

## Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 17 November 2022

### [Agenda](#) and [Documents](#)

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 17 November 2022 at 05:00 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/eff6e79n>

(Wednesday) 21:00 Los Angeles; (Thursday) 00:00 Washington DC; 05:00 London; 06:00 Paris; 08:00 Moscow; 16:00 Melbourne

#### **List of attendees:**

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Anne Aikman Scalese

#### **Contracted Parties House**

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Antonia Chu, Theo Geurts, Greg DiBiase,

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Kurt Pritz, Sebastien Ducos,

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Miloshevic

#### **Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo , Mark Datysgeld, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, John McElwaine, Susan Payne

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Manju Chen, Wisdom Donkor, Farrell Folly, Stephanie Perrin, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Tomslin Samme-Nlar,

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady

#### **GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:**

Justine Chew – ALAC Liaison

Jeffrey Neuman– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer

#### **Guest speakers:**

Leticia Castillo, Amanda Rose, Jamie Hedlund, ICANN Compliance

Olga Cavalli, Chair of the CCOICI

#### **ICANN Staff**

David Olive – Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional (apologies)

Mary Wong – Vice President, Strategic Policy Management

Marika Konings - Vice President Policy Development Support

Julie Hedlund – Policy Development Support Director

Steve Chan – Senior Director, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations

Berry Cobb – Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support

Emily Barabas – Policy Development Support Senior Manager (GNSO)

Ariel Liang – Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Specialist (GNSO)

Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Policy Development and Operations Support (GNSO)

[Zoom recording](#)

[Transcript](#)

### **Item 1. Administrative Matters**

### 1.1 - Roll Call

### 1.2 - Statements of Interest

There were no updates to the Statements of Interest.

### 1.3 - Review / Amend Agenda

The agenda was accepted as presented. **Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, noted items had been added to AOB.

### 1.4 - Note the status of minutes for the previous Council meetings per the GNSO Operating Procedures:

Minutes of the GNSO Council meeting on 21 September 2022 [part 1](#) and [part 2](#) were posted on 15 October 2022.

[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council meeting on 20 October 2022 were posted on 04 November 2022.

#### Action items:

- None

### **Item 2. Opening Remarks / Review of Projects and Action List:**

No time assigned for this item. **Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, reminded councilors of the importance of the Project Management Portfolio and encouraged councilors to view the [recording](#) available on the topic.

#### Action items:

- 

### **Item 3. Consent Agenda:**

The Consent Agenda had two items listed:

- Acknowledgment of John McElwaine to serve as Council liaison to the Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Implementation Review Team (IRT)
- Acknowledgment of the Expedited PDP on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) [Project Change Request](#) (PCR)

Councilors present on the call voted in favor of all Consent Agenda items.

#### [Vote results](#)

#### Action Items:

- Staff on behalf of Council leadership to communicate to GDS staff the GNSO Council's acknowledgement of John McElwaine to serve as Council liaison to the Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) Implementation Review Team (IRT).
- Policy support staff to update the IDNs-EPDP Team's project plan, timeline, and other materials according to the Project Change Request (PCR), and post them on the EPDP wiki project space.

#### **Item 4. COUNCIL VOTE- Whois Disclosure System Next Steps**

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, seconded by **Thomas Rickert, ISPCP**, submitted a [motion](#) for Council to accept the EPDP Phase 2 small team findings and recommendations as outlined in the [addendum](#).

WHEREAS,

1. Following the delivery by ICANN org of the [System for Standardized Access/Disclosure \(SSAD\) Operational Design Assessment](#) (ODA), the GNSO Council [formed](#) the EPDP Phase 2 small team which was [tasked](#) to provide the GNSO Council with its feedback on:
  - Whether the ODA has correctly interpreted the intent of the SSAD recommendations in the proposed implementation;
  - Whether the ODA has overlooked any key aspects of the SSAD recommendations that should be factored in by the ICANN Board when it considers the recommendations;
  - Its view on the concerns identified by the ICANN Board and potential options that could be considered, either in the form of changes to the proposed implementation or the policy recommendations themselves, to address these concerns (note, these are expected to be high level suggestions at this stage);
  - Any other aspects that help inform the Council's deliberations and consultation with the ICANN Board.
2. The small team delivered its [preliminary report](#) to the GNSO Council on 4 April 2022.
3. Following its review of the preliminary report, the GNSO Council [requested](#) that the ICANN Board direct ICANN org "to proceed with further developing the SSAD Light Design" while pausing the consideration of the SSAD recommendations.
4. ICANN org published the [Whois Disclosure System Design Paper](#) on 13 September 2022 and presented it to the small team during its sessions ([#1](#) and [#2](#)) at ICANN75.
5. The small team reviewed the Whois Disclosure Design Paper and provided its feedback and recommendations on how to proceed to the GNSO Council on 7 November 2022 in the form of an addendum to its Preliminary Report.
6. The GNSO Council, as the manager of the GNSO policy development process, reviewed and considered the addendum in light of the potential impacts on the SSAD.
7. Although it is not the role of the GNSO Council to approve or not approve moving forward with operational proof of concepts, the Council is supportive of efforts such as this one that can provide additional data to the ICANN Board in deciding whether or not to approve the SSAD recommendations outlined in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report.

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, highlighted the friendly [amendment](#) suggested by **Greg DiBiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, on behalf of the RrSG, accepted by Sebastien, the motion submitter.

Before the vote took place, several councilors intervened:

**Susan Payne, IPC**, requested that a [statement](#) on behalf of the IPC be included in the record during the vote.

**Kurt Pritz, RySG**, asked for clarification on the friendly amendment. **Greg DiBiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, replied that whilst the RrSG is in favor of the work proceeding, given this is out of the usual policy development process framework, it wished to confirm that this is a vote on process and not on policy substance.

**Stephanie Perrin, NCSG**, expressed appreciation for Greg's clarification, and requested to double check the updated motion language. The updates were confirmed by both submitter and seconder of the motion.

All councilors voted in favor of the motion.

#### [Vote results](#)

#### Action Items:

- The GNSO Secretariat transmits the EPDP Phase 2 small team findings and recommendations as outlined in the addendum to the ICANN Board.
- On behalf of the GNSO Council the GNSO Secretariat thanks the EPDP Phase 2 small team for its work and requests it to remain available to continue work on this topic as part of the next steps in this process which aims to inform the further consideration of the SSAD recommendations by the ICANN Board.

#### **Item 5. COUNCIL VOTE - Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team (RDA ST) - Assignments #1 (Enforcement and Reporting and #2 (measurement of Accuracy) Write Up**

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, seconded by **Thomas Rickert, ISPCP**, submitted a [motion](#) to accept Registration Data Accuracy Team recommendations for assignments 1 and 2.

WHEREAS,

1. The GNSO Council adopted [a proposal](#) on 21 October 2020 which recommended that a Scoping Team addresses the effects of GDPR on Registration Data accuracy requirements and the Whois Accuracy Reporting System (ARS), stating, "a scoping team would be tasked to, 'facilitate community understanding of the issue; assist in scoping and defining the issue; gather support for the request of an Issue Report, and/or; serve as a means to gather additional data and/or information before a request [for an Issue Report] is submitted'.
2. On 4 November 2020, GNSO SG/Cs as well as ICANN SO/ACs were informed of the Council's intent to form a Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team and were requested to indicate if they would be interested in sending representatives to this effort.
3. At the same time, the GNSO Council also requested that ICANN org develop a briefing document that outlines both (i) existing accuracy requirements and programs and (ii) the corresponding impact that GDPR has had on implementing / enforcing these requirements and programs. This [briefing paper was](#) delivered to the Council in February 2021.
4. Following the Council discussion of the ICANN org briefing paper in April 2021, Council leadership put together a first proposal outlining possible instructions to the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team.
5. As a result of input that was provided by different Council members on the first proposal, the Council decided at its May 2021 meeting to form a small team to further review and revise the instructions to the scoping team.
6. The small team, consisting of one Council member from each GNSO Stakeholder Group or Constituency, two NomCom appointed Council members and the GNSO Liaison to the GAC (as

an observer), submitted its recommendations in relation to the formation as well as the instructions for the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team to the Council on [9 July 2021](#) for Council's consideration.

7. The GNSO Council confirmed the formation of the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team and its instructions during its meeting on 22 July 2021.
8. The GNSO Council confirmed the Chair for the Scoping Team during its meeting on 23 September 2021.
9. The Scoping Team started its deliberations on 5 October 2021 focusing its efforts on assignments #1 (enforcement and reporting) and #2 (measurement of accuracy).
10. The Scoping Team delivered its [write up](#) for assignments #1 and #2 to the GNSO Council on 5 September 2022.
11. The GNSO Council was briefed on the write up and its recommendations during the [Council meeting](#) at ICANN75 and continued its deliberations during its [October Council meeting](#).

RESOLVED,

1. The GNSO Council adopts recommendation #3 of the write up which recommends 1) pausing the work in relation to proposals that require access to registration data, 2) encouraging ICANN org to proceed with their outreach to the EDPB as well as the Data Protection Impact Assessment in connection with the scenario(s) in which the request and processing of registration data takes place as a matter of urgency, and 3) requests that ICANN org and Contracted Parties finalize the negotiations on the Data Processing Agreement (DPA) as soon as practicable as the absence of a completed DPA may act as a roadblock for policy work before Council.
2. The GNSO Council defers consideration of recommendations #1 and #2 until such time the DPA negotiations between ICANN org and Contracted Parties have completed and there is feedback from ICANN org on if/how it anticipates the requesting and processing of registration data will be undertaken in the context of measuring accuracy, or for six months, whichever is the shorter.
3. Once the DPA negotiations are completed and the feedback referred to at paragraph 2 is received from ICANN org, the GNSO Council will review the [formation and instructions](#) to the Scoping Team to ensure these are still fit for purpose and request the Scoping Team to further consider potential proposals that require access to registration data as well as how these impact the existing recommendations #1 and #2 (e.g. should these still be considered by the GNSO Council for adoption, or in the context of proposals that require access to registration data these may no longer be relevant or a priority?). If, after 6 months from this resolution, the DPA negotiations are not completed and/or the required feedback referred to at paragraph 2 has not been provided by ICANN org, Council will discuss and determine whether or not to continue deferring the consideration of recommendations #1 and #2.
4. Taking into account the delay with which the write up was delivered, as well as some of the challenges that were shared with the Scoping Team's Chair during his briefing to the Council, Council leadership will reach out informally to Scoping Team members to better understand the issues encountered to help inform the Council's review of the formation and instructions.
5. Council leadership is requested to send a communication to ICANN org in relation to recommendation #3 (as well as Contracted Parties in relation to the DPA) as well as communicate the Council's decision to non-GNSO groups participating in this effort (ALAC, GAC and SSAC) as well as the Scoping Team.

6. The GNSO Council thanks Michael Palage, outgoing Chair, and Olga Cavalli, outgoing Council liaison, for their efforts. As part of its review of the formation and instructions to the Scoping Team, the Council will consider next steps for finding new leadership for this effort.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, reminded Council of the background to the motion and that **Susan Payne, IPC**, had suggested [amendments](#) which had been accepted as friendly.

**Mark Datysgeld, BC**, asked that a [statement](#) on behalf of the BC be included in the motion vote results.

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, on the topic of NIS2, as raised in the BC statement, noted that a webinar will be organized shortly on the topic. This was welcomed by several councilors in the chat.

All councilors present on the call vote in favor of the motion.

[Vote results](#)

#### Action Items:

- Council leadership will reach out informally to Scoping Team members to better understand the issues encountered to help inform the Council's review of the formation and instructions.
- Council leadership to send a communication to ICANN org in relation to the GNSO Council's adoption of recommendation #3 (as well as Contracted Parties in relation to the DPA) as well as communicate the Council's decision to non-GNSO groups participating in this effort (ALAC, GAC and SSAC) as well as the Scoping Team.
- The GNSO Secretariat, on behalf of the GNSO Council, thanks Michael Palage, outgoing Chair, and Olga Cavalli, outgoing Council liaison, for their efforts.
- As part of its review of the formation and instructions to the Scoping Team, the Council will consider next steps for finding new leadership for this effort.
- Include a placeholder on the meeting agenda for May or June 2023.

#### **Item 6. COUNCIL VOTE - DNS Abuse Small Team Report**

**Mark Datysgeld, DNS Abuse Small Team Co-Chair**, seconded by **Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, submitted a [motion](#) for the GNSO Council to accept the recommendations as outlined in the DNS Abuse Small Team report.

WHEREAS,

1. The GNSO Council recognizes that the topic of DNS abuse is a longstanding topic and the GNSO has undertaken a variety of activities on this topic in the past, including considering which aspects of the subject of registration abuse are within ICANN's mission to address and in particular, which are appropriate for ICANN to establish policies that are binding on gTLD registry operators and ICANN-accredited registrars<sup>[1]</sup>.
2. In February 2022, the GNSO Council tasked a small team consisting of Council members to consider what policy efforts, if any, the GNSO Council should consider undertaking to support the efforts already underway in the different parts of the community to tackle DNS abuse.

3. As part of its deliberations, the small team reached out to all GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, as well as the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) and the DNS Abuse Institute asking for input on what problem(s) policy development specifically is needed to mitigate, if any, as well as the expected outcomes if policy development would be undertaken.
4. In considering the external input received, the small team realized that the suggestions provided can generally be allocated to one or more of the following three buckets:
  - a. Issues that may benefit from education / communication / outreach;
  - b. Issues that may benefit from contractual negotiations between ICANN org and Contracted Parties; and,
  - c. Issues that may benefit from GNSO policy development.
5. The small team delivered its [report](#), containing 4 recommendations, to the GNSO Council on 10 October.
6. The GNSO Council received a briefing on the report and its recommendations during its [October Council meeting](#).

RESOLVED,

1. The GNSO Council accepts the recommendations as outlined in the DNS Abuse Small Team report and requests that the leadership of the small team works with Council leadership on developing the respective communications as foreseen under recommendations #2, #3 and #4.
2. In relation to recommendation #1, the Council commits to considering requesting the development of a Preliminary Issue Report on the topic of malicious registrations after the outreach and communication as foreseen under recommendations #2, #3 and #4 have taken place and the Council has had an opportunity to consider the progress made from efforts related to that outreach. If the Council determines that a Preliminary Issue Report is needed, it must be undertaken in a way that avoids overlap and/or duplication of efforts.
3. The GNSO Council thanks the small team for its efforts, as well as the community groups that contributed to it.

[\[1\]](#) Some past work includes:

- Registration Abuse Policies WG Final Report from 2010: <https://gns0.icann.org/issues/rap/rap-wg-final-report-29may10-en.pdf> (some, but not all recommendations adopted)
- Staff best practices discussion paper from 2011: [https://gns0.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield\\_26745/discussion-paper-rap-best-practices-28sep11-en.pdf](https://gns0.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_26745/discussion-paper-rap-best-practices-28sep11-en.pdf)
- Uniformity of Contracts to Address Registration Abuse Final Issue Report 2012: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/registration-abuse/uofc-final-issue-report-20sep12-en.pdf> (Final Issue Report, but not sufficient support to initiate a PDP at the time)

**Mark Datysgeld, BC & DNS Abuse small team co-chair**, provided updates to Council. The small team has been working on the report for the last few months. The report emphasizes on the importance of

outreach out of ICANN org. There is also the possibility of the team looking into the topic of bulk registration and how to best move forward on working on it. The small team would like to add their strength to the letter sent by the CPH to ICANN org.

**Theo Geurts, RrSG**, raised concerns about the matter of contract modification and the large voting threshold to be met for anything to be finalized. This is the first time this goes to a vote, and there is no historical reference on which to base expectations. Should the vote be successful, there will be input not only from ICANN registrars, but all registrars. This will provide actionable intelligence. The current outreach is based on assumptions by the ICANN community.

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, agreed that this was also the case for the RySG.

**Tomslin Samme Nlar, NCSG**, asked if there was the opportunity for the community to comment on the negotiation language.

All councilors present on the call voted in favor of the motion.

#### [Vote results](#)

#### Action Items:

- The GNSO Secretariat, on behalf of the GNSO Council, thanks the DNS Abuse small team for its efforts, as well as the community groups that contributed to it.
- Leadership of the small team to work with Council leadership on developing the respective communications as foreseen under recommendations #2, #3 and #4 in the report.

### **Item 7. COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) Review**

#### **Next Steps**

**John McElwaine, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, provided background information on the discussion : phase 2 of the RPM review will focus on the UDRP. Phase 1 looked at Rights protection Mechanisms which were part of the new gTLD program. After three years of work, the consensus of the participants and of Council was the need for a rechartering for phase 2. This was to review the policy efficiently. Council requested a Policy Status Report which was delivered to Council. Councilors discussed the possibility of deferring work of phase 2 given the workload on Council at that time. RPM phase 2 review now needs Council to decide what next steps are. There are three different approaches: start a group to redraft the charter and begin phase 2 upon its completion, defer the work on phase 2 but set a period of time or a trigger which makes sense, terminate the PDP (which requires a supermajority vote). However for the latter, all policies need to be reviewed periodically, so terminating the PDP would not remove it from Council's agenda.

**Manju Chen, NCSG**, asked if there had been a precedent of the GNSO Council terminating a PDP.

Staff provided an example of PDP termination in the chat.

**Stephanie Perrin, NCSG**, asked if there was another mitigating approach, such as a scoping paper with a call to comments to the community?



**John McElwaine, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, replied that that approach was undertaken for the phase 1 Final Report. He added that the concern that even a very narrow scope would be a heavy effort.

**Marie Pattullo, BC**, noted that phase 1 was very lengthy and agreed with John's question of the need to fix UDRP if it's unnecessary. If a review is appropriate however, an expert review would be necessary - WIPO for example - to bring it to completion.

**Susan Payne, IPC**, agreed with Marie Pattullo. In addition, there is a risk the same members of phase 1 will be involved in the IRT, and would need to be involved in a review of the UDRP. There is an overlap of skills and expertise.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, mentioned that the RrSG would be in favor of an 18 month deferral.

**Desiree Milosevic, CPH NCA**, asked if for next steps, when would registrants input be taken into consideration, as was written in the RPM charter?

**John McElwaine, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, suggested that they be represented via the ICA. Equally, registrant input was visible during the Public Comment period. At the close of the discussion, he concluded that Council seemed to be in favor of a deferral in order to put together an expert group, with rechartering to fit that mold.

Action Item:

- Staff to request from ICANN GDS staff an estimate as to the duration of the RPMs Phase 1 implementation. Once that is received John McElwaine to send to the Council list the options – deferral for either for 18 months or until the IRT is complete.

**Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Expired Domain Deletion Policy (EDDP) and the Expired Registration Recovery Policy (ERRP) Next Steps**

ICANN Compliance joined the Council meeting to [present](#) next steps on the EDDP and ERRP .

**Greg Dibiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, reminded councilors that input had been asked of Compliance for the need for a Policy Status Report.

**Jamie Hedlund, Senior Vice President ICANN Compliance**, introduced his team Leticia Castillo and Amanda Rose, also present on the call. They went over the main highlights from the [report](#) they drafted at the GNSO Council's request. The report focussed on data and metrics on external complaint and audit-related activities from the 1 August 2013 through 31 August 2022. It also contained Compliance's observations garnered from the enforcement of the two policies and common areas of noncompliance. Details on external complaints can be found on slides 3 & 4. For further information on the enforcement of the EDDP & ERRP, councilors are encouraged to refer to the full report.

**Theo Geurts, RrSG**, commented on the resale failure, that the initial policy didn't envision distinguishing between several business models, some of which can have 5 to 10 year long running contracts. In this case, renewal notices are not set up during 5 years for example. Such caveats are not currently covered by the policy.

**Kurt Pritz, RySG**, asked if eliminating ambiguities would be a solution, or are they a necessary part of the policy?

**Jamie Hedlund ICANN org**, clarified that the Compliance team could only enforce the policies developed by the community and not necessarily comment on them. They can only encourage policies to be as clear as possible in order to enforce them.

**Greg Dibiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, thanked the Compliance team for their presentation.

Council then discussed next steps. Does the Policy Status Report need to be provided, or can it be delayed? Would it be worth requesting it to deal with the ambiguities raised during the presentation?

**Theo Geurts, RrSG**, replied that having read the report, there may not be enough there to justify a PSR.

**Greg Dibiase, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, on behalf of the RrSG agreed that deferring this would make sense given the strong level of interaction between ICANN Compliance and the RrSG.

**Kurt Pritz, RySG**, on the high level of complaints, mentioned that whilst data is gathered and dealt with, the question of the ambiguity still remains to be resolved.

**Stephanie Perrin, NCSG**, asked if there were indications of end user satisfaction taken into account in the case of a resale?

Action item:

- Council leadership to form a small team to review information provided by ICANN Compliance in view of deciding next steps which could include 1) concluding that no acute issues are present and no Policy Status Report is needed, and that the two policies will be added to the “end” of the pipeline for consideration at a future date, or 2) concluding that there is reason enough to request a PSR to obtain further information on the basis of which the Council can decide whether additional work in the form of policy development or implementation guidance is necessary.

**Item 9: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvements (CCOICI) - Work Stream 2 (WS2)**

**Olga Cavalli, CCOICI Chair**, [presented](#) the [CCOICI WS2 Recommendations Report](#).

As part of the GNSO Framework for Continuous Improvement Pilot, the CCOICI was tasked to review the status of the CCWG on Enhancing ICANN Accountability WS2 items pertaining to the GNSO Council. These were Rec #1 (Diversity), Rec #2 (Guidelines for Good Faith Conduct), Rec #3 (Human Rights Framework) and Rec #6 (SO/AC Accountability). The Recommendations Report provides status designations for WS2 recommendations from the perspective of Council. In addition, implementation recommendations relating to the Petition for Removal of Directors as well as the Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights are also included. Next steps for Council are to review the report for adoption.

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, thanked Olga for her presentation and willingness to stay on in her role to bring the WS2 effort to completion.

Action item:

- Council members to review WS2 recommendations report and come prepared to consider the report for adoption during the December meeting.

**Item 10: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - SPS Planning**

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, reminded councilors to review the [draft agenda](#), and start reading through the preparatory materials ahead of the SPS prep webinar scheduled on Tuesday 22 November 2022.

Action Item: none

**Item 11: ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

11.1 – New CCOICI Chair - Olga Cavalli agreed to finish the CCOICI's assignment on WS2 following her departure from the Council at ICANN75. Now that the CCOICI has submitted the WS2 recommendations report, a new chair will need to be found. Per the CCOICI [charter](#) "The committee would be chaired by a member of the Council who would serve in ex-officio capacity". Note that the only remaining CCOICI activity as part of the pilot project is to review any public comments received in relation to the WG Self-Assessment and finalize the report for submission to the GNSO Council.

**Manju Chen, NCSG**, volunteered for the CCOICI Chair position.

Action item:

- Staff will produce a motion on behalf of the GNSO Council leadership to acknowledge Manju Chen as CCOICI Chair for the consent agenda of the December 2022 Council meeting.

11.2 - Vacant Council Liaison positions (TPR)

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, reminded Council that this position needed to be filled by next month.

11.3 - GNSO Nominated Fellowship Program Mentor and Fellowship Selection Committee Member

Both **Chris Disspain** and **Sebastien Ducos**, have indicated that they are available to continue in their respective positions.

**Susan Payne, IPC**, suggested that all SC/C's be consulted, and a first call for interest be made before deciding to reappoint the incumbents.

**Tomslin Samme-Nlar, NCSG**, indicated that he would be interested to take the Selection Committee position - Position that he replaced Heather Forrest for, before being replaced by Sebastien Ducos.

Action item:

- Staff on behalf of the GNSO Council leadership to circulate to the Stakeholder Group and Constituency Chairs a call for an expression of interest for the GNSO Nominated Fellowship Program Mentor and Fellowship Selection Committee Member.

#### 11.4 - Closed Generics Dialogue - Board Liaison

**John McElwaine, GNSO Council Vice Chair**, informed Council that its proposal for the Closed Generics Dialogue team to request a Board liaison had been well received.

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Chair**, adjourned the meeting at 07:01 UTC.

The next GNSO Council meeting will take place on Thursday 22 December 2022.