
ICANN80 | PF – GNSO Council Wrap-Up
Thursday, June 13, 2024 – 10:45 to 12:15 KGL

GREG DIBIASE: All right, everybody, take a seat, please. Let's wrap it up. Thank you, Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Hello, and welcome to the GNSO Council Wrap-Up. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Greg Dibiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Caitlin. This is Greg Dibiase. This is the GNSO Wrap-Up, our final meeting for ICANN80. We've added a couple of agenda items. If any other councilor has additional items they'd like to add, we can discuss those during AOB. So I'll pause and see if there's any questions before we jump into this agenda.

Seeing no hands, I will go first to agenda item one, next steps for the aspirational statement. Leadership had taken this off of the Consent Agenda. Because during the informal meeting, the NCSG had informed us that their constituency was not decided yet. They have subsequently let me know that the NCSG supports this. So we are inclined to put this back on the Consent Agenda for July. But I want to

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.

pause here and make sure that all councilors are aligned with that. It seems like NCSG was able to come to consensus, but I thought I'd raise it before we put this on the Consent Agenda because I'd really like to not put it on and take it off again. I see Mark noting it aligns. No other hands in the chat. Oh, Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks, Greg. I thought that in that discussion, Lawrence also raised—is Lawrence in the room? He said something. Oh, hi, Lawrence. Did you say something about receiving instructions and that's a bit awkward?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Thanks, Anne. I basically said that there are some of us councilors that happened—forgive me. I'm still trying to make my way, basically, into the room. But there are some of us councilors who are directed on how to vote. This is going to put me in an awkward position where my constituency directs otherwise. So I believe that this is of good intent. But for some of us, this will be at par with the desires and workings of our constituencies. I also don't feel the Council should further put us in any difficult position. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Lawrence. So I do want to note that this is voluntary and it's aspirational statements. It doesn't say that you can't follow your constituencies' directions. It's aspirational. This is what we strive to. But recognize that there may be circumstances where it doesn't always happen. So I guess just following up—is that a BC position?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes.
What I just said.

GREG DIBIASE: I'm sorry, Lawrence. I think we lost you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, I said my submission is a BC position. I can't speak for the rest of the CSG. But the BC would like to maintain the latitude to direct their councilors on how to vote on any one issue.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Thanks. And to be clear, I think you retain this latitude. But if that's the BC's position, that's the BC's position. Mark, I see your hand.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. I believe the BC, what they expressed was that since we are directed councilors, we would still be acting on that behalf. But my interpretation is slightly different from Lawrence's even though, in principle, I think we heard the same thing. What I think this does is it gives us better incentive to whoever is the councilor to sell more of that consensus back to the constituency. What it does is push us towards trying to help them see if a consensus is imminent or if this would be helpful for the house as a whole. While keeping in mind that everybody still will keep their latitude or their possibilities of intervention. So I think it's more of a matter of how to look into this because it can be seen from both sides. So definitely we'll bring this back to our constituents and try to work out better how to make this fit. But I think it's a fit. I don't think it's a problem. Although Lawrence's concerns are valid and within our position, I don't think this is as much of a problem once we actually lined things up.

-
- GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Am I understanding correctly that, Mark, you're saying you're going to review this with the BC again and let us know? Am I hearing that correctly?
- MARK DATYSGELD: I'm saying we can go ahead with this for now, and then we see where this lands, right? Like there's no need to hold this back again because the idea is that this is nonbinding, it's fine. That at least that's where I'm coming from. Unless Lawrence heard something very different from that, that's, I think, where we stand.
- GREG DIBIASE: Mark, I'm just trying to determine if this should be on the Consent Agenda for next meeting. And if the BC would vote against it, then I do not think it belongs in the Consent Agenda. So maybe we can follow up offline after this to get clarity on that, if there's still some ambiguity.
- MARK DATYSGELD: Yes, that would be ideal. At least from my part, when communicating with the constituency, I will walk a line of supporting this. And I don't think there's like strong pushback or anything. It's just a matter of clarity and we can find a clarity. But please do follow up first and let's aim for the Consent Agenda. Let's put it that way.
- GREG DIBIASE: Okay. I'll follow up. Nacho, I see your hand.
- NACHO AMADOZ: Very quickly, just to add my voice to say that we shouldn't be using much more time on this. This is not forcing anything on anyone. That latitude is still present. We can maybe change truly exceptional
-

circumstances for exceptional circumstances to see if that accommodate other views. But I think that this is just common sense that we should just go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Nacho. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Susan and I are also directed by our constituencies and the position of the IPC was to vote for the aspirational statement. So I don't foresee that changing. So just wanted to clear that up.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: I like Nacho's amendment to this, to take up that truly. Because I think it's pretty clear that exceptional circumstances would cover instructions from your constituency or stakeholder group. And so I would favor the Nacho amendment. But I don't know what the BC will eventually say. I honestly thought that it should be included as a defined exceptional circumstance, but nobody seems to want to do that now. Obviously, I'm not speaking for the IPC because the IPC councilors just said how they were instructed. I am just saying in a nonvoting position, advising Council as a whole that all of us know that there are people who get instructed by their constituencies, and there are other constituencies that do not instruct. And sometimes I think it's just better to be explicit about things that aren't known outside the Council. But as a compromise, I think dropping the truly is a really good idea.

-
- GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. A couple of quick things. This has been out on the list for editing for like four months now. So if councilors have edits, I really need you to go in to the doc and make any edits. And I don't think we have time to discuss edits on the fly in this wrap-up meeting.
- ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: So then slap Nacho's hand then.
- GREG DIBIASE: No. Thomas?
- THOMAS RICKERT: Maybe it's too early in the morning, maybe it's because I'm not a native speaker. But I fail to understand why this would limit what directed councilors can do. So I think this language offers you everything, and the ISPCP doesn't have an issue with this, just to put that on the record. I think if we insert other undefined terms such as exceptional circumstances or something like that, we're watering things down more than necessary. Nacho, I like the idea that you're trying to bridge the gap. But if we need to reopen wordsmithing this, I would suggest that we just add a statement to say that we recognize that some councilors have directed votes. Just that, but not on the output side. You have wiggle room. In addition to the wiggle room that we offer with this.
- GREG DIBIASE: Okay. So I suppose I'm okay putting this in draft form. And maybe we can take back that feedback and send it out again, but I really need a final determination before we put this on the Consent Agenda for next meeting. Is everyone okay with that? Great. Thanks for that. Any other comments before moving on to the next point? Okay. Peter?
-

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Greg. It's just my concern, actually, about the aspiration statement. Though it's not binding, I'm just looking at it from the perspective of a long-term influence of these people's decisions. In case maybe the people in this seat actually are not on the seat any longer, maybe long term in terms of 10 years, 15 years, and the way people will actually interpret this statement in terms of—so we know that is not binding, but people will try to refer to it and say, “Oh, councilor have to try to be in favor of PDP recommendation,” and something maybe in case, though each constituency stakeholder have the way they vote or their beliefs and their perspective about submissions and how they are represented to shoot vote. I'm just thinking about this in terms of long term, like the influence. When we talked about policy, we have some binding, we have some nonbinding, but there are some tests that can influence decision when people actually try to read it. So that's just my concern. I'm just submitting that.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. So does that concern me that you would not support the aspirational statement?

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: That's a difficult question. We actually have to. From our distance, we say that we're going to discuss more about this and we'll get back. Yeah, definitely. But I'm just concerned about that. Not that we didn't support that. So I'm just trying to look at it from the angle how people are going to interpret these in the long term in the next future. So I'm just thinking about that. I'm just bringing it out to the table, not that

we don't support that. But how people will interpret this in the future because we see how people interpret policy instrument, whether it is binding or nonbinding.

GREG DIBIASE:

Okay. So we can take that back, but I'm just seeing that there may not be support after all. So I'm not going to put this on the Consent Agenda if there's valid concerns. I'm hearing those concerns. But yeah, I think we need to move on. So yeah, maybe we'll send an update to the list and we'll note these concerns. Any objections with moving to the next item? Okay.

So we introduced the next steps on registration data accuracy. I don't think at least, I was particularly clear and introduced. We gave the background, but I don't think we established kind of clear questions about what the next steps are before Council. I at least took a stab this morning, trying to think through what I see the issues are. From my perspective, this is just a straw person, not the registrars, not anything, but maybe to give a starting point on the conversation. I was going to provide a couple of questions I'm thinking about, and then maybe that can hopefully advance the conversation and bring questions that we can bring back to our constituencies to advance this topic.

So, from my perspective, the challenge here is to properly scope an issue or determine if there was identify a problem that may be solved by policy, we need data. And there seems to be a lingering challenge in that we may not have sufficient data to support policy development. So looking at ICANN's report, they kind of noted the challenges in obtaining data. And they provided one alternative in which data could

be obtained in looking at historical compliance data regarding compliance with the verification and validation portions of the RAA. While analogous to accuracy, it's not necessarily assessing accuracy. So while I think that's helpful data, I'm not sure that that would be enough data to reconvene the Scoping Team.

So I think there's three questions. First, can we identify other alternatives for getting more data to help the Scoping Team or that would warrant restarting a Scoping Team? Second question, if not, is reconvening the Scoping Team a worthwhile exercise, and then going ahead? If not, what would an alternative be to formal policy development to keep this topic moving forward, recognizing that this is an important topic in the community?

So these are just my preliminary thoughts, trying to get our arms around this. What are additional alternatives we could consider for getting additional data? Thinking about should we be restarting the Scoping Team? And then is there alternative to formal policy work that we should consider on this topic? I know those are pretty broad and maybe we don't have the answers right now, but I just wanted to start the discussion and provide a little more detail in thinking about this moving forward. So I'll open the queue with Kurt.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks. I also agree that it's an important topic in the community and we need to find a way to move it forward. My input is that we shouldn't restart the Scoping Team. The results from the first team were of marginal value of the ideas, the best ideas that came from it were the survey or audit of registrars that can no longer be done. But the team itself was sort of plagued by conflict that made it difficult to move

forward. So I don't know. I'd be not for trying to do the same thing and expecting some sort of different result than the last time. But I think the Scoping Team worked really hard but was unable to develop a suggestion.

So that's my input. And sadly, we do need some sort of new construct moving forward. Sadly, I don't have something constructive here. The other point I want to make is we need to make some statement that we're working on this. I think there's misconceptions. There is a major misconception that once DPAs were executed between contracted parties in ICANN that that would resolve the data availability issue. And I still think that perception lingers despite ICANN's pretty clear statement that it would not. So I think we need to make a statement that kind of defines where we are and say we're working on it. Of course, I'm looking forward to see what others have to say about the possible suggestion for moving forward. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Kurt. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure, Greg. I think we should try to push this forward to the best we can. I think, Greg, your points are very good. I didn't have answers to those yesterday. I don't have answers to them today. But I think just from my own personal perspective, as long as we could just sort of keep this on the radar, and maybe we take up those points, and maybe that's sort of what we look at, and we try to define those over the next couple months, and then come to a resolution. I think that's fine with me. But data accuracy is a key thing. I mean, there's an enormous amount of effort that's going into access to WHOIS data. I think the

access and the accuracy kind of go hand in hand. Getting access to stuff which is completely inaccurate and false isn't worth a whole lot of discussion. So I think you have some good points. As long as we are to keep it on the radar and if we have a goal to strive towards, I think that's a good system. So thank you.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Damon. Yeah, I agree with those points. So maybe summing up, thinking about going forward, are there other alternatives for gathering data as the Scoping Team requested, that was what the Scoping Team stated. That was the roadblock originally. There may be other alternatives we haven't considered. Let's think about that. And then if reconvening the Scoping Team is not viable, what are alternatives to moving forward on this issue that is clearly important to the community even if it doesn't rise to the level of formal policymaking? Okay. Any other questions or comments on this topic? Okay. Topic number three, GNSO chair election. I just wanted to share with the Council that I'm planning to run for a second term. I think we've been doing good work, and frankly, I'm enjoying it. So I'm going to run. I'm open to any questions councilors might have. But yeah, I just wanted to make that known. And I don't know what my vice chair's status is. What are you guys up to? Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE:

Thanks, Greg. That's good news. I just wanted to report some pretty favorable comment that occurred in yesterday's NCPH proceeding on hopefully maintaining all three of you in leadership positions, if you're willing. So I would personally certainly support that.

-
- GREG DIBIASE: Much appreciated, Anne. That's great to hear. Damon?
- DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Greg and Nacho and Tomslin. Being a new councilor, I just want to say thank you for your leadership. I think you guys are doing a great job. So I'm happy to hear that you're considering me running. Nacho and Tomslin, I hope you'll rerun too. I guess I should also say I am a directed councilor. We haven't discussed this at all in the IPC. But firstly, it is a pleasure to work with you as leaders. Thank you very much.
- GREG DIBIASE: Great. Thank you, Damon. Susan?
- SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Everything that Damon said, including the directed part, but obviously, it's really good news. Really pleased to hear that. I suppose for just for formality and completeness, can you remind us if anyone else is wanting to put their hat in the ring? I mean, is there a deadline? I'm not suggesting that I'm going to, quite the reverse. But just so for completeness, if anyone else was minded to stand against Greg, they would know when they needed to do it.
- GREG DIBIASE: That's a great point, Susan. I don't know. I'm looking to staff. I should have known this information before.
- STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. This is Steve from staff. I am not the right person to ask and I wish Terri was here, but I think an approximation of what is required, I think it's early mid October when submissions or I guess informing that the house is putting forward a candidate. This is why

Terri should answer, not me. But I think it's around October prior to the AGM. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. We will follow up on list with the exact details from a more knowledgeable staff member.

STEVE CHAN: Ouch for the record.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You can still lose against none of the above, right?

GREG DIBIASE: Just kidding. Thank you, Steve. Okay. Moving on to AOB. Do any councilors have any other business? Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: It looks like Kurt was first with his hand up in the room.

KURT PRITZ: No, no, no. Go ahead. You go first.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: I did just want to mention that out for public comment is the review of the Operating Procedures Annexes on input GNSO Guidance and GNSO EPDP, and it's something that folks might overlook. But I think it's actually pretty important to our structure in the way that we operate. This is a mandated five-year after review of the recommendations of the Policy and Implementation Working Group. It has some wonderful safeguards in that any councilor can raise an issue under the procedures specified. Of course, we've used EPDP. We have used GGP now for the first time. I'm not aware that we've used GNSO input. But I think just again, speaking personally and not on

behalf of any constituency, that we would be wise to pay attention to that July 2nd deadline and to hopefully file comment that is in support of these mechanisms or any improvements that you'd like to see to them.

For example, when I presented yesterday on the SPIRT team and I outlined from the predictability framework, the guardrail on what's happening at that level, is any councilor can raise an issue at the Council level. It supersedes a decision made by the SPIRT and ICANN Org that's an important guardrail. And so, I think that I am hoping constituencies and stakeholder groups will be willing to put effort against this public comment that it's open until July 2nd. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Anne. Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

I just wanted to respond to what Anne is saying that the NCSG is definitely looking into that public comment. It's reviewing them. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. I know I did this in the chat yesterday, but I think that since it's Any Other Business, we really should give Anne a round of applause for the mastery on the SPIRT. I mean, I thought that was one of the best presentations I've seen in ICANN land. It was thorough, it was interesting. She demystified an important topic that, frankly, is complex. So, Anne, just publicly I wanted to say thank you. I thought it was fantastic.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks so much, Paul. But I must say Juan and Steve, wow. Okay. I mean, these guys are fantastic at documenting things that I insist be documented. I appreciate it. Thanks so much for that, Paul.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Paul. Mark then Kurt then Thomas.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. To reinforce, thank you so much, Anne, for all the hard work. And now I will just show my ignorance, which you might say is unusual thing, and it is. But even after Anne's presentation, I'm still slightly unaware of the full scope of SPIRT. I understand the mechanisms and how it's supposed to work. But in terms of scope, from when to when will it be running? Will this be ongoing indefinitely? Is this a pilot? Is this our new way of policy? Can anybody help clarify that aspect of it? Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Well, the team does not come into play until the Applicant Guidebook is published. And so in accordance with the SubPro Final Report, there was a recognition of a need to be able to deal expediently with issues that could arise after the Applicant Guidebook is published. There were categories of issues that were outlined in the final report. Actually, we had like five categories. But in the IRT process, we agreed to limit that to three different categories that essentially covered the same ground, non-minor issues are treated one way, and they come to the SPIRT. Minor operational issues, changes can be made by ICANN

quite readily. And then if there are issues that involve policy, those obviously need to be kicked up to the Council for determination of where to go from there. This is based on the fact that in 2012 round, issues did arise and had to be dealt with, things that had not been anticipated. So when it kicks in, if that's your specific question, is on publication of the Applicant Guidebook.

What I'm also hoping is that after our June 24 meeting, if we get to consensus on all the draft language, I would like to—and again, the role as liaison is not the substantive role, it's a reporting function to you as Council. So, hopefully after the 24th, when we have consensus on the draft that the team wants to recommend to Council, we can get it to, I hope, well in advance of the July vote. Now, I'll also say that it was pointed out in this morning's IRT meeting that there will be a final public comment on the Applicant Guidebook in the fall next year, I think. When does that happen? Sometime in 2025, there will be a final Applicant Guidebook comment. Lars Hoffman pointed out that there could be changes to the predictability framework that could occur as a result of that public comment, and that might require some adjustments to the SPIRT charter that Council has approved. So Susan and I are going to be looking at what the motion should look like in connection with Council approval or non-approval in July in order to allow for those revisions for public comment that may occur on the predictability framework. I guess I recommend that you might have to read the charter as good bedtime reading as soon as we get the finalized version to you. And then certainly we will be prepared to answer questions via e-mail ahead of the July meeting, and also in the

July meeting itself before presenting this for a vote. Does that answer your question?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you so much for the explanation, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Okay.

GREG DIBIASE: I'll note Justine's suggestion to take Anne out to coffee, and I'm sure you'll get the answers you need. Paul, is that an old hand? Kurt?

KURT PRITZ: So this is a new topic and it's an idea that was triggered by our discussion of the aspirational statement. To what degree the aspirational statement collides a little bit with our goal of making our policy recommendations Board-ready. We talk about that every once in a while, make sure our policy recommendations are Board-ready. And it seems to me that the Council approves almost all policy recommendations without a comment. And then the Board looks at the policy recommendations, like they're brand new things and there's a deep dive de novo review. And the result is the Board often rejects policy recommendations. Sometimes it's not a surprise and sometimes it's a complete surprise. And I'd like to work with a small group of councilors to sort of look into what steps the Council might take to make recommendations Board-ready or sort of smooth the transition or ease the degree of scrutiny that the Board takes with Board recommendations to give them confidence into what's been done so far. I think that might be accomplished by interviews with Board members, deep dive interviews with all the recent PDP chairs

and PDP participants, and try to understand what if any steps the Board, the Council could take to make our recommendations Board-ready and kind of had them be more amenable or raise the expectation for approval without months and months of work. What could be done either with the process or with information transfer?

We've already taken steps, Jeff, but 38 policy recommendations by the SubPro got rejected. Most important policy recommendations of the PDP, the two most important ones got rejected. They were taking steps, but I don't know. I'd like to learn more about it and do a brief study. I'm only going to be on the Council until November. So it would only last four or five months, but I wanted to get your feedback and see if anybody else thought that was a good idea.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Kurt. From my perspective, we are taking steps. But yeah, no issue with identifying ways we could continuously improve. Steve?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Greg. This is Caitlin Tubergen again, ICANN Org. Thanks, Kurt, for the suggestion. During the SPS, there was a small group of volunteers that had come forward to talk about working on maybe a one-page document that could include more information about what it means to be Board-ready. And in the background, support staff has been gathering some ideas to share with that group. But we might want to put out our call for volunteers to see if those original volunteers are still interested. But if anyone around the table is interested in being part of that, support staff and leadership has already worked together on something that would be a good starting point for the group. And if you want to redo the whole thing, that

would be fine. But we thought to get the conversation going, it'd be helpful to put some thoughts on paper that we could share with Kurt and anybody else who's interested in working further on this initiative.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Caitlin. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Greg. To Kurt's question, I think something the Council should also be thinking about is how we could probably bring the ODP and impact assessment reviews into the PDP so that is done much earlier.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Tomslin. I agree with that. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: A word about Kurt is—maybe I'm the only one, but I thought that the announcement of Kurt as the new CEO was as loveless as can be. There wasn't even a picture of Kurt, and no message from Kurt whatsoever. I think that was not really a warm welcome by this community, to be quite honest. Maybe we as a Council just want to send him a quick note saying that we heard that he's been appointed CEO, that we are impressed with his track record, and that we're very much looking forward to working with him. Out of courtesy, no pun intended.

GREG DIBIASE: That makes sense to me. Something we can consider. Paul, is that a new hand?

PAUL MCGRADY: Somebody mentioned the ODA ODPs. Instead of moving them forward into the PDP, I'm hoping that they will wander off to the graveyard of

bad ideas and die lonely deaths. So we should talk about whether or not we went to accidentally keep them around. From my point of view, they extended everything out for a year, especially in relationship to the one on the SSAD was a particularly bad piece of work. The ranges that came back and it was just nutty. So I do think that it's an important question of whether or not the new CEO is going to keep that construct, which seemed to have been completely pulled out of thin air by the last CEO. And if they are, maybe the Council needs to be thinking about what guardrails we could suggest to staff about what those should look like. But to have two or three more of those that really weren't helpful, slowing down the process, I'm not sure. If we are going to keep them, then absolutely we need to kick off that work during the PDP. There's sort of this bigger question of whether or not those should stay or go. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Paul. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Plus one to Paul. Even if the review is pending for the ODP, it should not be reflected in the Z diagram that everyone sees as part of the policy development process. Number one, because it's not part of the policy development process. And number two is that the review may or may not determine that's appropriate. And three, even if it is appropriate, it's not going to be where it says it is in the Z diagram. As Paul said, it's supposed to be incorporated within the PDP. So I would ask that the Council ask staff to remove that from the Z diagram since that's not a GNSO, since that's not a formal activity of the policy development process. It's not in the Bylaws and it's frankly not in our

operating procedures. So I would think that that can be done and should be done immediately. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Jeff. Paul, old hand? I think I heard a couple new potential action items of building on Kurt's idea and Caitlin's mention of the list of improving Board readiness and making sure we document things, and then possibly taking up Thomas's idea for a nice letter to the new CEO.

Jeff, sorry, can I get a response? Why is the ODP in the Z diagram? Oh, from staff? I'm assuming they're not authorized to make that determination now.

STEVE CHAN:

This is Steve from staff. I haven't looked at it in a little while, but I think it actually specifically says optional. So I think we could probably take it out, at least for now. Because I guess to Jeff's point, it's the authoritative steps that take place in the PDP, the Z graphic should reflect that. So at least from my perspective and as much decision-making I can make, I don't mind updating that document and replacing it. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Jeff, does that satisfy you?

JEFF NEUMAN:

I think it says pilot as opposed to optional. But I would prefer just to be removed unless and until it is made a part of the formal policy development process. Because I've got a question, by the way, about it. Just the reason I'm bringing it up is I've gotten a couple of questions

now over the past couple of months from GAC members. I just think it's unnecessary to have gotten those questions. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Jeff. Steve, fair I can say staff is taking that back? Great. Okay, anyone else with comments, questions, observations? Seeing none, I'd like to thank everyone. I thought I heard someone. Okay, seeing none. I'd like to thank all the councilors for their hard work during this meeting. I look forward to next steps and I hope everyone has safe travels home. I'll call this meeting to a close.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]