focused on improvements to GNSO processes and procedures. And we have two things developed: the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement (CCOICI). Council members participate in, with the assignment of considering if and how the working group self-assessment can be improved and possibly enhanced. And I will show you in minute some suggestions with a periodic assessment as well as exit interviews with interested parties to help identify at an early stage potential issues as well as future improvements to be considered and the GNSO statement for interest taskforce that is consisting of the stakeholder group and constituency representatives. And it tasks the CCOICI to review statements of interest requirements and make recommendations. I will show you more details in a moment. I will go into details.

---

We can go to the next slide, please. So these are proposed updates for the working group self-assessment, which includes updates in Points 1 and 2 that you can see in the blue part in the upper part of the slide, and a new thing, which is a working group self-assessment survey, that I will go in detail into in a moment.

So the proposed updates of the GNSO operating procedures and the GNSO working group charter template are the following. And all this that I'm talking about is up to public comment. So I will go into details in a moment, but you can review in detail all those documents now and comment about them. So the proposed updates reflect the stated objective of the working group self-assessment and inform the chartering organization of potential issues that might need to be immediately addressed in a periodic survey, or for future efforts in a closure survey. The charter is to state if and when a periodic survey and/or closure is expected to take place to provide flexibility and clarity around what would be publicly available and with whom information is shared and permit anonymous responses but with the ability to send a unique link to working group members to ensure that only working group members respond and new and updated questions focused on the performance of working group leadership, Council liaisons, and staff support. These are updates.

And now I will go into details about the working group self-assessment. Thank you for that. So the idea is a periodic survey, with a survey tool, with a new template that would normally be conducted after the publication of the initial report, unless the charter indicates differently or the Council decides another thing. It includes PDP 3.0-proposed

---

survey questions regarding leadership. The Council leadership in consultation with the liaison to the working group may decide to modify the survey if necessary and the set of technical requirements that the survey tool would ideally possess. So these is new—what I told you a minute ago—suggestions to improve the operating procedures.

And can we go to the next slide, please? Please tell me if there are hands because sometimes, I'm not good at looking at that. So proposed updates to the GNSO statements of interest, which is related with the GNSO operating procedures, Annex A, Chapter 6.0 (statement of interest and the statement of interest template).

So the proposed updates are the following: splitting the statement interest into two parts: a general statement of interest, which contains general information about a participant, and the other part is activities-specific statement of interest which provides information specific to the activity that a participant has requested to participate in. And the updates of the statement of interest questions to reflect this split and clarifying questions, including further guidance on how to report on representation in case of professional ethical obligations prevents disclosing names on entity and client.

Can we go to the next one? Thank you. These are some changes related with updating the links and typos and that that have to be done. It's important but it's not a substance to comment on now.

And can we go to the next slide? So these are the different documents that are open for public comments until some day in October. I cannot recall exactly the date. So you can click in the document and go to the

---

public comment website so you can go and review all these documents in detail.

And next steps. So you can go to your constituencies and stakeholder groups and comment about these changes and have the opportunity to comment in the public comment period. There you have the link. In the future, the CCOICI and Statement of Interest Taskforce will consider all the inputs that will be received in the comment period. And Council will consider the proposed updates.

So that's all for the moment. And if there are questions and comments, let me know.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Olga.

Any questions for Olga? Only these two items and the updates that Council will consider sometime by the end of the year or early next year.

Okay. Seeing none—Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI:

I would like to thank all the members who participate in the efforts and of course GNSO staff and especially Marika that have been fundamental for doing all this work. Thank you for that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Olga. And I would add that we must thank you for chairing this and leading the team to this result. I think those two topics are

---

really important. We know the SOI is critical for the quality of our work and credibility of work as well as making sure that we learn moving forward. That's the whole purpose of the working group self-assessment. Thank you for leading this.

Okay. Seeing no questions, we'll move forward with our agenda then and go to Item 7. That's the follow-up to the PDP improvement tracker, the discussion that we started during the SPS and reviewed last Sunday during the working session. And for this, as you would recall, on Sunday we went through, I think, three potential improvements, including the ODP discussions. I'll leave it to you, Marika, who will be leading this. But essentially, the purpose of this discussion is not really to continue here what we started on Sunday but rather determine how we can do it. We won't have time at this meeting to go into the detail of each and every suggested improvement but rather determine whether we need to convene a dedicated session for this.

So with this, Marika, would you like to, well, maybe briefly summarize where we are and offer a few suggestions as to how in the future the next Council can continue this work? Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thank you, Philippe. So indeed we actually sent out, I think, yesterday or the day before the slide deck that the staff support team prepared which basically summarized the results of the survey and, for each of the improvements items, also identified proposed next steps or a slightly modified form to address the input that was received.

---

As we already went through the results, there was, in general, a high level of support for the proposed improvements as well as the proposed next steps, but in some cases, there were some specific suggestions that were made that needed to be factored in or considered. So I think we managed to cover two of those during the meeting on Sunday, but there's still quite a few left. And I think it's a discussion that also we don't want to cut short.

So I think that the conversation here really is about, what is the best way to finish the review of these improvements and the staff support team's suggestions for next steps and then determining whether or not there is support for the Council as well as stakeholder group and constituency leadership to move ahead in the way suggested.

One way could be to just do that through e-mail and ask people to weigh in and see if there are any concerns about the proposed suggestions for moving forward. another approach could be setting up a dedicated call to spend some time going through these items and again trying to assess whether there's concerns about the way we've suggested moving forward.

And again I want to emphasize that all of these proposed next steps really are incremental steps. They don't yet represent any kind of major changes. It's merely taking the next step and moving forward with the improvement, at which time the Council of course will have the ability again to review how that next step was conducted and decide again, do we then move forward with the next step or do we need to take a step back and make changes?

---

Another option would be as well to just put out, for example, the staff support team suggestions in the form of a survey (“Do you agree? Not agree?”) similar to what we did before. And maybe there’s something else that could be done.

So, again, I think this is really a question for the Council: what your expectations are with regards to how to move this to the next step and what will be the most effective way for doing so.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Marika.

Any views on how this piece of work can be further progressed through the SPS or a dedicated session?

I’ll say what my opinions are at this point. I think this piece of work probably requires some thinking. And doing this through e-mail doesn’t seem really feasible. So one working session would be necessary to do this, I think, just to make sure that the comments that were provided in the survey ... And some of them need some thinking because there’s substance in them. So I think that would be useful to do that during a dedicated session.

Any views on this? Or should we take it through with the next leadership for that matter?

Mark?

---

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. Briefly, I've read through the document and found it very interesting. I do think that there is value in us going over this individually. Maybe the space of this meeting is not the most appropriate, as there are some questions that do go in depth in terms of how we would want to react to certain things. So perhaps something for us to schedule individually would be ideal. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Mark. Yeah, that's a thought: maybe going through the next Councilors one by one and collecting inputs would be another way forward if feasible, given the number of Councilors.

Just to thank you, Stephanie, thanks for the inputs in the chat. Some of the low-hanging fruits, as you put it, Stephanie, in the list of improvements to a large extent have been covered, as Jeff said in the chat, too, such as the offer of a presentation to the Board for the curative rights protection for IGOs. Hopefully, those were covered, but maybe there are others.

Next is Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Philippe. I just wanted to check. Do we need to look at the urgency of reviewing this? I know we've received the report, but should we look at the timeline? Is it necessary to do it this week or maybe in a month's time? That's what I'm wondering.



---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. I think it's a good point. What's the urgency for this? I think it really depends overall ... There's some thinking to be done on the structure of this framework, but as to each individual improvement, I think it really depends on the improvement. There are some that are more longer-term, like the leftovers from PDP 3, for example. But others, like the feedback on the ODP, would seem to be quite urgent, given the number of exchanges that we've had over the course of the week.

So I guess, to your question, it really depends on ... But that's also the purpose of having a discussion: to figure out which of those are of higher priority. And there was, I think, some input to the survey to that effect. That's a really good question for the group. Thank you, Tomslin.

Next is Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. To a certain extent, haven't events already taken this one, right? Because we talked a lot this week about having more information at the beginning of PDPs so that we're not surprised with what would become unnecessary ODPs and A's. Wouldn't this just be part of what we're asking for? As I read this, I think that's part of what we would be getting if we got more robust participation in the beginning. So I don't know. We may just want to screenshot this in and throw it in with the other thing because it sounds like it's already overtaken. Yeah, we're already there. Thanks.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Paul.

Marika, I see you just had your hand up. Do you want to respond to that? Let me just give my impression. I think, as a framework, this could stand. You're right that there are things that have been progressed, especially over the course of the last few weeks. It's a question for this group. Is this framework that provides a sort of across-the-board overlook of the potential improvements useful? And how lightweight can we make it? I think that's the purpose. The concern over this being some administrative overhead was raised, and it's a good one. So the question for the group is also, is this useful, or do we want to focus on a subset of this and then move on with those and discard the others? I don't know. It's a good question.

My own personal view is that this is as an entry point, say, as something that would provide a way to have an across-the-board overview of the potential initiatives is a good one for the next Council, then.

Marika, I guess it's to this point. My apologies to John.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Philippe. I just wanted to mention that one of the questions ... I think that may indeed be something where the Council may want to have a look at. Indeed, does this approach work? Is it helpful?

I think Paul was also specifically referring to the improvement we had up that we already did discuss on the liaison guidelines. Indeed, that was an item where work has already been undertaken, and that was

---

identified. So indeed that is one that could potentially be marked as done.

I think there's one other in there where the Council already started with that improvement in relation to offering to the Board a session after the final report is adopted.

So, again, I think for some of these items we've already started doing them in practice. And they were still included in the survey, but I think in practice they are already kind of being rolled out. Of course, there's still then an opportunity at some point for Council then to look back and say, "So was that helpful?"—for example, the guidelines. Have a look at that. Does that cover what you expected? If/when we have that meeting with the Board to brief them on the final report, did that contribute to a better understanding by the Board of what is being recommended? Did that ultimately help as well maybe reduce the time that the Board needs to consider these recommendations? Or are there further enhancements that can be done? Because again I think we're looking here at continuous improvement and not one-off things.

On the other items, I also want to make sure that people really understand that the next steps that are identified are really the low-hanging fruit and just an initial step to see how we can potentially move forward on this while still allowing the Council as well at every point of that step to say, "Okay, hold up. This actually needs more time or needs more attention that we don't have now or we need to plan for it," and that's, for example, items in that third bucket, where we've identified that these are improvement that have been identified and are on the list, which may likely require more work and may also result in changes

---

to existing processes and procedures which automatically triggers more work because that involves public comments, community work. But again, for example, for one of those items, we've said maybe it's helpful if staff maps out first what aspects may be considered as part of such a further review. And again that allows the Council again to have another look at that and say, "Okay, is that really a path we want to embark on, or indeed it's not something for now because we have plenty of other things on our plate?"

So I think it's definitely not about trying to rush through work but it's being able to take incremental steps on these items that have been identified as important and potentially helpful in improving the effectiveness and the efficiency of the PDP and provide for a path and a way of tracking that as well in a very transparent way of doing it.

So I hope that provides a bit of further context and also answers Paul's question.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Marika. That's very helpful. And I see there were inputs in the chat as well to include this in the SPS and wrap this up.

Next and last is John.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks. Looking through the paper, it looks like a few of the modifying consensus policies ... Like, that's the biggest bucket of work that may left to do. And we do have a small team on that, although a number of items that that small team have been completed. But maybe taking a

---

look at what's left over, it looks like it might be just receiving some forms and things like that from staff and making sure that, when we do a PDP, we're actively looking at what consensus policies could be impacted by that new work. But I might encourage us to take a look at what's over there and reengage the small team if we need to finish up work.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, John. So food for thought for the next leadership and the next Council: to take that over and hopefully wrap this up, as was said in the chat.

With this, I think we can close this item and move on to the next one, which is our discussion on the WHOIS disclosure system. Just looking at the clock, we're running behind schedule, so maybe—just a thought for Sebastien on the SCBO discussion—given the importance of the work on the WHOIS disclosure system or the urgency, say, we want to accommodate what was originally planned. So with this, over to you, Sebastien, for the update on the small team.

Just maybe to recap for those who haven't followed, the small team met on Saturday. They were provided with the design paper from staff. There's been a number of exchanges this week with the Board within a number of SG/Cs, not only with the representatives to Council but also with the Board on the need to review and make a decision on this proof of concept and WHOIS disclosure system or whatever term we may have to use now. So I think Council will need to understand the remit of what is proposed here and what isn't proposed in this and also

---

understand the prerequisites for this to be a success in terms of collecting data that would be representative of the issue at hand and eventually make a decision and respond/answer that question put forward by the Board as to whether they have the sign-off to these by Council.

So with this quick summary, over to you, Sebastien, for this.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Philippe. So as Philippe said, the small team—actually the whole community because it was published on a blog—received the paper from staff last week on Tuesday. I tried to work with staff to get this report out early as possible before the meeting, fearing that it would land on people’s laps as they were traveling to Malaysia, which doesn’t make it very easy. But it was pretty clear that it was going to come only a few days before the meeting, which always makes it a bit difficult.

We did have a meeting with staff that presented the report in broader details on Saturday morning. The small team had similar meetings, actually, with them in July and in August to review their progress. And that was broadly in line with what we had seen. The report is thorough. They did a huge amount of work. It’s thorough and detailed, for those who have read it. And there are a number of details that emerged last week, particularly on Saturday when we discussed that all, which I’d like right here, given the time that we have, not to get into.

We have a small team meeting that has been organized in the last few days for tomorrow, and we will spend an hour to go deeply into these

---

things. The small team's people present will be there. They confirmed. I have confirmation from Becky Burr that she at least will be there and possibly others and obviously from staff to answer questions. So I think we'll be able to progress then.

Essentially, again, the report describes what in broad lines we've asked them to produce in May/June, and that is a scope for a tool that is essentially a ticketing system to propose to the broad public a centralized intake system for requests that goes and bridges those requests—well-formed requests in the sense that the the system is a template and a form that asks the right questions in order to be able to have all the information necessary for a registrar to take a learned decision on their ability to disclose the requested information or not and then respond to the requester. It is not the entirety of the SSAD that had accreditation and other topics that we decided early on not to pursue in this test phase. But again, the devil is in the details. Some if not most of those details came last week, and we still are digesting them.

Now, in parallel, there has been, starting a bit earlier than when we received the report, strong hints from ICANN leadership for us to take the opportunity of a quick decision on this. And bear with me. I'll caveat. Should we be able to take a decision to proceed with this in the next month—so by our October meeting; and I'm only giving back the hints I've received as I've received them—this work could be scheduled for the beginning of the year, 2023. It would give enough time for staff to ramp up what they need to ramp up before starting to actually to do the

---

dive in earnest. And they would be able to complete that then in, let's say, the first nine or ten months of 2023.

Just to be very plain and clear, the idea here from what I understand is to do this fast because there would be a bandwidth to do it. And that later work coming online including SubPro work and others might enter in conflict if we were to delay this, let's say another six months.

So, again, I'm repeating this, but it is a factor that the small team will have to look into. And again, we are meeting tomorrow, we are also prepared to organize and we'll discuss that tomorrow a schedule before the 10th of October, which is the deadline to submit to the Council to have a response formed. And then we'll see where we go with this. And I don't want to preempt there.

We also had a request, not a formal but a request from Becky Burr on behalf of the Board to make sure that in our response to the Board, we are very clear about what we're asking them to approve in the sense that it's not a, "Yes, go with it and then take your responsibility for it." The Board would want us to, in our instructions or in our response to them, to say yes or no. But if it's a yes, yes, we understand that this is what we're getting, these are the features that we're getting, this is what we're not getting. And just to be very clear about it so that they can be very clear also to Org when they ask them to proceed with the development. I have a feeling that there's a need here for a shared responsibility. And this is not about just passing the ball on, but working together there, which is—and reflects the way we've been working for months on this project. I think that covers the point I wanted to give you, and I'm very open for questions now. And I see Marie.



---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Yeah, please handle the queue. Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. Hi, Sebastien. Looks like you've got nicer weather than we do. Wish I was joking. I'm not. Firstly, I'd like to shout out a massive vote of thanks to you personally, because I know how much work you've put into this. Obviously to all of the small team and obviously to staff.

None of us have managed to digest all of the report yet. We only had it since the weekend. Some very useful things in there, obviously. Was really interested from my perspective—Now I have to see my personal perspective. The BBC, like everyone else, hasn't yet had time to completely corral thinking on this. But when I listened to the points about speed, one of the things that strikes me is if we go fast to do something that won't be very useful, we're going to go fast to do something tying up resources for something that's not very useful. And I don't think any of us want to go down that road. That's what we were talking about at the weekend.

I really appreciated Becky's comments yesterday when she was talking about the logging of requests. There's also, to my mind, a very practical thing that if we are setting up this ticketing system so that the end result is we have data that we can use, then we actually need usable data. So to my mind, we want to log the requests that come in, all of them. I would also love to see all registrars and registries actually using this. Why? So the data is actually usable at the end of it.

---

I was also really happy to hear Becky talking about privacy proxy, some aspects of that being rolled in. Again, going back to our conversation at the weekend. So I think if I can tie it, what I'm trying to say is when the small team do get together, can you please not just look at the fact that we need to get this done, pronto? We need to get something usable, practical, beneficial done, pronto. Thanks very much.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks, Marie. This is obvious. Thank you very much for saying it. I'm absolutely in full agreement. There's no reason or need to rush into something that won't be useful and what we need.

Again, I'm only reflecting what I've heard and what's been said to me. If usefulness requires a substantial redefinition of what was given to us—and to be honest, if I reflect what I've heard is any redefinition of whatever is given to us, I think there will need to be. But if it requires a—we will then not be able to start immediately and have to ask staff again to review the definition. So again, we then will find ourselves conflicting with other work. But all this is understood, I believe, by the small team, certainly understood by me, and we will have to balance it. And I fully agree with you. We're not running to get something that is not useful. I see still your hand up, Marie, but I believe that's an old one. And I will pass it on to Manju.

MAJU CHEN:

Thank you. I just sent an email to the list yesterday about how the CCWP human rights, the human rights impact assessment of SSAD and the ODA. And I thought it could be a good reference when the small team

---

carries on its discussion whenever you are trying to look at it, and just use it anytime you feel like it. Yeah, that was it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you very much for the quick plug. I saw that. To be honest, I started looking at it, but I haven't read through it. But it will definitely be read and taken into account. If I understand well, it's an assessment on the SSAD, the policy, the original documents, so there will be probably chunks and pieces that don't fit anymore where we're at. But we will use it as it best works for where we're at now. Thank you. I see Greg's hand.

GREG DIBIASE:?

I don't want to dive into substance here. But just because we're on the topic of timing, I think it's worth noting that something that came up in the Registrar Stakeholder Group is that registrars have kind of more specific operational questions and a number of registrars have struggled with the name service portal functionality in the past. So we've requested ICANN staff to have a more dedicated session with registrars that they can kind of walk through this on a more granular level, just to make sure that it makes sense with us. And then I think that also goes to the goal of wider spread adoption. So I think I'm just flagging that as something that will have to happen for at least on our side to move forward that a more dedicated, kind of operational session between ICANN staff and registrars.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Greg, that seems to be a good move. It's definitely important to do all we can to get most all the majority of registrars on board. It's very much key to the success of this thing. Just very quickly for the small team. I will note that Greg reached out to me and will be joining the small team on behalf of Sarah, tomorrow, as she's not present in Kuala Lumpur. Kurt, I see your hand up.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Seb. So, I don't know where to start. But I see this as sort of a high-risk project. Not with respect to implementability, because that's straightforward. But if we build it, it may or may not be used. There's a probability that data seekers will use the same method as before and it may or may not point to additional features that might be useful.

And so the utility of this \$3 million investment is questionable. And how do you make that investment decision? It's the Board that balances all these investment opportunities and decides which ones are the most valuable to the ICANN community and the multi stakeholder model and all that stuff. I don't think we're the ones that can really make that balancing decision.

So while I know we're on the hook to make a recommendation, then the real politic is if we approve it, so will the Board. I think that the report should indicate the risks that we see in that, that there's a \$3 million investment and here's why that might not pay off, even if perfectly implemented. I think the report should include something to that effect.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that. Just for reference, and just for clarity, you're absolutely right, we're talking about a \$3 million investment. You're absolutely right. It's not for us to decide. We don't have the purse strings here. The Board does. I just want to note—and for everybody to remember—that the original exercise was vastly more costly. And vastly more costly in terms of out-of-pocket costs. We're talking about \$3 million. That is heavily weighted on internal costs, sunk costs, costs that are already incurred by ICANN. It's staff, IT maintenance, stuff that they're already spending, but that is allocated to this project. And so yes, there is a risk. Yes, it is a project that we're allocating time and resources on. But we are a world away from where we were. This said, I'm going to wrap it up. I've got messages saying that I'm spending too much time. So small team, see you tomorrow. I will be there even though there's conflicts with other agenda items. And we will continue talking about this. Thank you very much for everybody.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Sebastien. Thanks to the small team for their hard work. And just to wrap up, the expectation, as I understand them from Council, the small team will meet tomorrow and in the course of the next few days, to document their understanding of the remit of that ticketing system, both in terms of what it does and what it doesn't do, including identifying the question marks on the way as well as the risks associated with it in the spirit of, as you said, Sebastien, sharing the responsibility on this as the cooperative nature of that work suggests, with an expectation of having guidance from the small team between now and say three weeks to make a decision at the next Council call in

---

October, as the Council sees fit, obviously. I hope that that summarizes the discussion. So with this, thanks again, Sebastien, thanks to the small team.

we'll move on to the next item, mindful of time. The next is the update from the UA steering group. And we have Ajay Data as the chair. Welcome, Ajay, for this update. The floor is yours.

AJAY DATA:

Thank you, Philippe, thank you, GNSO, for inviting. Universal acceptance is a very important topic. And we have something very exciting to share with all of you. And just to start my meeting with thank you to GNSO for having a liaison officer with us who is Christian who is here with me right now sitting. He is there for any queries you might have after my presentation. He is the one person to go to and get this thing resolved. Thank you for appointing him to have better and smoother communication among us. Next slide please.

So, we are going to cover this. I have a very short time, but I will try to speed up as much as possible. [And so I knew not to worry about translation I don't see happening.] So we are going to talk these UA awareness working groups, why it matters for all of us, a UA day and some meetings which we already have covered and are going to be there in ICANN 75. Next slide please.

So universal acceptance is a very simple vision: all domain names and all email addresses must be accepted equally in all software applications. It's a very simple thing if we see it that way, but there are challenges which we are going to cover. Why we should do it? Because

---

it has an impact to bring next billion people online. And it provides a choice of a consumer to select a domain name of his choice, improve competition, and provide broader access to the end user. And this is the impact which we wish to bring while we are saying to our vision that we need to have all the domain names and email addresses must be accepted in all software applications. This group was formed in 2015, with the initiative to address universal acceptance issue, and advocate and engage with stakeholders to make all the applications UA ready. Next slide, please

So it's a very important slide, my favorite slide to summarize the entire universal acceptance issue with this slide. The slide covers everything. So when I said that all the domain names and all our email addresses must be accepted equally, you can see certain examples of domain names and certain examples of email addresses in front of you.

These are the domain names which I'm referring to when I say that they are not accepted well. And let me tell you a small reason why. When the Internet started, and when the .com got delegated way back in 1995, and then .net, .org and so on and so forth, everybody thought—at least the programmers thought—that these are the only top-level domain names, seven of them. And this is how they programmed their softwares, to validate whether there's an input entry and a valid top-level domain name or not.

And they also presumed that these could be only three characters after the dot, like .com. So if you see .com, .net, .org, they gave an impression, though it was not guidance, it was not a best practice. But it was presumed by the developers that this is how the validation should be.

That was fine, till ICANN started issuing top-level domain names less than three characters or more than three characters. And this is an example. .sky, for example. If it comes—obviously, it is not the in the list of original seven top level domain names, and some websites reject them. We call them new short top-level ASCII domain names to specify a category.

Second-level [inaudible] long top-level domain names, which means you could have a domain name or a top-level domain name for up to 64 characters after the dot, which means you could have 64 characters instead of .com. So softwares started rejecting them, and not validating them as a valid domain name.

And the third category, which is an IDN domain name, do not have any ASCII character. So obviously, when it was in the initial times, all the .com, .net were in ASCII characters. So this validation was also done on that side, that it could be only ASCII string in a domain name when we are typing in. But the world changed. And these kinds of domain names started coming in.

This introduced the complication of the email side also, because domain names would have the email addresses, and email addresses have different combinations. And these combinations start coming in where you could have the Unicode mailbox name or ASCII mailbox name and a Unicode domain name, so on and so forth. There are examples in front of you.

But I would like to tell you that the second last, Unicode at IDN is my real Hindi email address. If you can copy and paste from your



---

presentation and try to send me an email address, you will actually test your software application whether you are you're ready or not.

And another last example is script which moves from right to left. So for example, if I come to your website—you all are technical people, you must be working in a company or you own a company, and you have a website. And if you have a form where I can contact you, and I provide you my email id in Hindi, will I be able to type in?

If I can type in, the five pillars come into the discussion now. If I can type in on your website, the accept gets ticked off, it means you accept it. Can you validate it as a valid email address? Can you process it for the purpose I'm registering there? Can you store it in your database well? And can you display it back whenever it's required?

If your website does these five things with my email address, you are UA ready. If not, obviously, there is a problem in the website. It's a bug which needs to be resolved. UA readiness is not there on the website.

This means, if you go back on my previous slide, if you say that it does not allow me to come on your site, It has the next billion people who are going to have their own email addresses in the language of their choice will not be able to become your customer, will not be able to join your services. And that is the reason we talk about universal acceptance of all email addresses on all domain names. Next slide.

So this is the slide which tells you the status of email acceptance by the top websites globally. We do this survey every two years and you can see that things have not moved well. Things are very good for ASCII domain names, quite better, we are at least you can see 80% and below

---

100%, at least 90% somewhere. So some websites still do not support newer short ASCII or long ASCII.

But for IDNs, where the ASCII character is not there, they are in a very bad state, which is where the Internet is moving, to have IDNs worldwide, and people will have email addresses. And these email addresses are not accepted on the global websites. Hence global service providers, it is important to address this issue and be aware that we need to address this issue whenever we are making softwares or procuring softwares so that the next customers who are bringing next billion people online, who are bringing their own email addresses in their own language are accepted in your systems which we are trying to make them ready. Next slide please.

So this is little bit awareness because if you see these faces around, I'm the Chair of universal acceptance. I have a vice chair, Abdalmonem Galila who is now the GAC member also, and UASG vice chair, Pavanaja. And you can see these faces. Edmon, there's Mark, Anil Jain, Satish Babu, and Nabil there. And I just said Edmon. He is a Board member now who was previously vice chair of the UASG. Next slide, please.

So these faces I'm showing you so that you know if you meet these faces, they are all available. We have the local initiatives. And it's a very interesting thing, which we would like to also say if you'd like to initiate a local initiative in your own region.

Local initiative means UASG tie up with a group of volunteers in a particular region and sign a memorandum of understanding with them, and an initiate with the local initiative in that region to promote UA. We

---

also support with knowledge, we also support with finances and see that UA in that region gets supported well. So these are the four leaders whom you can think. And one leader is not there, who is from Sri Lanka we recently agreed to. And Sri Lanka local initiative is also starting. We have some leaders here in this room. Sarika is here on the right side. Anawin is here from Thailand. We are all here in this. Next slide, please.

So these are our working groups, and the structure we have. And just to tell you, we had a meeting with the UASG organizing team. And we gave already ambassadorship to Göran Marby, and with a simple request that whenever you go and speak, please talk about universal acceptance in the global forums. And this is also here the same request from global leaders, that wherever you go, please talk about the UA leadership there.

This is the structure through which we work. All information is available in the presentations and you will be able to contact us at any point of time. We have no rejection policy, anybody volunteers, we accept him and we work with him as close as possible. Next slide, please.

Let's talk about the UA Day. That's an important reason, one of the important reasons I am here with you. UA Day, we are going to celebrate on 16th of February. We decided that this is the day we will celebrate every year from now on. This day is going to celebrate the universal acceptance. And here is my appeal and here's my request, what you can do.

You could pick up your region and do something around UA on 16th of February, or if you cannot, please block your calendar and join a UA

---

session in some part of the world. You could plan any session you want. Universal acceptance group is planning the content from 15 minutes to the prerecorded videos to the two-day workshop. We have everything. Whatever you are interested, UASG will support you with that content, with probably a speaker if you require, but we would request you to do something. This is not just one person's job or one team job of the UASG. This is for all of us to bring next billion people online. There's the reason this UA Day is. And there's the quest to listen this and take of this, take this agenda in your meeting and decide something around it. Next slide, please.

That's our request. If any one of you individually has a plan to do something on UA, please send an email to info at uasg.tech. And otherwise, we are going to soon have a template for your proposals, which is going to be available on UASG.tech website, which you can fill and send. We are almost welcoming everyone, we will accept everyone. And we will try to make a huge difference in UA perspective in the whole word on 16th of February 2023. Next slide, please.

These are the events. I think I'm already there with you on 21st. We had already had ccNSO event. Tomorrow is the UA Planning Day. If you would like to participate and understand more about UA Day, please participate tomorrow. It's already listed in the ICANN schedule, please join that session, and you will be able to take it from there and understand more deeper around it 3:00 PM tomorrow, local time. Next slide please.

And that's all from my side. This is the slide which tells you how to get involved with the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, website, social

---

media, email addresses, hashtag, whatever you think is the easiest medium for you. Please get connected. We will be very happy to communicate with you and take it further. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ajay. I think we've got time for one question. Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. Brief comment. As somebody who has spent the past five years and change doing universal acceptance statistical and code analysis, the thing that I think the most about is everybody's talking about the new round of domains and the excitement for it. But the question is, we are still not done with making the previous ones work. Do we really want to do this again, without having made even the first ones work? This is the question that is always on my mind.

So maybe it's time we make a push, maybe it's time that the community, if there is really that much interest in new domains, maybe it is time everybody gets together and realize that it is not just about IDNs. Even if you don't care about IDNs, we still have three-letter new top-level domains not working in simple email providers. This is 2022. These were implemented in 2012. Bit of a question of why aren't we more on the ball about this. And at the same time, keep discussing new domains. Thank you very much.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Mark, for your comment. I think what I would suggest is that people would have question—mindful of time and the short agenda—would get back to—there were good questions in the chat from Jeff as to the concrete actions that people could take on that day in February next year. Maybe there could be some information shared on the Council list on this, what actions people can take both within the community as well as outside. That'd be good. And certainly, people can reach out to Ajay.

AJAY DATA: Thank you for this opportunity. And you have your man inside from UASG that's Christian who has a great experience. I think this is very smooth information flow, which could be very easily available if we use this channel. And of course, the leadership is also available, every resource is available, but we can have more smooth movement into the UASG. As Mark has said a very valid point. If we do not let the old domain names work, what we are discussing as a policy for new TLD rounds may be not as great, useful, because there is a problem in acceptance. So this is our duty to have that acceptance problem solved everywhere so nobody has a doubt whether the new top-level domain name I will get for, spent millions of dollars, will work or not. This is a very important point.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ajay. Yeah, good points. The two of them. For the liaison, thanks, Christian, for stepping forward for this and we'll get in touch. As well as the data that you provided on your slide and the fact that

---

whatever we come up with for SubPro, your first two lines show that the impact might be limited. Thanks again, Ajay, Christian, for the presentation.

We will now come back to the agenda. So mindful of time, we're now reaching the end, pretty much, of the time that was allotted to us. On any other business, I would just note for the first point that following the update on the call for interest for the GAC liaison, we had an exchange on the list as well as a conversation during the informal Council session on Monday, and our suggestion from leadership would be to be consistent with—for the current liaison with the update on the call for interest, i.e. that overall, the term would be four years, which means that the call for interest would be launched by 2024. So in two years from now. That's the proposal from leadership for the record.

So with this, I think we will defer the update on the SCBO given the time that we've got left, and move on to point three. So this is the time of our farewell to the outgoing councilors, people who've been around for a while now. Count me in. Flip Petillion, Juan-Manuel Rojas, Maxim Alzoba, Olga Cavalli and myself. And I'm sure I would be speaking on their behalf. It's been a pleasure to be with Council for all these years, a pleasure and an honor to serve the community. And I others I'm sure will be hanging around and remain committed to the community and looking forward to the next steps. So thank you. Jeff, you have your hand up.

---

**JEFFREY NEUMAN:** Yeah, thanks. I just want to express—I know I'm a liaison. But I'm going to take this opportunity just to thank Philippe. For those of you that have been in leadership of the GNSO Council—and I did it about a decade ago—it is really tough work. And it really takes up a lot of your time. Much more time than you would even imagine. And I think Philippe has done an amazing job these last two years, as well as Tomslin as vice chair, and Greg. I think we're going to miss your leadership, Philippe, and just want to express our appreciation. Thanks.

**PHILIPPE FOUQUART:** Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. And to this, obviously, I'm really thankful to Tomslin and Sebastien for the work we did together this year. I do want to associate Pam and Tatiana, who were with me, the leadership team last year. It was tough times for everyone, not only for ICANN, but this succession of virtual sessions have has been trialing for a number of us, and also because of our individual situations. So I do want to associate Pam and Tatiana in those thanks. Sebastien.

**SEBASTIEN DUCOS:** Just wanted to say that staff and everybody prepared the slide deck that you have behind you. I assume you will receive it too. And to reiterate what Jeff said, I thank you very much for your leadership as chair but also in the leadership in the small L leadership. It was fantastic working together, working with you this year. I'm very thankful. You're putting a very high bar for me. But it's been great. Thank you very much.



---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Likewise. Thanks a lot for this. And that gives me the opportunity to conclude with thanks for staff. I'm not going to name names because you know who you are. I would be so afraid to forget one name, which I'm accustomed to doing. So you know who you are, the policy staff and the support staff as well. There's nothing we could do without you. My apologies for [punting] AIs that I'm sure I still have on our bucket list. But there we are, there's only so much we can do. So thanks, everyone, for these two years, and more generally, for these five years. Thank you. And with this, I think—Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: From staff's side, we actually have a gift for you. Unfortunately, I don't have it in our hand, but we have it on the slide. So this is a personalized clock for you. And actually, Terri, do you have [additional info] about this clock? But anyway, this is our gift, and you will receive it very soon. But I want to just show you on the picture.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ariel. Much appreciated. And the fact that is sort of a virtual gift is telling for those two years. So at this point, at least—and I'm sure it's going to turn into something more concrete when I get it by the post. So thanks again. Joking apart, it's been a privilege to work with you all during these two years. So with this, meeting adjourned, and we'll welcome the new council within—shall we start on time, I guess? Should we say 10 minutes? Because we were lagging behind. Okay, we'll do that in 10 minutes then. 10-minute break. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**