

---

BARCELONA – GNSO Council Meeting Part I  
Wednesday, October 24, 2018 – 13:00 to 15:00 CEST  
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

HEATHER FORREST: Good afternoon, everyone. It is two minutes past. I think we ought to go ahead and get started provided -- staff, could you confirm for us that we have quorum? I think we're missing a few people, but do we have quorum?

Yes. Okay.

All right. Tech team, thank you very much, in fact for all your support throughout the week.

Excellent. Welcome, everyone, to the GNSO Council in its meeting of October 2018. Additionally, our face-to-face meeting as part of the AGM ICANN63. Wonderful to have an opportunity to meet with members of the public, and we'll see as we review our agenda that we have some opportunity for open microphone.

With that, I will turn to Nathalie to get us started, please.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Heather.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council Meeting, Part 1, on the 24th of October, 2018.

---

**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.**

---

Please acknowledge your name when I call it. Thank you ever so much.  
Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Donna Austin.  
Rubens Kuhl.

RUBENS KUHL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Darcy Southwell.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon.

---

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Carlos Gutierrez.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Susan Kawaguchi.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady.

PAUL McGRADY: Here.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Heather Forrest.

HEATHER FORREST: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: And Heather is proxy for Syed Ismail Shah who is absent and has sent apologies.

Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tony Harris.

TONY HARRIS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:           Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:            Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:        Arsene Tungali is absent and has sent his apologies. He's assigned Farell Folly as temporary alternate for the duration of ICANN63.

Farell Folly?

FARELL FOLLY:                 Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:        Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA:            Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:        Ayden Ferdeline has passed his proxy to Martin Silva Valent for the first and the second part of the council meetings.

Martin Silva Valent?

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Here.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Erika Mann.

ERIKA MANN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Adebisi Oladipo.

I don't see him in the room. We will follow-up with him now.

We also have GNSO support staff in the room with us. I would like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

And, Heather, it's over to you.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thank you, Nathalie.

My name is Heather Forrest. I'm delighted to welcome you all to our final meeting as the council of 2017-2018. And you'll see in front of us on the slide our agenda.

Are there any requests to update amend or the agenda? Bearing in mind you'll notice that item 7, which is hard to see, we're trying to -- it's a bit like that Whack-a-Mole game. Item 7 has been updated to Council discussion where it was previously a motion.

Any further updates to the agenda to propose?

No? Excellent. All right. So that takes us to item 1 in our agenda. Thank you, Nathalie, for completing the roll call.

Do we have any updates to statements of interest?

No. Excellent.

I'm seeing none. Let's move on -- and forgive me for going out of order. We've reviewed the agenda and confirmed it.

Let's note the status of the -- of the minutes for the previous council meetings. That has been completed in relation to our September meeting, and thank you very much to staff for assisting us in that process.

---

Let's, then, move to agenda item 2 which is our review of the projects list and the action items list. And if we could begin with the projects list, please.

Excellent. Thank you very much. So you'll note that a fundamental change on the projects list as it was circulated by Nathalie prior to the meeting in both red line and clean version is of course the shifting of the reconvened working group, IGO, RCRC you see there has been shifted to Board vote following our successful vote on that PDP in our September meeting. Marika, may I turn to you? Do you -- As I'm aware, that's the only major fundamental change to the projects list, is Red Cross. And I see Berry nodding as well. Great. Thanks. Thank you very much, Marika and Berry, for confirming that.

Any questions on the updated projects list?

Seeing none. Excellent. All right. Then let's move, please, to action items.

And I am delighted to share with you an action items list full of many green, completed items. All right.

So we have action -- we have a black -- or a white page on the screen. There we go. Good. And then the Adobe room has caught up. That's wonderful.

Excellent. So here we have the action items.

You'll notice open item here in relation to the Fellowship Program as in progress. As I updated over the weekend, I did attend the initial



---

meeting of the selection committee as our interim representative, and staff will initiate a call for volunteers and enable the SSC to conduct that selection process. That has also been advised to the other members of the selection committee, and they are awaiting our permanent appointment.

Any questions on that?

No? We can note our thanks as well to Ergys Ramaj for his presentation to us this weekend about the changes to the Fellowship Program.

Next item, sincere thanks to Keith and staff for a very successful evening out on Saturday. Keith, thank you very much.

A reminder to everyone, please, to ensure that you pay Keith following the link that was circulated around on the Council list. And, Keith, over to you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Heather. Keith Drazek. And I want to just to in particular note that Nathalie did all of the legwork and logistics. I provided some suggestions and advice, but gnat Nathalie really did the heavy lifting on that. So thank you, Nathalie. And I think I'm pretty much paid up. So thanks, everybody.

HEATHER FORREST:

Excellent. Thanks very much, Keith. And I think that that format was an excellent one in that it gave us some space in our calendar but still

---

brought us together, and it's always lovely to get together with the incoming councillors as well. Thank you very much.

Next item is strategic planning action item. So Rafik, Donna and I have been very busy in the weeks leading up to ICANN63, and I'm very pleased to say that you'll see at the end of our actions items list that we've done quite a bit to take stock of the action items that came out of the SPS. Some of those were noted in my report to Council, and I am hopeful that the remaining open action items are able to be taken up by the next council. I would suggest that we park any discussion around SPS action items until we actually see the list at the bottom of this list.

If we could move to the next one.

All right. You notice, of course, we've completed all items in relation to the adoption of the final report in relation to the protection for Red Cross names. This, of course, sits on our Council agenda today in the form of a consent agenda. The recommendations report, which is the standard next step following the approval by the GNSO Council of a final report. And council leadership has that final item there, communicated the thanks of the council to Thomas Rickert and the PDP Working Group members for their hard work. So that item is completed.

In relation to the EPDP, we've marked this item, although it's ongoing in nature, it has become internalized into the Council agenda that Rafik provide a -- an updated work plan and weekly update to the council list, and, indeed, part of our standing agenda for the Council as well. So

---

thanks to Rafik for that, and that will sit -- will appear on our agenda later today.

The GNSO Council review. We have an action item open, which is the GNSO Council to disband the GNSO working group after the implementation final report has been approved by the ICANN Board of Directors. That is on the Board's to-do list, so we are waiting for the Board to take action there, and we will then follow-up on that item.

Any question in relation to GNSO 2 review? No? All right. Next item, please.

IFR team. On our discussion this weekend with the ccNSO, the Council needs to consider a selection process for the GNSO co-chair, bearing in mind that the selection has happened at the S, G, and C levels for representatives. We will call for volunteers for a co-chair and then determine based on the response to that call for volunteers how to -- or whether the SSC needs to be involved. To the extent we only have one volunteer, that might slightly change the way that Council goes about that process.

Any questions in relation to the IFR co-chair?

Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. I'm not sure it's actually a call for volunteers because what the Council will receive is the slate of representatives from the GNSO. And what they need to do from that is

---

select a -- within the -- okay, within the members themselves. And I think the ccNSO also selects. So there will be two chairs. One will be selected by the ccNSO, one by the GNSO.

So it might be worthwhile to have some coordination, I think, between the ccNSO and GNSO on that.

Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Donna. Thanks for clarifying. I didn't shall -- I didn't mean to suggest a public call for volunteers. It's amongst that slate. And I think it's an excellent idea, Donna, and one that we can look perhaps to Philippe here in terms of our coordination with the ccNSO.

Thanks very much.

The geographic regions review. Cheryl, this is one that we might follow-up with you later on. If you'd like to say a few words now, you're welcome to.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

Happy to. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Just to report that it is, in fact, on the Board agenda for this meeting. When I checked yesterday, I couldn't have it confirmed whether it's on the consent agenda or whether it is to be pulled, but I am told that when the steward for this, Chris Disspain, discussed it with the Board, there is no predicted issues. So it may, indeed, go through just as the consent agenda but it should be finalized. Yay!

---

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks very much, Cheryl. And I can confirm that I had the same update, so that's brilliant. Two plus two equals four, we hope. Excellent success. Thank you.

Next item.

CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 Final Report. Final action item here was for leadership to draft a communication to express its thanks to the CCWG and our GNSO appointed chair, Thomas Rickert, and that has been done.

With that, we can turn to our next item.

Next item, lovely to see an item about the temporary specification completed. The final item for that one I think is at the bottom. If we can scroll down. I think there was one more -- might still be over the page.

I'm not sure which we've most recently ticked on that one. I think it had to do with -- with leadership and -- Ah, the closure of the PDP on RDS. Donna is right. Yeah. Well done. Closure of the PDP on RDS. RDS leadership to prepare postmortem on what took place in the PDP to be completed by the end of July. And it was shared with the Council this week. So thanks, Donna, very much. Excellent.

Any questions around any of those items? They've all been completed for quite some time bar that last one.

No? All right. Excellent. Let's move to the next item, please.

---

Nice to see PDP 3.0 in green, isn't it? Council leadership to propose and plan for next steps, expected to be a webinar with a preliminary target the first week of September. Of course that webinar was completed. Thanks very much to staff for setting that up and thanks very much to all of you for your forbearance. In the run-up to a council meeting, it's always very challenging from the leadership side to decide where we spend our limited time and resources and we were very hesitant to hold any sort of extra activity other than the council meeting but it seems like that webinar was -- was very helpful and appreciate everyone participating in that.

Any questions on those items?

Next item, please.

SubPro consolidated timeline. Another one that's nice to see in green. So the liaisons and the PDP chairs and staff have had ongoing discussions in the run-up to and here at ICANN63. That was the basis behind the discussion that we had on Sunday, and I think we are in a better place in terms of understanding the dependencies between those two PDPs and how that might impact their work.

Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin.

Just what I have on the screen in front of me is different to what's there.

---

HEATHER FORREST: Oh, indeed. Oh you're missing SubPro. Oh, no. You are. You are.

DONNA AUSTIN: I don't know. It seems we have a version control issue. And I dispute that it should be green, but what's on the screen on my laptop is different.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Donna. What we have in the AC room, the Council AC room shows this as yellow, which tells me that the more recent version is the one on -- on the visual screen because this should be marked as green and completed.

Apologies for that mixup. I will say that I asked staff to update a few items at the very last minute, about ten minutes before the council meeting went live. So apologies. Let's work with the one on the visual screen and go from there.

Thanks, Donna.

Questions on SubPro RPM consolidated timeline? Of course work to be done there, but on these Action items.

No? All right.

Next item is the updated charter for the Cross-Community Engagement Group on Internet governance. With thanks to Olivier Crepin-Leblond for being with us this weekend to talk through some of these issues. The remaining items here, council liaison to coordinate with the ccNSO and

---

the GNSO Council to determine if it will serve as a chartering organization.

I understand that the ccNSO has had some fairly significant discussions around this this week, and I would suggest, Philippe, that it may be timely after this meeting to circle back to the ccNSO and see where they stand because they would have received the same presentation that we did from Olivier and it was largely their questions that generated that presentation. So I think that would be a timely -- a timely loop-back.

Any questions on this one?

No? All right. Outstanding. Let's move to the next agenda item. Or, excuse me, action item.

WHOIS conflicts with privacy laws. Of course open item. Shall remain an open item until such point in the EPDP as the Council determines it appropriate to come back to this one. So nothing further to advise in relation to this. This one is parked.

So we can move to the next item. Oh, Donna, apologies.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin.

So kind of related to this, the last issue that was on the screen, it would seem that ICANN staff has done some kind of assessment of things that need to be -- whether it's policy that might be impacted by WHOIS or the EPDP. When I say "staff," I mean from the GDD side.



---

I wonder if it might be a good idea for council to have a conversation with the GDD to see if, you know, we're in alignment on where those -- you know, the status of those pieces of work. Just a thought.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Donna, very much.

Any other comments? I didn't mean to move through. Any other comments in relation to that item, that previous item? No. All right.

So then let's take up ATRT3. ATRT3 is completed insofar as we have a number of items on our list that were just recently completed. Council leadership to -- if we can scroll up. There we go. Council leadership to confer with the other SOs and ACs and the standing selection committee. Its work is underway. And with sincere thanks to Emily who has been helping in the background with coordinating with the other SOs and ACs.

Susan, anything you need from us in relation to the SSC for this item? Or all good? Great. Thank you. Excellent. All right.

Questions on ATRT3?

No. Splendid.

Let's move on to the next action item.

IGO-INGO access to the curative rights protection mechanisms. Of course, on our list today in a different context.

---

Susan, it remains for you and I -- and I would suggest that we hold off on this until the council has had its due opportunity to consider next steps.

But I would like to think that, as part of the PDP 3.0 process as well, that you and I can come back and deliver on this 3.7 item and inform council of our thoughts on that.

All right. Any questions, comments? For the record, Susan is nodding. Excellent. All right.

Let's move to the next action item.

CPIF. CPIF is our final action item in the standard action items list. The last is still ongoing there at the bottom of the page. Staff to review feedback, receive and share updated CPIF with council. And we look forward to staff providing that when they're ready to do so.

Any questions on CPIF? No. All right.

Let's then turn to the SPS action items. It's timely that we do this at the end of the year. You'll notice quite a bit having been completed here. A number of these, of course, date back to January and while we were together and things that happened immediately after January. All of the items there under the heading of what is the council and what does it do? We have made reference now since the motion on the EPDP charter to relevant ICANN bylaw sections. And I think that that's a good professional closing the loop, if you like, on our obligations under the bylaws.

---

The second item in that topic is, of course, something that was done on day 3 in L.A. So long-completed.

The roles and responsibilities of council leadership, things that Donna, Rafik, and I have discussed throughout the year. And I made particular mention of these in my report to the council. I think it would be extremely worthwhile for the next council to take up these items. And, to the extent that I can be of any help to the council in relation to that, I'm more than happy to do that.

The one item completed there is my report, which went out to the council earlier in the week.

Next item, please.

Role of council liaisons: Made some very significant progress in this regard. The liaison document updated. We've reconfirmed liaisons for this year. Of course, an early initial task to be on the agenda for the incoming council. And we have as well made very particular mention of the council liaison and perhaps further updates in our PDP 3.0 recommendations. So that is ongoing work in a broader sense.

Any questions around that one? No? Excellent. All right. Let's turn to the next one.

Changes in relation to the empowered community participation. This is ongoing work. We have reached out to the SGs and Cs to notify them of the changes that we made early on to the bylaws. And, of course, the Board -- following the Board's adoption of those, I would suggest here that staff continue to work on the template for EC powers. And that

---

would be something that the next council might usefully consider. We've, of course, had a very busy year with PDP 3.0 and other things and have not had a chance to circle back to this particular item. But it is the case that, once we have those templates available, we know that they are available to our use if and when we should need them. It could be something we can't anticipate the when. As soon as we have them done, the better.

Any question on the templates? Seeing none, how to manage council's 2018 workload. I think we've done a brilliant job here. A number of things done. Council leadership to develop timelines for action items: you'll note the particular emphasis that's been placed on action items in each council meeting. I think I probably have driven staff nuts with these. So thanks to them for their patience and to you for your forbearance in going through these in such detail. But I think this is a good marker of how much we've achieved.

Engage with the PDP leadership teams during ICANN 61, of course, complete. And the white paper on incremental changes to the PDP, has, of course, turned into the item we're voting on this afternoon, which is a brilliant result.

Scroll the page, please.

What does the council need and want to achieve in 2018 and how to do this?

---

One remaining item here. Achieve all bar -- if we can scroll down to the bottom of the page, council members to review the framework for post-implementation reviews and provide input.

Now, we have talked about reviews, but this was brought up in a different sense in January. And I think we still need some thinking here around the involvement in reviews and how to achieve this. It's largely been an ongoing source of discussion due to the postponement of ATRT3 and other things. I would suggest we come back to the topics of reviews when appropriate. And, Marika, please.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. Thanks, Heather. This is Marika.

I think that will also be something the council will be able to do in the context of the review of the transfer policy. So, at least from a staff perspective, we're hoping to apply at least the draft framework to that to also help inform and, indeed, does the approach work? And, of course, the council is welcome to provide input on that.

I think the survey that we originally ran on that is still open. I do believe we only have one councilmember actually providing input on that. I'm also happy to recirculate that list if someone wants to have a look at that. As I said, it may be of interest as well to invite Brian Aitchison at some point in the future, who is the main lead on this from the GDD side, but in close cooperation with the people on the GNSO team to kind of maybe reintroduce that topic and have people thinking about it

---

especially as well in the context of the upcoming review of the transfer policy.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Marika. That's very helpful.

Any further comments or updates on this? No. Excellent.

So we have one sort of bucket of other items which relates to IFR and CSC.

And, Donna and Philippe, we've ticked this item off as you've been working very closely with the ccNSO to coordinate these sorts of efforts. And Philippe, this will be ongoing for you. So thank you for your efforts in that regard.

Any final comments, questions, concerns on action items? No. All right. Excellent.

Let's turn back then to our agenda, please.

We'll return to item 3, which is the consent agenda.

We have two items on today's consent agenda -- the reconfirmation of Julf Helsingius as GNSO liaison to the GAC and the report to the ICANN board regarding adoption of the final report from the reconvened working group on Red Cross names policy development process working group. We had no requests to remove either of these two from the consent agenda. So, with that, I'll turn it to Nathalie to take us through a vote.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Heather.

Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please raise your hand.

Seeing no one, would anyone like to object to this motion?

Seeing no one, would all those in favor of the motion please raise your hand.

Heather Forrest and Martin Silva Valent, proxies for Syed Ismail and Ayden Federline, please raise your hands.

Thank you very much. The motion passes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, I guess.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Julf. Thank you for your report. All the best to you in your continued good work.

Let's please turn to item number 4, which is the council vote on the confirmation of a standing committee on ICANN's budget and operations charter.

Ayden Ferdeline is not with us. However, Ayden is prepared remotely to read in the motion. And I volunteered to help Ayden by running the queue here in the room.

With that, Ayden, if you'll introduce the motion, please, over to you.

---

AYDEN FERDELINE: Hi, everyone. This is Ayden. Can I just do an audio check, please?

HEATHER FORREST: We hear you, Ayden. Thank you.

AYDEN FERDELINE: Thanks. I am pleased to have this opportunity to introduce the motion that is on our agenda.

As you might be aware, I've been the chair of the council's standing committee on budget and operations since January. We were formed last September to assist the council in developing comments that relate to ICANN's budgetary and finance matters. And we do so in a manner that is similar to how other parts of the community, like the ccNSO, structure themselves to be able to review these documents in a comprehensive but focused manner.

This year we have developed four comments on the IANA/PTI budget, on ICANN's reserve funds, on the proposed FY19 budget and operating plan, and on the proposed management strategy for the reserve fund.

All of these comments were subsequently shared with the council and then endorsed by the council and submitted on the council's behalf. We reviewed our charter and our work. And last month we delivered to the council an after-action report within which we suggested that no changes to the charter were necessary at this time and within which we recommended the standing committee become a permanent one of



---

the GNSO council. So the motion that is before us today in a nutshell proposes that the standing committee become a permanent one and be tasked with immediately carrying out a review of the FY20 and future budget.

If there are any questions, I'd be happy to take them.

And I certainly appreciate you managing the queue, Heather. And, if you would like me to read out the resolved clauses verbatim, I'm also happy to do so. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Ayden. This is Heather.

Under the operating procedures, in fact, we need to start with reading the resolved clauses. So, if you would like to do that, Ayden, go right ahead. If you'd like me to do that, just let me know.

AYDEN FERDELINE:

This is Ayden. I'm more than happy to do so. It reads:

Resolved, 1: The GNSO Council adopt the GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operations charter on a permanent basis.

2: The GNSO Council thanks the council members and subject matter experts for their contributions to the FY19 budget planning cycle.

3: The GNSO Council will appoint the incoming council chair as a council liaison to the standing committee on budget and operations and as council vice-chairs as observers.

---

4: The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO secretariat to launch a fresh call for volunteers per the membership criteria outlined in the standing committee operations charter as soon as possible.

And 5: The GNSO Council task the Standing Committee on Budget and Operations to carry out the review and comment formulation for future ICANN fiscal-year draft budget planning cycles and to submit its proposed recommendations to the GNSO Council with sufficient time for its consideration.

HEATHER FORREST: Excellent, Ayden. Thank you. Let's open for discussion on this agenda item. Any questions, comments, concerns? Donna. And then Philippe.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin, for the record. Just to acknowledge that this was something that was set up for the first time I think maybe 12 months ago.

And thank you very much to Ayden for the manner in which you've taken this forward. I think you worked pretty hard to get people to contribute at times. And we really do appreciate the effort that you went to to bring this to fruition. So thanks very much and well done.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Donna. Philippe followed by Rafik.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'd like to first express my gratitude to Ayden for chairing this. We had a discussion within the ISPCP both when the question of continuing this work and then for the motion was put forward. We expressed our support for the continuation of this group. I just want to have something captured for the record. There was one particular concern expressed during our discussions. It was that -- and we already expressed that when we expressed our support for this. It is that this -- the work of this group should not preclude the stakeholders to express their views independently.

The remit of this group is attached to that of council, which is, essentially, the PDP.

So there should not be a perception or an understanding that this should be or must be the primary channel for the stakeholders to express their views on budget. They can do so independently as they see fit. I'd like to have that on the record for the ISPCP. Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you very much, Philippe.

Rafik and then Michele.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you. This is Rafik Dammak speaking. Yes, I want to thank Ayden for leading the SCBO and also the committee members for the work done. Because I think having this structure helped with the council to

---

submit several comments related to the budget. That's something we had issues before to do it in a timely manner.

I think it's not a concern. Something that we need to work on is to have more participation in the SCBO. Because it just ended, I think, like, a few members to be active there. So, since we are inviting from the different -- in addition to council members also, subject to matter expert is to have more participation so we -- that we help in terms of sharing the workload and so on.

And to Philippe's comment I think, there is no risk that -- I think it was made clear that the SCBO folks and anything related to the council and not what the stakeholder group or constituency may submit in their own comments.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Rafik. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you, Madam Chair. God, I'm going to miss saying that. Such fun. Michele, for the record.

I think Philippe's point is one that -- I think we've said this several times in the past. Obviously, I have no issue with putting it on the record. It's the same the registrars would take on this. And, in fact, I would almost say we all as stakeholders both as our stakeholder groups and as individuals need to put the ICANN budget under more scrutiny,

---

especially in light of some of the things we heard from Cherine at the opening ceremony this week. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Michele. I see no further hands.

I'll make a comment just to put it on the record as I made on Sunday. As the next council has oversight through the strategic planning session and otherwise of its own scary spreadsheet going forward, just bear that in mind as well that there are limited resources that can be devoted to any particular things at any particular time.

And I agree with all of the comments that have been said. It's certainly a worthy and worthwhile, let's say, thing to devote our limited time and resources to.

But, for that to work effectively, it needs to be that narrow remit that everyone has just described. So with that in mind, I see no further hands.

Are there any objections.

Ayden, forgive me. You have your hand up.

AYDEN FERDELINE:

Thank you. This is Ayden. And certainly not an objection, but I just want to thank Donna, Philippe, and Rafik for the kind words and also to address the concern that -- that Philippe raised, because it is a valid one. And we did capture this concern in our (indiscernible) direction

---

report, which is that standing committee's comments should supplement and not replace the comms of the stakeholder groups and constituencies. Autonomy should certainly be respected. So I just wanted to make that clear that in the event that the standing committee do continue, we would be on the same page.

Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thank you, Ayden. And my apologies for missing your hand.

Are there any objections to a voice vote?

No? Excellent.

Nathalie, thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

Thank you, Heather. Would anyone like to abstain from this vote?

Seeing no one, does anyone object to this vote?

Seeing no one, will all those in favor of the motion please put your hands up.

Thank you very much. No objection, no abstention. The motion passes.

Sorry. I'll repeat that. Heather Forrest and Martin Silva Valent, proxies, please raise your hands. Thank you very much.

Now, no abstention. No objection. The motion passes.

---

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks very much, Nathalie, and thanks very much. Ayden, particularly thank you to you. We will undoubtedly lean on you as this moves forward as a permanent standing committee.

That takes us to our next item in the Council agenda which is item 5, our vote on GNSO policy development process 3.0, the most recent version of which -- not the motion, but the final report was circulated yesterday. Rafik has submitted this motion on behalf of Council leadership.

Rafik, would you like to walk us through the resolved clauses or would you prefer that I do that?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Resolved, the GNSO Council hereby adopts the GNSO PDP 3.0 final report and recommendations and instructs GNSO support staff to work with the incoming Council leadership on the rollout of the implementation plan.

2, the GNSO Council requests the incoming 2018-2019 Council leadership to report on a quarterly BASIS on the status of implementation.

3, the GNSO Council thanks all those that have contributed to the discussion on GNSO PDP 3.0 as well as the proposed improvement to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the GNSO PDP.

---

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks very much, Rafik.

Let's open the queue for questions, comments on PDP 3.0.

[ Applause ]

And let the record reflect we all clapped.

All right. Great. I'm -- I think this is a good thing. I think it's already starting to pay dividends, for the record.

Any objection to a voice vote?

Excellent.

Nathalie, please.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

Thank you, Heather.

Would anyone like to abstain from this vote?

Seeing no hand raised, would anyone object to this vote?

Will all those in favor of the motion please raise your hand.

Martin Silva Valent and Heather Forrest, proxies, please raise your hand. Thank you very much.

No abstention, no objection, the motion passes.

HEATHER FORREST:

Great result, everyone. Congratulations.



---

Let's move on, then, to the next item which is item 6, the council vote in relation to the termination of the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service to replace WHOIS policy development process.

With that, Stephanie, we turn to you to read into the record the resolved clauses, and then we'll open for discussion.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. Stephanie Perrin, for the record.

Resolved, one, the GNSO Council hereby terminates the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service, or RDS, to replace WHOIS policy development process.

2, the GNSO chair will share the termination summary as well as the Council decision with the ICANN Board for its information.

3, the GNSO secretariat will inform the RDS PDP Working Group of this decision.

And 4, the GNSO Council expresses its sincere appreciation to the members of the RDS PDP Working Group, leadership team, and ICANN support staff for all its work and efforts.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks very much, Stephanie.

We'll open the floor for questions.

Questions about the motion on the table.

---

Michele, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Madam Chair. I'm going to keep saying that. You know that.

Michele for the record.

No, I just think it's -- it's good to get this done. I mean, to close it out. The working group had been on hold for months. Leaving something in limbo like that is far from ideal, so this closes it out. There's a document that has been shared with Council which we're calling the kind of the lessons learned type thing, and I'd encourage everybody to spend a few minutes to read over it.

If anybody has any questions, there are several of us here who were on that PDP, either as members or vice chairs.

Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Michele.

Amr on the microphone, please.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Heather. Is this working? Okay.

This isn't a question. It's just a comment. A reminder, if you will, to the Council. The RDS PDP Working Group was not only discussing issues

---

pertaining to privacy, and so the EPDP will not necessarily take up all the work that the RDS PDP was meant to address.

And specifically I want to draw attention to internationalized registration data. In May 2016, Steve Crocker, the then chair of the ICANN Board, sent a letter to James Bladel, who was then the GNSO Council -- or GNSO chair asking or inquiring how the GNSO Council was going to take into consideration the recommendations coming out of the IRD working group, which, of course, as you all not is a GNSO PDP Working Group so its recommendations were not considered as consensus policy in any way.

He drew special attention to three high-level requirements coming out of that report which were that, one, registrants should only be required to input registration data and languages or scripts in which they are skilled. Two, a registry must be able to accept and store any language or script that might be reasonably be expected to be used in their target market. And, three, unless explicitly stated otherwise, all data elements should be tagged with the languages/scripts in use and this information should always be available with the data elements.

The GNSO councillor, James Bladel particularly, responded to Steve Crocker's letter in December of 2016 concerning the first two high-level requirements saying that they would be addressed in the RDS PDP, and the third one was meant to be at the implementation phase at that point in the translation, transliteration of contact information from the (indiscernible) review team.

---

So this is just a reminder to folks here that this work was meant to be ongoing, and I don't want it to fall off the radar of the GNSO Council. Just kind of put a pin in that. I don't think there's any urgency in dealing with it, but I don't want folks to forget about it. And at some point I hope that the GNSO will address this issue.

Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Amr, very much for reminding us of that and putting it on the record so that it is captured for further consideration. One of the things that we discussed along the way in developing the EPDP charter was exactly what you identified, that there were aspects of RDS that would not be captured within that charter. And so having that specific reminder for me was very helpful.

Thank you.

Any further comments, questions, concerns in relation to RDS?

Seeing none, any objections to a voice vote?

Seeing none, Nathalie, could you take us through a voice vote, please.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

Thank you, Heather.

Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please raise your hand.

---

Would anyone -- Does anyone object to this motion? Please raise your hand.

Would all those in favor of this motion please raise your hand.

Heather Forrest, Martin Silva Valent, please express your vote.

Thank you very much. No abstention, no objection. The motion passes.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thank you, Nathalie. As a point of order, I would just like to note it's a bit challenging because we have an agenda full of motions. We had two councillors temporarily step away from the table who weren't captured in the PDP 3.0 vote. That's Paul and Pam. But we've recorded their votes. You will technically see that the record shows absent. It's entirely fine. But we've recorded your votes after the fact. So thank you. Noted for the record. Excellent.

That takes us, then, to item number 7 which is now a discussion item. You'll note in the formal agenda, as posted in the -- in the meeting room page, that we've marked this as withdrawn, and we've opened it for discussion here based on the discussions that we had last night. So if I might introduce the rationale for that. Actually, I might turn to Donna. Donna, would you -- as you're the maker of the motion, would you be happy to do that for us? Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin.

---

So based on the many discussions that the Council has had on this topic, not only since I submitted the motion -- what? Ten days ago, but also prior to that, it's very evident that within the Council there are a number of concerns outstanding, and we felt that it was premature at this point to go forward with the motion. We felt it was prudent to take some extra time just to work through some of the concerns that have been raised, particularly over the last two or three days and ensure that -- that when Council does make a decision on this, that they're comfortable with the path forward.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Donna, very much. So in our session last night, we had an opportunity to discuss next steps and how this might be moved forward. Of course part of the rationale for withdrawing the motion here is that any sort of changes we might make to the -- to the motion might be so fundamental that they would not necessarily constitute changes. So it seemed to be that the sensible thing would be to withdraw.

Would we -- We have this on the agenda as a discussion item. We have ample time. Would anyone like to -- to discuss this further? The potential next steps.

Phil, please.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Thank you, Heather. Phil Corwin for the record.

---

I'm not going to comment on this action, but I was one of the two co-chairs of this working group. Both co-chairs filed dissenting minority reports from the final recommendations. I won't repeat what was in my seven-page minority statement.

What I would say is that this is a difficult issue. We wrestled with it. It involves international law. It involves a fundamental clash between the right of domain registrants to access courts to appeal UDRP and the immunity of IGOs from judicial process, which varies in scope by nation. And the co-chairs attempted to find a middle ground that reconciled the two rights, and at the time of the initial report, it appeared we might have support within the working group for that, but then later on, that dissolved. And it was further compounded by the fact that the IGOs did not formally participate because they were engaged in discussions with the Board separately.

The last thing I'd add is that the wrap-up of this working group was rather messy. When the co-chairs proposed a way forward toward a consensus call, one member of the working group filed a 3.7 appeal with Council. That same member later filed a second 3.7 against you and the other Council leadership for your attempt to resolve it, and the same member later publicly accused you and the leadership of duping and manipulating the members of the working group. So it was a rather messy ending, and I think taking a time out and engaging in consultations may perhaps find a way forward.

Thank you very much.

---

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Phil.

Further comments?

Susan, please.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. As the Council liaison for this PDP, I highly recommend that we do take this action to withdraw this motion. I think it's the prudent path forward to really take the time to determine the next steps and the council's action on this.

So I applaud the Council for doing so, and thank you very much.

HEATHER FORREST: Susan, an important item to capture from this motion, now that it's no longer a voting item, is the message of thanks to you for your tireless efforts in relation to this PDP. We'll all acknowledge around the council table the amount of work that this has taken, and it's also the case that in many ways this PDP has helped us to understand and further develop our understanding of the role of the Council liaison. So thanks to you for your willingness and good spirit in that process.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I wasn't alone. So thank you for all your work, too, and staff. It was incredible.



---

HEATHER FORREST: Further comments, questions, concerns?

Paul, please.

PAUL McGRADY: Paul McGrady, for the record.

But I think it's important to say that withdrawing the motion isn't the same thing as voting it down; right? So this thing still has a life, and we still have to figure out what to do with it.

So just for anybody in the room or listening online, we're not saying it's, you know, totally gone away. We just have to step back, take a look at it and figure out what might be next.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Paul. And that offers a good opportunity to put on the record, to expand upon the rationale that Donna introduced us with. The rationale for withdrawing the motion rather than deferring the motion is deferral under the GNSO Operating Procedures requires that the motion be considered at the Council's next meeting. We will, of course, all have travel time to get home and then document deadline for the November meeting will be upon us rather soon.

So it seemed appropriate on the basis of our discussions last night that Council have some more time to reflect.

And Paul is exactly right in saying so what this does is this withdrawal effectively wipes the motion from the slate. We start over. So we are

---

now sitting on a final report from this PDP and will, under the operating procedures, ultimately have to bring it back to Council to decide what to do. And there are a number of options open to the Council at that time. It is very much the case that, as Paul has said, this remains within the purview of the GNSO. Nothing has changed to -- to change the status of this as a PDP, if you like. And all of Council's next steps would, I hope, consider our explicit role under Article XI of ICANN's bylaws to manage the policy development process.

Thanks, Paul. Well noted.

Further comments, questions, concerns? Relation to this agenda item?

Seeing none, let's move it our standing update on the temporary specification for registration data expedited PDP.

With that, we turn it over to Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you, Heather. This is Rafik speaking.

So this will be in the update since the last council meeting in September, which was just after the face-to-face meeting in L.A.

So since then -- Okay, here. Maybe starting with the slide.

So this to remind us about the EPDP timeline. And as you can see, we are close to -- to one important milestone which is the initial report. So we are aiming for November. And the EPDP team will discuss this afternoon in the session about the work plan and the timeline to get the

---

initial report done. So we will probably discuss several option and to -- maybe to make some adjustment.

So that's in term of timeline.

And we will take in consideration of how that will be impact the next steps. But just we are trying to -- I mean, I don't want to preclude what we discuss with the EPDP team, but this is more the thinking from the leadership team, and we are trying to see what -- what we should do in term that we can get initial report and start the public comment period.

Okay? So let's go to the next. Yes.

So in term of the approach for working methods, we could get the first deliverable in September, which was the triage. I guess there was expectation that we find a lot of -- I mean several areas of agreement, but that was not the case, but at least we could identify where the disagreement. And so we can focus our -- our attention there.

And we try to -- As we asked by the chair to respond to the question and to develop our preliminary recommendation is to choose the different tools, and we adjusted them. And that was the case in the face-to-face meeting when we started using the workbook or worksheets based on purpose, the data elements workbooks. So that helped us really to drive the discussion and deliberation, and also to have small teams since L.A. meeting. It was short time between that face to face and Barcelona meeting. And we had, in addition to the two-week -- two weekly calls, calls for the small teams.

---

Also just a reminder, we have the update that they are sent to the GNSO council.

And we changed the way how we deliver that. So just people need to subscribe in order to get that. And we can find -- we can share the sign-up form later on for those who didn't subscribe yet. Can we go to the next?

Okay.

So this is the slide that you probably saw during the topic, which is to explain how we worked using -- I mean, let's say that's a drilling for data element. So how we're trying to define the purpose and processing activities and also the inventory of data elements. It's those -- I say those tools or this worksheets they are going to be used later on for our initial report. And we start to -- we have already an outline.

And so having those elements helped us having to discuss and to work on teams.

So you can see here some example. The whole idea is really to populate our report in terms of recommendation and information from those workbooks. Next slide, please. Okay.

So the initial report is really, I think, the most expected deliverable from the EPDP team. And I understand there is always some concern about if we can do that on time. But we are focusing together. And we're using the data element workbooks.

---

And also we have several overreaching questions that we are trying to address. And we tried that also to do through small things like the question of natural versus legal person geographic application.

But all this is -- we are doing is trying to respond to the charter question in first place and to deliver the preliminary recommendation.

And so we know that in several areas we couldn't find -- we didn't reach agreement yet or is not possible yet. We are documenting this. We will document this to get input during the public comments. So we have that expectation that we tried to do our best in trying to deliver what is expected but also looking to get input during the public comment.

And so for some issues we probably need clarification and confirmation from -- I need to be careful, the EDPB -- for feedback.

It's also important for us to prioritize what we need to address by that strict deadline of the 25th May of 2019.

So just that we have that caveat at the end is really that the conclusion of preliminary commendation shared here are kind of the -- what we have kind of best thinking for now, because we are still -- there is still deliberation and discussion. And the EPDP team. And we will continue for the coming days to work on the initial report. So, hopefully, after the meeting this afternoon, with EPDP team we will have more clarity about how we should adjust. It should not be a big change, but maybe just to give a specific date and to work toward that.

---

In addition to just what happened in the last day, we had a full day and meeting on Saturday. And we covered a few items that we needed to make progress on.

We also have our high-interest topic session. And that was an opportunity meeting for the EPDP team to present -- first introduce how we -- what's the approach we were following and also to present what we have up to now and to share that with the community to also to get sense or reaction from the community what they are thinking about what we did till now. Okay?

I think that's it for me in terms of update. But looking to hear from the council if there is any question but also any guidance they want to share with the EPDP team.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. Keith Drazek, for the transcript. First, let me thank you for the time and effort you put into this as the council liaison and vice chair. It's, obviously, been a very intense period of work. And I feel like, while there were some concerns early on about the progress and the pace of the work of the group, it -- my takeaway from the conversations here and the presentation and the work that I've seen and observed of the group both in its plenary session as well as the small teams is that progress is being made and that it is on a track -- it appears to be on a track to deliver an initial report in the fairly near future, even if it doesn't hit the date, as you noted, of November 5th.

---

I would just ask that, as soon as it appears that that date is going to change and if you have a new target date, that you communicate that to council as soon as possible.

And I guess the other observation I'd make is that it really does appear that the EPDP does its best work in a face-to-face environment. I think the Los Angeles face-to-face meeting was productive under challenging circumstances.

I think here this week the group has demonstrated that its face-to-face meetings are really productive. And I guess I would encourage you as you move forward -- and I believe there's also a new face-to-face meeting planned in January around the time of the finalization of the final report. But I would just encourage you to share with council if you think -- if you think the EPDP needs another face-to-face meeting somewhere in here. Because I think you'd receive support for that. Thank you again, and we look forward to the continued updates. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. That's why I want to share kind of giving a heads up because we have this discussion at least at the leadership level regarding the date. And I think the expectation as it's in the -- for the role of the liaison is to inform if there is any change in terms of the timeline.

With regard to the face-to-face meeting at the leadership level, we started the discussion because of the kind of logistical constraint. I

---

think we'll have to submit. And also submit the requests and also in terms of budget. So we are exploring those options. But, yes, we also have to think how we can use the face-to-face meeting and for which purpose.

But I think it was from the beginning envisioned in our charter and in terms of the resources we got. So we are working on that. Probably we have to speed it up trying to decide and to organize for that.

I think Darcy.

DARCY SOUTHWELL:

Thanks, Rafik. Darcy Southwell. I first raised my hand. And then Keith started saying what I was going to say. But I would encourage you to be sure to let us know. We've talked a lot this week about PDP 3.0. We had a lengthy conversation about the IGO-INGO PDP, how we could have done better as a council. Lessons learned always come from the hardest things, not the easiest things.

And this is an opportunity for us to really exercise what we've been talking about so much. So appreciate all your work and the -- this type of a dialogue where we can be more proactive in helping out. And it definitely -- me seeing them, having face-to-face, it convinced me that that's what they need. They work much better in that environment as well. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks. Yes, Amr.



---

AMR ELSADR: Thanks. This is Amr again. I agree fully with everything Keith and Darcy just said. And, although you guys did mention this during the working sessions on Sunday, I also thought that it was noteworthy to give a shout-out to the CBI folks who have been incredibly helpful from the PDP team making progress. So Gina and David were fantastic. And I guess thank the GNSO council for providing the resources to make that happen. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Amr. Heather.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Rafik. Perhaps a difficult question for you. But, in view of all the comments that have been raised, Rafik, could you share what do you see as the biggest risks towards the timeline on the initial report slipping? What should we be anticipating as potential risks?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Heather. I'm not sure how much people paid attention to the weekly updates we're sending.

Maybe I was sometimes diplomatic when I explained these issues. Because one problem is it's sometimes hard to kind of forecast like if we -- I mean, if we are still in the -- within the timeline or not. Because sometimes we feel that we made progress and after just one or two calls that we are moving back.

---

But my feeling that there are a lot of efforts put here by everyone to make progress. And, as Amr mentioned, that using the CBI folks helped in different occurrence to kind of steer the discussion.

There is risk, even with all of this effort, that we won't reach agreement in some area.

So here it's really -- it's not maybe the council or the leadership. It's really we, as a community, to find out how we can work together, I mean, the different groups and the EPDP team, to reach consensus.

For now we are doing our best. We are targeting the initial report because that's our first milestone. It's a question here what's needed afterwards. Because we can get that done. We can have the public comments, but still there is the final report. I'm kind of moderately optimistic here, but there is always a risk. So I tried to share this from my perspective.

But the question is how can maybe the council help here? To be honest, I don't have a straight answer. So I can share the feeling.

So what else to be said? It's maybe, as was highlighted, the face-to-face helped a lot. Because, when we got everyone in the same place, we could work together to make progress. Because it's always challenging to have those calls. There are two in every week. But lately we also had the small teams.

I'm not going to complain as someone from APAC and having those calls at 10:00 p.m. every evening. But I think that even for everyone it's really challenging in terms of commitment. Maybe the face-to-face is a

---

thing that can help to at a certain level. But still until then we have to do a lot of work.

Okay. Kristina.

KRISTINA ROSETTE:

If I may, Kristina Rosette, EPDP member on behalf of the registry stakeholder group.

In response to your specific question, Heather, my personal views, although I would expect my registry colleagues would agree in terms of what the council can do, is first the CBI has been extraordinarily helpful. I think those are resources very well allocated to the extent that we can continue to have access to their services.

Second, I think there continue to be discussion points where having timely but limited access to legal counsel could be extremely valuable.

Three: I think we are going to need a face-to-face.

Four: We are talking -- some of us are talking about the possibility of whether or not we will have a final report in which the recommendations may differ materially from the initial report in which case we would then need another public comment period, which means, because of our timeline, we have to kind of take the time from somewhere else, which means that we may try to shorten the initial public comment period.

It's my understanding that there is a provision in the operating procedures for doing that.

---

So I think, if the EPDP working group agrees as a group that that's what we need to do, I think we would ask -- it would be very helpful to have the council support for that.

And, in particular, more specifically to direct a -- to make a request to all of the GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups that they not try to request an extension to that public comment period. Because we are not -- we're just not going to have the time to grant it. It's really important that the message go out that, yes, 21 days is painful. But this whole process is frankly painful because of the compressed schedule and. We all just need to make the best of it.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks. Kristina. I hope -- sorry for missing your first place, Michele. Please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

That's okay, Rafik. I'll make you suffer for it later. Michele, for the record.

Kristina's input there is very helpful. I also asked that question during one of the -- whatever the hell they are calling those sessions these days.

Just speaking on my own behalf and from observing this particular PDP -- or I can think of other words to describe it -- quite closely, the compressed timeline is something that we really, really need to face head on.

---

Reducing the timeline for comments, if that gives us a few extra days from somewhere, I would be highly, highly in favor of doing this.

I doubt that my registrar colleagues would disagree. The rationale for that is very simply there isn't a single stakeholder group or constituency within the ICANN circus that is not watching this every single move.

So anybody looking for normal length comment periods or longer ones is playing some very strange game. I'm not sure what it is.

On the mediators, from all of the feedback I've had from multiple people within that group, they have made things significantly easier in order to progress things along. So, again, speaking personally, just -- I have no idea what the rest of the registrars think. Very supportive of that.

Face-to-face a bit of a no brainer. The one I have a bit of an issue with -- and I understand how Kristina framed it. And I'm not disagreeing with how she framed it, but that's the one I'm having the most issues with -- is on the issue of legal advice.

This is speaking as somebody who was involved in the RDS PDP which we just finally killed off.

We have had legal advice in the past on various issues. And the legal advice has then been questioned or second guessed. And then other people have had other legal advice. And it goes on and on, and it's just kind of a vicious circle. I know, for those of you who are lawyers, the legal advice is just based on the question you ask, et cetera, et cetera. I totally get that.

---

How do we fix this? So how can we get legal advice, which I know is needed. And I don't disagree.

But how do we get it in such a way that we don't end up again back in this endless loop of legal advice is received and then people question or reject it? That's the bit I'm having a problem with. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Michele. And regard to the legal advice, I think there was a request made, and that's for discussion. We are exploring the options.

You want to --

MICHELE NEYLON: Sorry, Rafik. I think you need to be a little bit more explicit.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah.

MICHELE NEYLON: This issue with legal advice, we've been down this road in the past. And it's one of those ones where you end up with the, you know, my lawyers are saying this, your lawyers are saying that. And it's -- and it's this thing where I see it as being more than a question of, okay, timeline. You know, you can shorten something here, you can shorten that. That we can deal with. Funding a face-to-face meeting, you can deal with. But this one is very -- is much more -- I'm trying to find a word for it. It's one of those kind of philosophical issues, but it's not -- but it's also one of

---

the more contentious ones, and it's how we ended up at loggerheads in the RDS PDP, was specifically on this.

Now, I'm not asking you -- look, you're the liaison so I would suspect you can't actually answer it now, but it's something that you be very, very careful with.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Michele. What I'm saying, we understand what you are saying and that the leadership is taking that in consideration. So for all this, also it will be done with the constraint of the budget we got from the Board. So if we want to ask more, I think that should -- something to discuss. But, yeah, point taken.

Okay. So let me check for the queue. I think we have Stephanie and Pam.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I think Kristina actually expressed some of my concerns.

I raised my flag to answer the question what do we think could delay it. And in my view, it is precisely the problem that I've been trying to point out; that in order to reach consensus, we use words that are not going to stand up legally because they don't have the meaning that people think they do.

And on the matter of lawyers, I do agree with Michele. You know, we don't want to get into an, okay, that's your lawyer's opinion; here's my

---

lawyer's opinion. However, this is, to my way of thinking, almost a legal drafting exercise. It's a legislative-type process. When you do that, you have -- I'm not saying that lawyers cannot be neutral. Hopefully judges are neutral. But when you have drafters, they are neutral and say, "Okay, what do you want? You can't use that word because in all of these laws it means this," so you have to pick a word that has meaning. We have not defined terms, and I do see that this is going to hit us in the end because we have some compromise language that we're going to have to throw out, and if it's on a matter that is an important principle on which we built all the rest of the edifice, well, it means taking the wall down again and rebuilding. So I think that's a risk.

As my second point -- So the sooner we get the legal counsel on that we can at least refer these questions to -- I could be dead wrong, but I do think I'm right on this one -- the better off we are.

But I do think as a recommendation for 3.0, and obviously I won't be here, but we might want to consider when we know now that we have a humdinger of a PDP coming, like this one, like the one that we've already discussed, we should consider doing a formal risk assessment before we start, as we're doing the charter exercise, so that we can identify risks that could hit us and cause delay or, you know -- and figure out how to mitigate those risks a little better. That might be a helpful thing to throw into the charter drafting process. Just a suggestion.

Thanks.



---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Stephanie. Pam and then Tatiana.

PAM LITTLE: Pam Little for the record.

I actually have a question for Kristina will the legal -- the legality of the recommendations. I -- I seem to recall at one of those sessions the ICANN org actually mentioned that they would do the first pass, or ICANN legal will do the first pass of the review, and if they are unsure about anything or certain areas that warrant outside counsel's advice, then they would then seek that legal advice.

What is -- So is Kristina still in the room or someone from the EPDP team? Is this a suggestion or proposed arrangement appropriate farce the EPDP is concerned? As far as relating to your request for legal advice or resources.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Kristina Rosette, Amazon registry.

I can only speak -- this is not something that the Registry Stakeholder Group of the EPDP have discussed. My personal concern with that arrangement is just the time required, because we're working pretty much in real time, and we are sent draft language and we have sometimes less than 24 hours to review and either support it or oppose it.

And so I think having the time that's necessary for us to reach a point or form a question, that then gets communicated to ICANN Legal -- yes,

---

Dan Halloran has been sitting in the meetings but he has been -- he has not been providing any kind of real-time conclusions, advice, recommendations, et cetera. And then -- so for that analysis to happen, and then it to go outside and then to come back, I just don't think we have that kind of time here.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Kristina.

Tatiana, then Stephanie.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, thank you very much. Tatiana Tropina for the record.

I would like to support what Kristina said and also what Stephanie flagged from other the experience. So I am not an EPDP member. I am an alternate. But when I sit at the meetings, I see that sometimes some terms are used with very little or no regard to what they actually mean legally because the groups are just trying to bring forward the terms and agree somehow.

And what I have a fear about is that once this language comes red-line from the ICANN Legal, and I'm not even talking about checking it against the law but just from the point of view of legal drafting, it can create even more discussions because the groups do not know did it actually mean what they wanted to put in there. And there is no time for this.

---

I remember we had this at CCWG-Accountability when we got the red-line text of the bylaws and core values, and they were completely different conceptually sometimes on the meta level to what we actually developed. And there is no time for this now, and I really don't know how to bring these two together. Like kind of check not only from legal point of view is it legal from the law, you know, against the law, but also that the text, meet the legal requirements of legal drafting are the group ---

[ No audio ]

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Tatiana. Stephanie and then Greg.

Please, Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Greg Shatan for the record. I was in the CCWG-Accountability and was involved in selecting and retaining, engaging counsel for that group. And I'll share, not at this mic, I think some lessons learned that we had. But very briefly, I think, first, their expertise needs to be beyond question.

In terms of neutrality, lawyers can be -- can provide views on all sides of the issues, even arguing against themselves, but clearly if they have a client or a viewpoint that they don't do that. But there needs to be an agreement on how counsel will be instructed. What you ask them to do will be -- vary completely. And it's really important to figure out what

---

their role will be in providing both expert advice and drafting advice. ICANN Legal, if ICANN Legal is in the room, should also be looking at the language to make sure it will pass muster from a drafting standpoint so that the problem Tatiana points out does not happen. The cycles really need to be reduced here. But having counsel in the room who is not taking anybody's side, who is not part of any camp, either in larger view data protection issues or within this community, is truly necessary. There's a lot of people who do know what they're talking about in that group, but having been a person who thought they knew what they were talking about in another group, ultimately you can't give advice and be a stakeholder at the same time no matter whether you really do know what you're doing. And I'm looking at Stephanie because I know she knows. But in the end, you know, you can't -- you have to have somebody outside who will really help everybody have a legal discussion and produce a legally sufficient document. And a lot of lawyers don't -- will not necessarily understand that kind of engagement and really need -- so you need to find somebody who will understand the posture that they need to take in that room. Because if you get the wrong counsel, not only will you spend a ton of money, you won't get the result you want and you will have the second and third guessing of what's going on.

So I'm happy to share at more length, you know, what we went through to get there, what we did right, what we did wrong. But I think this is one of those situations where despite what we can all bring to the table here, there needs to be, you know, almost a God-like law figure here

---

who will help -- not dispose but will help the community towards the ends that the community is trying to agree on.

Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Greg. So we have James and then Stephanie and -- after Heather. James over to you.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Rafik. I'm also skeptical. I think we've seen this with RDS, CCWG, IGO, NGO and numerous other things where it didn't yield the sort of breakthroughs that I think we were looking for. It took a long time, it cost a lot of money. So put me in the doubtful column on external of legal advice.

But I just want to touch on what Tatiana was saying earlier. We do have ICANN Legal participating in the EPDP. I am an EPDP member. I should have said that at the outset. We need them to speak up as we go. You know, if this -- we present them with an initial report or a final report and it comes back with a big red marker all over it and then they come back to Council with advice that ICANN org can't take on what we're recommending or they advise the Board to vote down, there's no breathing room, there's no cushion in the schedule to send this back to a working group or to even send it back to Council. We have to get this right, unfortunately, perfectly on the first try.

---

So I think they mentioned something yesterday -- gee, what day is this? Saturday. About, you know, silence doesn't necessarily mean consent. Well, then break your silence. Let's hear what you're thinking, because I think there's a lot of concern that we're going to get to the end of this process and the rug is going to be pulled out from underneath us.

Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, James. Yes, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

This is why I put my hand up the first time. Stephanie Perrin for the record.

The unfortunate thing is that ICANN Legal has a job to do and that's to protect ICANN, and I think it's asking too much to ask them to -- you know, we had this discussion in our working meeting the other day about taking hats on and off. They can hardly in this matter take their protection of ICANN, considering the liability in this case, hat off and pretend to be independent legal counsel for us to advise us. And I would also like to point out that one of the issues that we face is parties with a lot of skin in this game who are likely to be sued, in other words, are in regular contact with their lawyers. They have to go back to their stakeholder group. I'm reading that as code for "I have to check this with my lawyers." That is not case for some of the other players in the room, and I put my own hand up there because I'm less likely to be sued, although I know people would like to, than most of the others.

---

So there is this differential of understanding and advice within the room that is another thing that's going to slow us down.

But I -- I think that at the moment, we can't push ICANN lawyers to take their hats off and explain terms to us, and we are abusing Thomas Rickert because he is constantly having to take his hat off and explain what things mean. And I don't think this is fair, frankly.

So I think as a council, we should think of how this ought to be configured in the fairest, most equitable and expeditious way.

Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. Just to confirm for the queue, we have Heather, Keith, and Donna.

Yes, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. Going back -- this is Keith Drazek for the transcript.

Going back to something James said just now about we don't have time to sort of go at this a second time and we need to get it right the first time around, I agree wholeheartedly with that. But for the initial report, I think it's important for the group not to let perfect be the enemy of the good at this first cut of the initial report. I think it's perfectly appropriate for the EPDP working group to -- if the group can't reach consensus on a particular point, to leave that question for the

---

community to provide feedback on. You know, present the differing views or present the challenging area, and then seek the public comment on that, which hopefully will guide the group towards finalizing the questions, the open questions in the final report.

On the question of legal advice or legal counsel for the drafting effort, obviously we're not going to have that in place if it's approved before the initial report is done, but I think there is potentially some time to maybe find a resource, if deemed appropriate, before the work goes into the final report drafting based on feedback. So I think there may be an opportunity there in terms of timing.

So anyway, I guess just to put a line under it. If there are open questions, don't let that prevent you from issuing an initial report. Just make sure that the questions are posed to the community in an appropriate way.

And then I just want to follow-up, Rafik. One question, back to the questions of risk. Risk to the timeline. You know, let's just say for the sake of argument we're looking at a two-week delay of -- and that's just my number. I'm just pulling that out of the air. A two-week delay from November 5th. Do you see the risk of slippage or delay or further slippage primarily due to the volume of the work that's yet to be done or the -- the lack of ability to reach consensus? Do you see that there's a greater challenge from one or the other of those?

Thank you.



---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. I think the point we are making is really that for an issue report, maybe we'll have some open questions.

So I guess maybe it's the former? But we -- I mean, we will push as much as possible. So again, in term of assessing risk or giving heads up, it's really in, like, weekly basis. If I feel there is a problem, I will tell the Council. Sometimes it's really hard. Things can change quickly. I'm not sure that was the case for other PDP, but certainly for this particular.

I mean, we tend to -- tend to forget this effort just started less than three months ago. So...

Okay. Heather, I think you will give the last word on this.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Rafik, very much.

Just to put it on Council's radar that this is the most robust discussion that we've had around the EPDP. I think it's been particularly valuable. We need to not wait until the next council meeting to have another robust discussion like this because the next council meeting is scheduled for the 29th of November. That's more than a month from today. And if we wait that long, to Keith's point -- and thank you, Keith, for bringing us very neatly back to the question of risk -- we are going to have to energize our discussions around and our vigilance of the weekly summaries that Rafik posts to the council list. So, Rafik, it may be that you need to poke folks and/or it may be that you're fielding far more questions on a weekly basis than you have been up to now. But Council needs to be super mindful of this because if the next time we have this

---

discussion is when Council gets back together, we will have lost a significant amount of time.

So thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Heather. Yeah, I think it's really good to put in when the weekly update is shared to get any question or request for clarification. I will be happy to respond.

Yes. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thank you, Rafik. Michele Neylon for the record.

Heather's question about the timing of the meetings is something that kind of -- is a big red flag in my brain or something. So discussion on the council mailing list would be ideal, but historically hasn't really happened. I mean, it's -- you get the odd exchange but you really don't get anything further than that. And we obviously can't wait for the next council meeting if there are issues we need to address.

Now, so I suppose what I'm kind of putting out there for those when we sit down again, and I end up sitting exactly where I'm sitting now but I'll be on a new council, we probably do need to think about how to do that, pause Heather's point is very well made. We can't really let it go that long if we're to have any actual discussion. I mean, the updates are fine, but that's one way.

---

Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Michele. Point taken. And I think that's really something we have to work on. It's not just wait for the next council meeting. It seems that -- and we reached at the level we have to close the discussion.

And Keith, you have the last word on this. Okay. So we are on time. Thanks.

Over to you, Heather.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Rafik, very much. And thanks to everyone for a robust discussion for that item.

Let's move back to our agenda back to item 9, which is any other business. There are three things on AOB for today. The first one is to assign the call for SO/ACs to nominate the fellowship program mentors.

Second is open microphone. And we consciously, let's say, let that discussion around the EPDP run for a while. Because I think that was fundamentally, in the spirit of open microphone that we normally have in our council meetings.

And we'll end with a thank you to the outgoing councillors.

So let's take up item 9.1 to start with, assigning the calls for the SO/AC chairs for mentors to the nominating standing selection committee.

---

As I said at the start of the meeting, in reviewing the action items, I did attend on Saturday the initial meeting of the fellowship program selection committee.

At that meeting and since I'm -- Ergys Ramaj, on behalf of the organization presented some information about the planned methodology for how mentors will work and what mentors will do. One thing that caught my attention in that discussion was there is a very, very, very significant time commitment expected from mentors. It's anticipated that in the eight weeks up to an ICANN meeting, it's a very substantial quantity of time that's anticipated to be put into this.

And a concern was raised that this is a wonderful idea in practice having these mentors. But, in reality, that will pull some of our community leaders out of the policy development process effectively and into this mentoring environment.

I don't think any of us doubts the benefit of mentoring. And I'm sure each and all of us, by virtue of sitting here at the council table, have benefited from some sort of formal or informal mentoring process. That said, it's pretty significant. So, with that in mind, may I suggest, if we're willing to move forward with this, may I suggest that Susan, in conjunction with staff, that the SSC reach out to Ergys and his team to get an encapsulated summary from him as to exactly what the time commitment is, what we're looking at so that way that can inform that call for volunteers?

Susan is nodding yes. That's brilliant. Thank you.

---

Any concerns about instructing the SSC?

Martin, please.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Just to be sure about -- we're supposed to commit at what date the official name? I know they need it for the next round of fellowship.

There is a deadline of November, I think, we have to meet sort of yes or yes.

HEATHER FORREST: Martin, I'm afraid -- this is Heather. You're right. And I'm afraid I don't know the exact date off the top of my head. We'll follow up. But I do know it's the case that what happens first is the committee gets underway. And then we start looking for the mentors. So --

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: This is Martin Silva, for the record. I think it's somewhere in the third week of November. I can't remember exactly.

MARIKA KONINGS: This is Marika. I have the announcement. They requested appointment by the 14th of December.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Martin. And thank you, Marika, as always. Any comments, questions on this one?

---

If not, Susan, we'll consider it instructed to you folks to carry this one forward. And all of us take back to our respective SOs and ACs what we've heard this week about the new fellowship program, the new metrics which were taken part and parcel out of the GNSO comments and put into that program and start thinking about folks to tap on the shoulder for mentoring.

With that, I'd like to turn to the open microphone. And with that I see we have Brian and Phil.

Brian, over to you.

BRIAN BECKHAM:

Thank you, Chair. Brian Beckham, for the record. As you can see, I'm joined by my co-chair in the rights protections working group, Phil Corwin. Overnight ICANN's Office of Legal Counsel and the RPM cochairs received correspondence we will forward to the council which we believe may be relevant to discussions the council is having in the context of the RPM working group, the IGO working group, and the PDP 3.0 discussion. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

We will share it with council. Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST:

Michele.

---

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Such fun. Gosh, I miss doing this. It's so fun. Come the elections, unless they do something weird on the council, I can no longer do that.

Gentlemen, good afternoon. Some of us have had previews of some of what this issue is dealing with. And my personal reaction, speaking on my own behalf and not on behalf of anybody else is wow. It's not -- this is not the -- not the game that I thought we were playing. So I was shocked and I was very disturbed at how something could end up in this situation. And so you -- whatever you have received, if you could please send it to us, we'd greatly appreciate it so that we could have some kind of discussion. Just speaking completely on my own behalf as someone who has been involved in multiple PDPs and various other efforts over the years, if this is how somebody deals with an issue within a working group, then I don't see how any of us can continue to participate. I think it's just not workable.

And that I would view as being a complete breach of those standards of participation that we've spoken about so many times in the past and something that we've called out specifically in our discussions around the PDP 3.0, which we need to rename to something else, apparently. Please do share that with us. Personally, I'm sorry you guys have ended up being embroiled in this. I'm sorry that the leadership of the GNSO council has been embroiled in this.

I'm aware that, from speaking to people here this week, that you've all had your -- what little personal time you get disrupted by this entire mess. I think we all owe you a drink in the bar. Thanks.

---

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Michele. Stephanie followed by Keith.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin. For those of us who are dead curious and tragically uninformed, could you give us the elevator summary of this? And, before you do so, I would like to remind council that I asked the CEO in one of our meetings way back in January what our status was in terms of being protected as community participants in the event of nasty lawsuits. I'd just like to remind council, as I'm leaving, that I still think that's a valid question. The general coverage isn't specific enough. Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Stephanie.  
Keith followed by Susan.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Heather. And thanks, Brian and Phil. I have to say I'm completely in the dark what you're talking about. And the message is a bit cryptic. If you'd like to say it to the council that you've got information that's relevant to our work, it would be helpful to give us a little more information. Thanks.



---

PHIL CORWIN: I need to be -- we need to be very careful about what we say here. We presented -- we presented to council on Sunday regarding an ongoing disciplinary matter in the RPM working group. Attorneys for the individual who is the subject of the complaint sent a letter to ICANN legal overnight regarding things that were said in that council meeting. And, in addition to that underlying dispute, the letter also referenced something that happened in the working group itself within the past 24 hours.

So it appears that outside -- the involvement of outside council now, on behalf of that person, extends not just to the predecessor dispute but to things going on in Barcelona in the working group meetings.

So we will share it and -- but it would be not prudent to say anything further.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Phil. Thanks, Brian. That's helpful.

HEATHER FORREST: Susan, you'll have the last word on this one. Sorry. Susan followed by Martin will have the last word.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So I may not be as quite in the dark, but I'm sort of guessing here. Susan Kawaguchi, for the record.

---

Based on some rhetoric in emails in the IGO-INGO working group email lists and directed at some of us, me, liaison and Heather as chair.

I would request that -- I would hope that the GNSO council, in dealing with this, since I'm stepping off here in a few minutes, would request a review of the history of PDPs and similar circumstances that have taken place in the past. They may only be rumor. I don't know, because I have not investigated this.

But, in discussions within my own constituency, when I voiced some of the comments that were put on that list to our constituency, others have said oh, yeah, yeah, that's happened in the past, too. And ICANN legal will take care of it. But ICANN legal shouldn't have to repeatedly take care of anything.

So, if there is a history of this, I think it should be known and should be reviewed and should be taken into account. If there isn't and that was just purely rumor, then, you know, that's fine, too. But we need to know. So a full investigation should be done in this case.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Susan. Martin.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent, for the record. I sit on this RPM in every call. And I should have some background than other counsellors. But I don't know any detail. I didn't even know -- when I read on the agenda, I already knew what it was. But I'm guessing a lot here.

---

But I do want to echo Stephanie says as far as liability of the working group members but specifically about the chairs. Because the chairs cannot openly act or freely do their job if they have to be worrying about being liable for their role. I think that's very concerning and is part of the tools that ICANN has to give to members and especially to leadership positions like chairs so they can do their work. It's not a minor issue. And ICANN should be responsible.

And, in my opinion, it's part of the tools to do their work.

I also want to say that this will be a precedent if we eventually take some sort of direct council intervention into it. So I also want to echo other people's words on how careful we have to be on how we do this process. Because it will set -- if we take this, for instance, let's assume that council -- the chair's report is everything we need and we take action, then that's a precedent.

But, if we say no, we have to take -- we will take apart each part of the report and show evidence for each one and say, okay, there were violations of the conduct policy, for this level of reaching and that level of reaching. And we'll start analyzing that case with a test of when and how we take serious the type of policy. And that policy is going to be very relevant for future procedures.

And the last thing I want to comment on is that, as I was very afraid at first, of improving group dynamics through this sort of conduct policy so that everyone behaved in a manner that was productive and efficient and in good faith and also, to make our lives more bearable in here. I was just questioning myself and saying that I'm also afraid of people

---

using this sort of process to try to put other people out or things like that. I know this is not the case. But, as a precedent, I think it's important we make it very strict and very clear so that we create reasonable expectations of when these sort of interventions are going to happen and that this is in very extreme cases, very obvious cases. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Martin. Let's leave this for now until we have more information, with thanks to Brian and Phil.

Now I'm -- let's turn then to the final item in our agenda. We have no other participants in the room at the microphone.

And our final item is a thank you to outgoing councillors. It is a great honor to acknowledge the work and the service of Susan Kawaguchi and Stephanie Perrin. We have served together for four long amazing years. And Stephanie and Susan are well due. Susan is already packing up her laptop, for the record.

[ Laughter ]

Now Susan.

Please join me in thanking and congratulating Susan and Stephanie.

[ Applause ]

Excellent.

And it is truly an honor and a pleasure to say what I have to say next.

---

Donna, it's been a long four years.

I admire so much your commitment to the multistakeholder model -- I never heard someone use the phrase more often than you, and you use it in exactly the right opportunity -- your ability to appreciate all perspectives no matter what the topic; your willingness to give back to the next-generation of ICANNers. And you do it with such grace and without any arrogance, without any -- you're just almost always the most experienced person in the room. And it's amazing how you manage to communicate that in the way that you do.

And your ability, in particular, to zero in on exactly how something impacts the policy development process. You've taught me so much in that regard.

I am deeply honored to call you a colleague. And I thank you for all of your exemplary years of service to the GNSO. Please join me in thanking Donna.

[ Applause ]

Donna's fingers are purple, for the record.

DONNA AUSTIN:

It's a manicure I just got earlier this week.

So now in return, yeah.

---

Heather's dedication and passion to the role in the last 12 months has been exceptional. I think she has helped all of us understand the responsibility that we have to the GNSO on this council.

I think, before we got into the strategic planning session in January, it was certainly -- and I don't want to say this the wrong way.

I was committed to the role as a councillor, but I fully understood the role when I left that strategic planning session. And that's because Heather understood that it was important for all of us to go through the governing documents that guide us.

And the responsibility that we have to the GNSO and the fact that we have had the level of conversations this week around a particular PDP and we've signed off on PDP 3.0 is evidence of that. And I sincerely hope that the council takes that forward.

I'm from Australia, as most of you probably know by my accent. But I moved to the United States five years ago. So I don't have that time zone issue that everybody else has from the Asia Pacific region.

Heather's dedication and personal pain, I would have to say, to, you know -- she never bitched about it. Never complained. Just got on and did the job. Even if it was 1:00 a.m., we weren't aware of it because it never came through.

The professionalism of Heather always shone through. So -- it's been a pleasure and an honor. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

HEATHER FORREST:

There are so many things that it's hard for me to wrap my head around today. Chief amongst which is the fact that today ends the four most challenging, interesting, motivating, fascinating years of my professional life. And I hate to see it come to an end. I can't get my head around it. Everything we've done this year, everything that we've achieved we've done together. This is the multistakeholder model at its very best. For all the discussions we've had this week about how the model doesn't work so well, I feel so privileged to have been involved in an area where it has worked exquisitely well. When you think about our achievements this week, it's hard to deny that the model is alive and well here.

I'll close my time with all of you by noting that I find it so very surprising that you've all said such wonderful and humbling things to me to thank me.

And, truly, it's for me to thank you from the very bottom of my heart. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

DONNA AUSTIN:

Can I just say before we head off into the wild blue yonder, Mary, Marika, Julie, Berry, Nathalie, Ariel, Emily, Steve, Terri, Julie B. who is not here, and Michelle -- and God help us, I've probably forgotten somebody, but the support -- Siri, I forgot Siri, Caitlin -- the support that we get on a

---

day-to-day basis is extraordinary. And we are very grateful for that, because we wouldn't be able to do our jobs without it.

So thank you very much to all of you.

[ Applause ]

HEATHER FORREST:

With that, ladies and gentlemen, it's my great pleasure to close the October 2018 meeting of the GNSO council. May I suggest that the current and new councillors stay here in the room. We'll have a photo opportunity.

Donna, great news for us, considering how we look.

And we'll have an opportunity for photos. Then we will transition to the new council for part 2 of our meeting. This is officially what we call the hug break. I should be visiting each and every one of you. So thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

[ Coffee break. ]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Ladies and gentlemen, it falls upon me to welcome us back to the GNSO council. Let's take two minutes. and new councillors will you please join us at the council table?



**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**