EN

ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – GNSO Council Meeting Part I
Wednesday, October 21, 2020 - 13:00 to 15:00 CEST

[This meeting is being recorded]

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. And welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 21 October 2020. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it thank you.

Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

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.

EN

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Gregory Dibiase.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon.

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tom Dale.

TOM DALE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Marie.

Scott McCormick. I don't see Scott yet in the Zoom room.

John McElwaine.

JOHN McELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Flip.

Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here, thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

Elsa Saade.

ELSA SAADE: Here, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

Farrell Folly.

FARRELL FOLLY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Tatiana.

Juan Manuel Rojas.

EN

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: James Gannon.

JAMES GANNON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you.

                            Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks, Cheryl.

Erika Mann. Erika did send her tentative apologies for today's meeting. She's moving house. So I don't see her in the Zoom room.

Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here, Nathalie. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Yes, I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. And we equally have GNSO policy support staff in the room.

So I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your name before speaking for recording purposes.

And a reminder to councillors that we're in a Zoom Webinar room. You have all been promoted to panelists. You can activate your microphones and participate in the chat as usual.

Please remember to set your chat to "all panelists and attendees" for everyone to be able to read the exchanges.

A warm welcome to observers on the call who can now follow the council meeting directly. Observers on this call are silent observers. They, therefore, do not have access to their microphones, nor to the chat option. There will be an open mic session at the end of meeting where all will be invited to take part by raising hands to be placed in the queue.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

Thanks, Keith. And now it's over to you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. Hello, everybody. Welcome. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, depending on your time zone. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place during ICANN 69 taking place on the 21st of October 2020.

I will now pause and ask if any councillors have updates to statements of interest. If anybody has an update to statements of interest, please raise your hand.

And, James, I see you. Go right ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Keith. James Gannon for the record. I will be taking a seat on the PTI Board after this meeting. I don't believe it presents any conflict of interest for this meeting but just for full transparency.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, James. And thank you for your willingness to serve in that role, an important role related to PTI. So thank you very much for bringing that to our attention.

Any other updates to statements of interest, please?

Okay. I'm not seeing any additional hands so let us move on. I will now conduct a quick review of the agenda for today's meeting.

This is our annual global meeting, so we will have some administrative items towards the end of the call. But item number 2 on our agenda today, after we got through our admin matters, will be some opening remarks and a review of our action decision radar, the projects list. I will make a couple of opening remarks and then hand it over to Berry Cobb to go over the ADR as well as the projects list.

On our consent agenda today, we actually have five items. It is a substantial consent agenda. And I will just briefly go over those

five items here, and we'll get into a little bit more substance when we get to the consent agenda.

But the first is 3.1, next steps for the WHOIS conflicts procedure Implementation Advisory Group. As a reminder, this was an effort that was paused during the work on GDPR and the temporary specification and the EPDP. And this action item is to essentially restart that work.

3.2 is council agrees to launch a call for volunteers for a small team to develop a draft charter and an EPDP scoping document for the IDN policy track.

3.3 will be initiation on next steps related to the EPDP phase 2A items. That's two separate buckets, one on legal versus natural and the feasibility of unique contacts and the second being the topic of accuracy.

3.4 is a confirmation of the recommendations report to the ICANN Board related to the EPDP phase 2 recommendations that were approved during our September 24th meeting. This is the procedural step that effectively initiates the delivery of those recommendations to the ICANN Board.

And then 3.5 is the appointment of the new GNSO liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee, or GAC. And there's a

motion link there. Jeff Neuman is the nominee and is the -- will be the new GNSO liaison to the GAC.

So those are the items on our consent agenda for today.

Item number 4 will be a council discussion on a draft motion to affirm the intent of EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 7 and initiation of the thick WHOIS transition policy EPDP. I will hand this topic over to Pam Little when we get to it.

Just as a reminder to all councillors and observers, I have previously recused myself from managing this topic on the council leadership team as the thick WHOIS transition policy uniquely impacts my employer. But it also impacts all registrars that sell and distribute .COM and .NET domain names. So Pam Little will handle the introduction for this topic.

But I do want to note that there are some important procedural questions here that councillors will need to pay attention to.

Item number 5 is a council discussion on a draft operational design phase for gTLD policy implementation. I think as you all will remember, we received some information from ICANN Org and directly from Goran Marby, ICANN CEO, related to the concept of a draft operational design phase. And this has potential implications for the EPDP phase 2 recommendations

as well as perhaps the subsequent procedures work down the road. So this is an opportunity for us to discuss that as a council.

Item number 6 will be a council discussion on the Board consultation regarding questions surrounding the financial sustainability of the SSAD, the standardized system for access and disclosure. You will remember that this was touched on briefly during our GNSO Council session with the GAC -- the ICANN Board, excuse me, earlier this week and that this is an opportunity for the council to discuss next steps in terms of an engagement with the ICANN Board on the question of financial sustainability of the SSAD, as was called for in the motion that we approved when we approved the SSAD package.

Item number 7 is a council discussion. This is ADR item, council to consider the delay of a request for a policy status report on the expiration policies. We will talk more about that in detail when we get to it.

And then item number 8 is any other business where we will have farewell to outgoing councillors and then an open microphone session for participants.

So with that, are there any questions, any comments on the agenda for today's meeting? Okay. I'm not seeing any hands.

EN

And hearing no voices, let us get back briefly to the administrative matters.

I'll just note that the status of the minutes for the previous council meetings. Per the GNSO operating procedures, the minutes of the council meeting of the 20th of August, 2020, were posted on the 4th of September and the minutes of the GNSO Council meeting of the 24th of September were posted on 9 October, 2020. So thank you for that.

Okay. Item number 2, opening remarks. I'll just make a couple of points here. Just to note that this is a -- as was noted in the AOB section, this is the GNSO Council meeting at the annual global meeting, so we will be having quite a bit of turnover at the end of this call. We will have eight new councillors coming in, eight departing, eight coming in, as well as turnover at the leadership team as well. So we can talk a little bit more about that. But I just wanted to note that.

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands, and hearing no voices, let us get back briefly to the administrative matters.

I'll just note that the status of the minutes of the previous meetings per the GNSO operating procedures. The minutes of the Council meeting of the 20th of August 2020 were posted on the 4th of September, and the minutes of the GNSO Council

ICANN|69
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

meeting of the 24th of September were posted on 9 October 2020. So thank you for that.

Okay. Item number 2, opening remarks. I'll just make a couple of points here. Just to note that this is a -- as was noted in the AOB section, this is the GNSO Council meeting at the annual global meeting. So we will be having quite a bit of turnover during -- at the end of this call. We will have eight new councilors coming in. So eight departing, eight coming in, as well as turnover at the leadership team as well. So we can talk a little bit more about that. But I just wanted to note that this is a significant turnover and a significant transition, it's an important period for the GNSO Council, and the overall community.

At our last AGM in Montreal, if I recall correctly we had the turnover the six councilors. So you can see just in the period of one year, we've had significant turnover at the Council level. And so we'll talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

Berry, I'm going to hand it over to you now for a review of the ADR, the action/decision radar, and our projects list and then we'll get into the substantive part of our agenda. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: Great, thank you, Keith. Berry Cobb for the record.

I won't go through any of these in huge detail but just basically highlight a couple of the things that I outlined when we sent these work products to the mailing list last Monday the 11th.

First, what you see on the screen here, which is an older version, that's not the latest version that was sent out, but from the projects list to the action/decision radar and to the project management tool, if you've reviewed those in detail, you'll have noticed that there's kind of a new color theme by program that has been implemented. This is mostly to try to help build cohesion across all three of these work products and to better allow for cross-reference through them. You know, essentially the project management tool is kind of the macro level view of everything that is on the plate for the GNSO, whether it's reviews, operations, the different programs that deal with the policy topics that the GNSO usually discusses.

You know, then we step down into the project list, which is kind of a more tactical view of all of our current and ongoing types of projects. And then to complement this all is this action/decision radar which is meant kind of to reveal a pipeline of actions and decisions that are in front of the GNSO Council, all of which, with this kind of new scheme, is our slow evolution to get us to a better place -- thank you much this is the more current one -- to get to a better place about better prioritizing our work and

EN

eventually get to go a point where we can truly understand our bandwidth and resource capabilities for not only existing work but for decisions on launching future work.

And then I think probably around November or December time frame, the fourth work product, which is our action items, will start to inherit some of these same features, identifying the program and project for which the action item is associated with. And what this is going to allow with this cohesion across these four work products is to hopefully be able to start producing some reporting about all of the activity that goes into all of these different projects and rolled up into a program and macro view.

As it relates to the action/decision radar, I don't want to go into detail about any of these line items other than to say the zero-to-one month range marker, several of these are on the agenda as Keith noted and pointed out. And, you know, if you haven't looked at it yet, then I would recommend that you take a closer look at the one-to-three month range marker down towards the bottom of this page and further on because that really starts to set up what's in front of the GNSO Council from now through the end of the year.

I think some of the things that you'll notice here is that we have the SCBO that is spinning up, we have two primary PDPs that are

anticipated to deliver their final reports, as well as things like the strategic planning session, and so on and so forth. But I believe we'll go through this in a little more detail at the wrap-up session tomorrow.

And if we can just switch over to the projects list real quick.

So for -- basically what's in front of us from a project perspective, I'll just note the primary changes from the last version.

The RPM working group, if you'll recall from the last Council meeting, they reviewed through their Project Change Request, and we upgraded the status back to a revised schedule, but the health of that project is still remaining in trouble in terms of trying to get to its final report by the mid to end of November, I believe.

The Sub Pro Working Group had completed its public comment period and is reviewing through their particular comments as they start to approach delivering their final report. And then of course the Council also voted on the EPDP Phase 2 consensus recommendations. That has also been shifted over to the Board vote phase where the Board will start to consider those.

So those are kind of the key highlights here. You'll also notice that the project list has evolved a little bit. The phase column has shifted over to the right to better align with the metadata of

the project which follows our typical policy development process. And you'll notice over on the left that the program, and then there's a project code. And it's this project code that's going to kind of be the unique key that's going to enable the reporting.

And I'll just close in. I see there's a question from Maxim about how many simultaneous active processes, including chartering, do we envision in January.

I don't have that right off the -- I don't have a direct answer for you just yet, but I do believe that is a topic that we'll touch a little bit on when we review the action/decision radar in tomorrow's wrap-up call as well as I believe it will be a topic for the strategic planning session.

So thank you. I'll turn it back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Berry. And, yeah, I was going to reinforce that for all councilors, and particularly the next council, is that there will be a strategic planning session taking place where, again, the topic of work prioritization and, you know, sort of working through the program management, project management, and the funnel of work will be a major topic. So look forward to that.

But as Berry noted, it will also be a topic of discussion for the Council working session that's -- that will take place later this week.

So thanks, Berry.

Any questions, any comments for Berry on the ADR or the projects list?

All right. Let's then move on.

So we will move next to our consent agenda. And again, I gave a brief overview of these items at the outset, but let me just speak a little bit more in detail to them.

So the 3.1 is the next steps for the WHOIS Conflicts Procedure Implementation Advisory Group. As I noted, this was something that was put on hold during the consideration of GDPR, the temp spec, and the work of the EPDP in both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

And the GNSO has considered the proposed immediate action and subsequent stepped as outlined in the WHOIS conflicts procedure IAG, small teams' proposal.   And the proposal outlines recommended next steps to consider with respect to modifying the implementation of the WHOIS conflicts procedure in light of public comments received and changes to data protection law that may have affected the implementation of

EN

the procedure. And there are a number of items here that are the specific GNSO Council requests, including requesting ICANN org, in consultation with the contracted parties, to draft a proposal for a modification to the existing procedure based on past experience with both the WHOIS conflicts procedure and the registrar data retention waiver process.

And so I'm not going to go through each one of these line items. This has been available to Council as part of our agenda and part of the consent agenda, but I did just want to sort of tee up and give a bit of a context for what this is.

The next item is 3.2 is the Council agrees to launch a call for volunteers for the small team to develop both the draft charter and an EPDP scoping document for the IDN policy track.

You'll remember that starting last year, the GNSO Council initiated a scoping team to make recommendations to the GNSO Council for its consideration on the topic of the IDN policy track. We received that back in January and February of this year, and we are now at the stage where we're prepared to initiate the charter drafting and the scoping of a EPDP on this effort.

And just to note that we did -- the Council leadership, working with staff and in consultation with ICANN Legal, confirmed that this was an appropriate topic for an EPDP; that there was

ICANN|69
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

sufficient and substantial work done, and the body of work basically indicated that we didn't need to go through the extra step of having an issues report requested.

That said, I want to make it clear that when you see the term EPDP, that doesn't mean that this effort on the IDN variants and the IDN policy work will follow the structure or the format or the engagement of the EPDP on the temp spec. That is why we actually have a separate item here listed for the scoping of the EPDP in addition to drafting the charter. The effort -- we'll need to figure out how this group will be constructed and how it will be chartered. But it's not a given that it will necessarily look like the previous EPDP in terms of structure. I just want to make that clear for folks.

3.3 is the council's direction to initiate follow-on work on the EPDP 2a items. And, again, these are being handled in two different buckets. The first will be the legal versus natural and feasibility of unique contacts that will be handled within the construct and within the charter of the EPDP. And we're going to need to go through the process of initiating a call for a new chair and for making sure that the groups who have contributed members to the EPDP on the temp spec and on the SSAD are prepared to continue engaging and if they would like to keep

their previous members to confirm that or to identify new members to the group.

And then the follow-on work will be on accuracy. This is a separate track that will require some additional scoping effort. And this is basically the GNSO Council signaling that we're starting on that work to move forward on both of those tracks.

And then I noted 3.4 was the confirmation of the recommendations report to the ICANN Board on the SSAD recommendations.

And 3.5 is the appointment of Jeff Neuman as the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

So with that, Nathalie, I will hand it back to you to conduct the vote on the consent agenda. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Keith. So this vote will be conducted via a voice vote. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye.

[No verbal response.]

Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion?

[No verbal response.]

Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say aye.

[Chorus of Ayes.]

With no abstention, no objection, the motion passes, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And thanks, everybody. Quite a bit of work included in that consent agenda but important work that we're now moving forward with.

So with that, we'll move to item number 4 which is the council discussion discussing the draft motion to affirm intent of EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 7 and the concurrent initiation of the thick WHOIS transition policy EPDP. We have 25 minutes allocated to this.

And as I noted at the top of the call, I'm going to hand this over to Pam who led a small team effort -- or I should say is leading a small team effort, and to Rafik as the council leadership team responsible for this item.

Pam, over to you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. Pam Little for the record. Hi, everyone. As Keith has said earlier, this matter has a significant -- significant and important to the council from a procedural perspective. That's why we've taken an unusual approach to propose a draft motion for discussion at this council meeting.

As you may recall, during the September council meeting, Sebastien Ducos, the GNSO Council's liaison to the IRT, provided a report to the council. Basically, the gist of the report was that the so-called impasse or disagreement within the IRT still persists. So the matter is now referred back to the council.

So this basically boils down to two issues. One is Recommendation 7 in the EPDP final report and Recommendation 27.

Recommendation 7 deals with transfer of registration data from registrars to registries. And apparently the IRT -- within the IRT, there is disagreement as to what Recommendation 7 means or intended to mean.

And we also received some correspondence from ICANN Board, as some of you may recall. The Board was concerned about the impact on the thick WHOIS transition policy and also the fact that the EPDP Phase 1 final report did not explicitly repeal thick WHOIS transition policy.

So in order to resolve these issues, we were relying on or really sort of referring to the existing GNSO guidelines or principles and processes to guide us. I don't believe the council has dealt with a unique situation like this one in front of us right now. So this is all a bit of unchartered waters for us.

So we looked at those principles and guidelines and framework to see what the council needs to do or can do or should do in such unique situation.

And it appears to me that the only role the council should play at this juncture is to provide guidance to the IRT about the intent of the recommendation. I'm not saying that's the only option, but I think given that the -- to me the intent is sufficiently clear, then I believe it is council's job to provide such a guidance. So that's what we're trying to do in this draft motion as set out in the agenda.

The motion is intended to do two things. One is to confirm the intent of the EPDP Phase 1 recommendation. And that's exactly the language from those documents I mentioned earlier. And, also, the other thing is to initiate an EPDP to review the thick WHOIS transition policy.

The small team I would just stress that we -- when we convene the small team right immediately after our September meeting,

EN

there were different views and interpretations of various documents and even the recommendation itself. So there are different suggestions or proposal as to what the council should do.

At the moment, you'll see the draft motion is there because I personally feel we have -- as a council, have been looking into this matter for a long time. Since May we asked our GNSO liaison to the IRT to see if he can help resolve this matter.

But after exhausting all his effort, it appears not the case so it came back to me. We all should be very familiar with this matter.

But when we have to make a decision about what -- about next steps, basically there would need to be a motion for the council to vote on in order to make a decision to move forward.

So that's why we propose this draft motion. And the small team was working -- used this document as kind of a working document for us to discuss some of the different issues or considerations.

And you'll see in the draft motion in its current form now, it looks very long. But really it's structured in three parts: Basically the Whereas clause, just trying to set out all the chronology for you, if you like, so you understand what happened along the way,

how we got to where we are; and the Resolved clause just to do those two things I mentioned earlier, to reaffirm the intention for Rec 7 and to initiate the EPDP on the thick WHOIS.

We also thought given the significance of this matter, it seemed appropriate to provide a rationale. So the last and the latest part of this draft motion is a rationale about why we -- the council is making such a decision and the reasoning for our decision and the basis as well.

So you'll see this is a draft motion for your consideration -- and I do hope you have had a chance to review it. If not, please do so after the meeting.

I do hope that you will get behind this document and if you feel there is room for improvement or if you have other suggestions, please let us know.

And as I mentioned earlier, there was a lot of discussion and work within the small team. We, in fact, met three times after our September meeting as a small team and also work via email. And that's where we are in this draft motion before you. It's sort of a work in progress at the moment.

So I -- I -- because of the small team composition and where there were different views, I would just pause it to -- pause here

EN

to see if some of the small team members would have anything to add or clarify.

So I'm not seeing anyone in the queue.

KEITH DRAZEK: Marie has her hand up.

PAM LITTLE: Okay. Marie, over to you. Sorry, I didn't see that.

MARIE PATTULLO: That's okay, Pam. This is Marie Pattullo from the BC. Lovely to not see all of you but lovely to talk to you.

I can reiterate what Pam said that we had a lot of discussion in the small team, and of course the role of Council is not to go into the substance, not to relitigate but to manage the process. But what was very clear in council -- sorry, in the small team is that there are very different views. And as Sebastien put it who is, as you know, our liaison, there are very different views that persist in the IRT, in the community, but clearly, of course, persist in the small team.

There were a number of options for what's being discussed, this motion being one of them: the idea that there should be a PDP.

It's no secret that from the BC side, we don't believe that a new PDP would really have been the best way forward. As far as we were concerned, the legal basis does exist. ICANN org can provide evidence that the legal basis does exist, and then the optional transfer becomes, de facto, mandatory. But, you know, I'm relitigating here, and I don't want to.

There were various other options that our colleague from the IPC, John McElwaine, came forward with, so I'll leave him to talk about those, but one concern, one overarching and if I can go as far as ethereal concern, that the Phase 1 report did not say it was changing, writing, appealing an agreed consensus policy as in the thick WHOIS consensus policy. And it is, we think, rather worrying that this process has led us to, if you like, a de facto back-door appeal of a consensus policy. I apologize if those words aren't as diplomatic as they could be. I don't have this written down. I'm just talking.

So this is -- this is the BC perspective. But from the small team perspective, as I said, we were looking at a number of different ways forward. And I don't want to put him on the spot but I'd be really grateful if John McElwaine could come in at this point.

Thanks, Pam.

EN

PAM LITTLE:	Thank you, Marie.
	John, anything to add?
JOHN McELWAINE:	Hey, John McElwaine for the record. Can you hear me?
PAM LITTLE:	Yes, we can hear you.
JOHN McELWAINE:	Okay; good. So I'm working only off my phone right now. I've just gotten to the office.
	So, yeah, I agree with everything that has been said.
	The -- the impasse as I saw, and I think as the small team saw was not so much going to be solved by interpretation of legal basis but really the concern is and was what is the outcome of determining that legal basis would include requiring transfer of the thick WHOIS data elements.
	I proposed a couple of different ways, short of an EPDP, to address that situation. And where we landed is -- and I can't see on the screen right now because I'm on my phone, but that the -- essentially the small team's motion still requires the language as

drafted to go out and be implemented by the IRT, recognizing that there's still interpretation work to be done by ICANN org with respect to that if there was ever any sort of enforcement efforts.

At the same time, it became very clear to me and I think others on the group that pursuant to Recommendation 27, we're going to have to review the EPDP's work and SSAD model and its impact on thick WHOIS.

So the idea that I had was to make sure that any review of the thick WHOIS policy was limited, have guardrails up on it that would comply with what we were asked to do by the Board and by the EPDP group in the wave one report on Recommendation 27.

So essentially getting down to the BC and IPC's position is that, you know, there -- there can be some ambiguity as to how legal basis is interpreted. We think that a written contract between a registrar and a registry can be that legal basis. But regardless, it's the outcome that the community is concerned about, the outcome of those data element transfers. We've already been asked to review WHOIS policy in the wave one report, and that's what this motion does.

So that's sort of like my summary of where we landed.

Thanks.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, John.

And thank you, Marie.

Yes, so that's -- probably the council has now got a better idea. We sort of have two -- two different approaches, if you like. And from my perspective, we actually as a council don't even have to go into whether there is legal basis in all cases or not, because that's not our role. We are not there to relitigate policy discussion or to determine whether -- whether there is legal basis in all cases. Our role is procedural.

And in this case, we also have a very important question in my mind, is in this implementation phase, that the different roles and responsibilities of various parties -- for example, I just mentioned that it is the role of the Council to provide guidance in relation to the intent of Recommendation 7, because they are clearly documented in those documents what our role is.

But what's unclear to me is the role of the Board. We are not here talking about a -- a recommendation that has not been adopted/rejected by the Board. This Recommendation 7 was -- has the consensus of the EPDP team, was adopted by the GNSO

Council, was actually approved by the Board, and it is during the implementation phase where it appears that the org was acting on the Board's instruction to draw up the policy language in a way that actually is inconsistent with the actual recommendation. Because the recommendation, in my mind, is pretty clear, transferring registrant data from registrar to registry is really option -- is optional according to Recommendation 7 language. And it's up to the registry to determine the legal basis or whether they have legitimate purpose.

But we don't even have to go into the policy discussion. What our role is to ascertain the intent of Recommendation 7 based on the report in its totality and the claim or the interpretation that all legal -- legal basis exists in all cases and transferring of registrant data elements is mandatory. It's just not supported by the report. It's just inconsistent with so many parts of the report.

That's my read -- my reading of the report.

So -- And I just feel it's kind of a -- we get ourselves into a knot if we're trying to get into the substance of the recommendation. But we are able and, in a position, to ascertain from the report as a whole what the intention of Recommendation 7. As I said, my reading of the report suggests that intention is sufficiently clear for us to make that determination.

I have a question in the Q&A pod from Amr and I'll read it out loud: Amr asks: In considering the issue of Recommendation 7 has the GNSO Council or its small team taken into account that the thick WHOIS PDP Working Group's charter included a question on conflicts of thick WHOIS with privacy/data protection law, and that the thick WHOIS PDP Working Group recommended that it lacked the capacity to resolve this issue back in 2013, and that resolution of this issue should be deferred to implementation as more information becomes available? If this has not been considered, why not?

Amr, we haven't considered this specifically as in the context of such a recommendation back in 2013, but we -- we are aware that the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group would make this thick WHOIS policy, privacy and data protection law wasn't fully considered. So we kind of -- is a way of such a background. But there you provide us more concrete and detailed context. Thank you for that.

Okay. I have Rafik in the queue, and Michele.

Rafik, over to you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry, Rafik Dammak speaking. So thanks for the presentation.

EN

I'm not going to speak for too long. I think Pam explained in details about the background and the purpose behind this motion. It give all the details and have the timeline for the issue from the beginning in relation to thick WHOIS.

I do believe what is proposed there is the path forward for the GNSO Council. Again, we are the process manager. We should not get into the substance.

We are -- We have there a response to the IRT to help them and give them guidance in how to move away from that impasse. And also, we are responding to the many question from the Board regarding the thick WHOIS. And we have that plan and that we need to work on that issue and probably initiate the PDP, et cetera.

So I do believe we have the proposal that should be considered by the GNSO Council. I understand that there is (indiscernible) that we try to rework the recommendation number 7 at GNSO Council level, but that won't be the right space to do so.

And we also -- I want to emphasize that the more we spend time on this, the more time for the IRT to spend and to be away from finalizing the implementation of EPDP Phase 1 recommendation.

And so we have a way to move forward. I think we should go with that one. And maybe it is not satisfactory to all, but I think it's satisfying what the GNSO Council is supposed to do. Thanks.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Rafik. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Pam. Michele for the record. This is my last GNSO Council meeting. And seeing the way that we're now back to squabbling over this kind of thing is yet another reason to remind myself as to why I am so happy to actually be stepping off council.

When -- GDPR and other data protection laws were ignored by ICANN for years. This is a fact. It is not a dispute. ICANN policies and ICANN contracts cannot break the law. They are not a law unto themselves. And it was flagged very early on around the same time that the temporary specification was introduced by the ICANN Board back in 2018 that many of the ICANN policies and contracts would need to be reviewed to make sure that they were synced up, that there weren't -- that they weren't in direct conflict with other things.

Now, this entire argument, I find, absolutely bizarre.

The EPDP phase -- the EPDP on WHOIS, Phase 1, came up with a set of recommendations. The recommendations on WHOIS data and the transfer of it is pretty straightforward.   It's not complicated. And, yes, we are seeing our colleagues with the BC and IPC relitigating this over and over again.

If there is a clear legal basis, then there should be no issue with this. Can we please move on? This is farcical.

And the thing is you take .COM and .NET, there are millions of domain names in .COM and .NET. VeriSign has never had the registrant information for those names. VeriSign has no reason to have the registrant information for those names in order for them to resolve. The registrars have the data, have always had the data. The fixation with what is currently called thick WHOIS, as if it is going to somehow magically fix the world's problem, has always struck me as absolutely bizarre. But that's where we're at.

And this is why -- as the cool kids say, this is why we can't have nice things because we're relight litigating over and over and over again the most farcical and ridiculous, tiny, minuscule elements of policies.

So here's the thing, the WHOIS policy -- the thick WHOIS policy is a consensus policy. Yes, it is, but so are the recommendations

from the EPDP. There's a conflict between the two of them. That conflict needs to be resolved. Can we just do that? I don't see why this is becoming a "thing." It just needs to be dealt with, and we all just need to move on.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Michele.

Any other hands? I don't see any other hand at the moment. I can see one, but I don't see any hand.

Anyway, I will just conclude -- maybe we can sort of continue our discussion on the council mailing list. But one thing that is really -- I don't know whether I said this earlier. This is getting late in my evening, is about the role of the Board in this implementation phase because I am unable to find in this sort of situation in the bylaws or GNSO procedures that -- whether the ICANN Org or staff should actually take instruction from the Board. And I think this came up when I -- when the council had the session with the Board as well.

I am still not sure where that source is or source of authority, if you'd like, that during implementation of a policy recommendation that the Board, after they actually approve a recommendation from the council, that they actually could instruct the Board -- sorry, the Org how to actually interpret and

implement a particular policy recommendation. That remains a puzzle to me.

But it is very clear that the -- during implementation, according to the consensus policy implementation framework that ICANN Org is actually accountable to the GNSO Council. And if there's inconsistency with the policy recommendation -- then if the implementation is inconsistent with the policy recommendation, then the council has a role to play. And council is the one to clarify intent of the recommendation.

And it's based on that, I feel, the course of action in this proposed draft motion, it's actually an appropriate one and the right thing to do. So I would encourage you to all take a look at this draft motion. It tried to set out the chronology as clearly as possible and even quoted the comments from ALAC and BC and IPC.

ALAC basically said that they were concerned about the notion or that thick WHOIS will be abandoned throughout these recommendations. So that to me is very clear -- another clear indication what the intent of Recommendation 7 is. And IPC, BC actually said they support or share the concern of ALAC and made a suggestion perhaps the thick remains thick and thin remain thin.

So I would encourage you really -- for those councillors you care about, this is bigger than what Recommendation 7 is and whether thick WHOIS is going to be repealed or not or changed. To me this is bigger than that. This is about roles and responsibility. This is about our GNSO Council's role, a very important role, during policy implementation.

And if we don't -- we are not there to defend the implementation to be consistent with policy recommendation, then we might as well all pack up and go home because there's no point having working group or PDPs to develop policy recommendations.

With that, I will hand it back to Keith. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, Pam. And I just want to say thank you to the small team that's contributed this effort and also to Sebastien Ducos as our GNSO Council liaison to the IRT. And, Pam, in particular, thank you for your coordination of this effort from the leadership team.

You know, just to briefly summarize before we move on, the next step in this process, as I understand it is from the ICANN Org and the IRT perspective, is to publish the proposed policy language for public comment. We, the GNSO Council, received a letter from the ICANN Board on this topic. We've received the Rec 27

Wave 1 report from ICANN Org. And I think there's a general recognition that there are inconsistencies, or the word that we used previously, "conflicts," but at a minimum inconsistency between two consensus policies. One being the preexisting thick WHOIS consensus policy, and the other being the new EPDP Phase 1 recommendations that are now consensus policy.

And I think to boil it down, I think what Pam has noted is that procedurally the question is should the implementation of the policy language be consistent with the recommendations approved by the EPDP team, the GNSO Council, and the ICANN Board. And I think procedurally, as Pam has noted, it is the responsibility of the GNSO Council to make sure that policies are implemented faithfully and consistent with the intent of the language. And I'll stop there.

I want to keep it focused on the procedure and the roles and responsibilities that Pam has laid out. But I think that sort of boils it down into sort of what we're facing here.

I think all year we've recognized that there was going to need to be some additional policy work on this topic as part of the Rec 27 language and as noted in the Wave 1 report from ICANN Org, among many other topics. But this was one that was clearly called out.

And I think the sooner that policy work -- that follow-on policy work is initiated, the sooner we'll be able to resolve whatever inconsistencies exist between these two policies.

So I'll stop there and see if there are any other questions or comments before we move on.

Pam, back to you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. I was just going to add, it is my intention to submit the motion for the November council meeting so we can actually have something for Sebastien Ducos to take to the IRT because my understanding is the IRT, some of their work is actually being held back because of this disagreement on how to implement Rec 7.

So that is -- the motion is now here for all the councillors to review. But hopefully by November, we have a form that -- a motion in a form that people find acceptable and we support. And, as I said, my intention is to have this on the November council agenda. Thank you.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK:	Okay. Thanks very much, Pam. So just to reinforce that, everybody -- especially once we get to the new council -- need to get up to speed on this issue and be prepared to engage.

So thanks for that. We need to move on in the interest of time. So let's move now to item number 5 on our council agenda which is a council discussion on the draft operational design phase for gTLD policy implementation. So just to recap, during the 23 September SO and AC leaders call, Goran introduced the concept of an operational design phase. The SO and AC leaders had a preliminary discussion on the topic, and then we received some additional documentation, email and attachment with a paper that was prepared. We received that on the 5th of October.

I hope everybody's had a chance to review that. As I noted, we did discuss this during our session with the Board around ICANN69.

And so I just want to basically tee this up as an opportunity for folks to share their views. I hope you had an opportunity to discuss this with your stakeholder groups and constituencies. There's no decision needed here, but I think there is an expectation that as a proposed operational design phase may have implications as it relates to timing of process -- and, also, obviously clearly from a GNSO Council perspective, we would

need to ensure that a so-called operational design phase doesn't alter or change or impact consensus policy recommendations coming from the GNSO without those issues being returned to the council for further consideration.

So that's just teeing up the discussion today. And I'd like to open up the queue. I see Rafik and then Tatiana. Go right ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. This is Rafik Dammak speaking.

So I think several of us had the chance to interact with the board and Goran in the last days, other than the discussion we had at the GNSO Council and the board meeting. And so my personal take on this, we can acknowledge the purpose and the rationale behind this proposal. And we should review it.

So I think one first action is really for the GNSO Council to have an action item as a follow-up to get the small team of councillors to work on the council response or comment to this paper. That doesn't prevent the stakeholder groups and constituency to submit their own comment. It should complement it.

And I believe that full GNSO Council should take the lead on this. And we try to bring this topic of operational design and other elements to the PDP itself and to probably elaborate or

providing guidance in our own working group guidelines and PDP manual or operating procedure in how we can work on the design issue, feasibility, financial sustainability, cost, operational matter, et cetera. I think there are several areas we can work on providing guidance and have this process or factors discussed at early stage.

I hear comments that maybe it's not for the community to give input. But that's not the point. It's really that if we are working on a complex system and recommendation, it's better to have any useful feedback at the beginning. And that's why in the PDP we -- by this time, we had the ICANN Org liaison and the board liaison to participate. We didn't want to leave them at the end, after we have the recommendation approved to be involved with.

So it's an iterative process that there is a feedback loop. They can intervene during the whole life cycle of PDP working group. I'm not saying the PDP, because that goes beyond working group phase. And we can, for GNSO Council, work on how we can, with that, embed this in our working group guidelines. And we get the resources for that. I think that's one of the issues, maybe we didn't have this in other PDPs, it's a question of resources. And so it can even start from the scoping phase that we need to identify those question that we should respond for

the recommendation in terms of feasibility, operational matters, cost, and also any kind of assessment that is needed we can add. Maybe we (indiscernible) everything. But you have, for example, the human rights impact assessment, et cetera. So it's important in terms of planning and scoping to have them to get the ICANN Org participating in terms of input and feedback.

And so they are not going to be so (indiscernible). They are following any working group, and so they are aware about what's going on and what kind of recommendation is getting in shape. And even if we talk about the -- one of -- in the paper, they can start at the late stage, in fact, we -- when we have, like, initial report and final report, there is no extensive change, should not be extensive change in the recommendations. So we can at some percentage of likelihood or confidence, we know what the working group will deliver as a recommendation, and so the work starts early.

I don't say that a design will be short when you have a complex system, but start early in terms of planning will reduce the cost, will give feedback that will help in terms of deliberation and give some really to check to working group members about what we are trying to (indiscernible).

So this is my proposal, is really first for the GNSO Council to respond to the paper as soon as possible and to have small thing

to work on that. And on our side, to work kind of continuous improvement as maybe part of the PDP 3.0 or 4.0, or whatever number we select, is how we can review our -- like, the PDP manual and working group guidelines and see how we can embed or add those component or those phases during the PDP working group phase and define what maybe kind of resources or the participation of ICANN Org, et cetera, in this process to be effective and efficient.

Having -- I mean, we understand this is really, really helpful for the board. That is understood. But we can agree with that. And, I mean, after the approval by GNSO Council, it should be straightforward, because all that preliminary work should be already done and we just not wait for the approval to do so.

So start early, and it will, anyway, help the board in terms of consideration.

So thanks. And I should stop here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Rafik. I think excellent suggestions.

Tatiana, you're next. Then Philippe, then we probably need to move on.

Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Keith. I will try to be brief.

Well, first of all, after talking to Goran Marby during our stakeholder group meeting with him, the rationale for this design phase paper is still not clear to me. It seemed that Goran and ICANN Org expressed their willingness and desire to have more transparency in how board is making the decisions. However, from the document, it looks to me like the means of these do not actually feed the aim of transparency, because till now, it looks a bit more like input-asking. And these, as Keith said already, can diminish the role of the GNSO in policy-making, and GNSO is the home for policy-making, and makes us vulnerable to the possibility of renegotiating some of the contentious issues which GNSO basically voted and adopted the policy on.

So what I would say, we need the clarification to have what this design phase is for. And we need stronger safeguards against this vulnerability of -- to renegotiations.

But I very much agree with Rafik that perhaps we can take an initiative here and start integrating some of the parts that will be discussed or considerations that are supposed to be discussed in this design phase into policy-making already. Otherwise, this design phase, if we don't make the part of sort of streamlined process, it will become not a burden, but yet another complex

component, the last complex component of an already complex process. And it should make the board and our life easier and community life easier and not complicated to the point where it's too intricate.

So I would say that, yeah, try to make it part of streamlined process. Otherwise, by clarifying and putting in safeguards or integrating these concerns already in the existing or new policies, or even both.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Tatiana.

Philippe, last word on this topic, and then we'll move on.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Keith. Philippe Fouquart.

Probably very quick.

Just on the idea of having a small team, yes, certainly that's a very good idea. I'm sure we can put that together.

I just wanted to convey some of the elements that we discussed within the ISPCP. And they're very much in line with what has

been said. I think there was a recognition that clarification and transparency was a good thing, but also some concerns that some of the things that would be discussed within that context could overlap with policy-related issues and that -- especially to what Rafik just said, those should be taken as early as possible. So there was that concern.

And adding to that, I think there was also the concern that with the EPDP, with these deadline-driven initiatives, the odds are that there will be a number of elements, as those -- those being the policy-related issues -- and that moving forward, it's not unlikely that the number of these elements grows and that we -- we need to let the very rigorous -- we need to be very rigorous in making sure that all of these things remain under the remit of council.   So those were the concerns that, essentially, were addressed during the ISPCP discussions.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Philippe.   And very much welcome hearing what the conversations have within in some of the various groups. And I'm sure that the council will continue to engage in that.

But I do think -- I do support the suggestion for a small team of council to begin working on a comment or communication on this, because it really does potentially have a direct impact on the policy recommendations that the council is responsible for. So I think we'll probably take an action item there and draw a line under that one. Obviously, more important discussion to take place there.

Okay. Let's move on, then, to item number 6 on our council agenda for today. And that is a discussion on the board consultation regarding questions surrounding financial sustainability of the system for standardized access and disclosure.

Just as a reminder, as part of the motion that the GNSO Council approved on September 24th related to the EPDP Phase 2 work, that the -- we had a clause 1A -- 1A and then 1B. 1A approved the SSAD package. 1B noted that some of the questions surrounding financial sustainability of SSAD and some of the concerns expressed within different minority statements, the GNSO Council requests a consultation with the ICANN board as part of the delivery of the GNSO Council recommendations report to the ICANN board to discuss these issues, including whether a further cost/benefit analysis should be conducted

before the ICANN board considers all SSAD-related recommendations for adoption.

That was the clause. And just to note that the request for a consultation with the ICANN board in this regard is not usually an element of the transition of moving approved recommendations for board consideration. So this is an opportunity for the council to discuss next steps. And there's also the transmittal letter that was included in our consent agenda. But this is really an opportunity for us as the council to discuss next steps of engagement with the ICANN board on this question.

And I think, just to frame it a bit, you know, we recognize as the council in our consideration of the SSAD recommendations, the EPDP Phase 2 report, that there were concerns about the cost-benefit of developing SSAD, whether the expected or anticipated users of the system would find sufficient value versus the potential cost of building and running such a system.

And we also recognized that the previous estimates that the EPDP Team had received from ICANN Org were preliminary. They were estimates. And they were based on an incomplete or not finished set of consensus policy recommendations.

So I think the goal here was for us to have an opportunity as the GNSO Council in approving these recommendations, these policy recommendations, to be able to engage with the board on questions of just what I've described.

So I'm going to tee that up and see if anybody would like to get in queue on this.

If anybody has thoughts or suggestions, please go ahead and put up your hand.

And, Michele, you're first. Go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Michele for the record.

Go ahead with a bang, just drive you all crazy at my last meeting. No, jokes aside.

I think this entire thing about financial sustainability, I think it's a very important topic. And it's not -- in this case, we're looking specifically at the SSAD and public reactions to the entire thing, which I think is what is driving a lot of the concerns from some of us around this.

But it goes to a much more important and fundamental issue, which is the financial impact of any policy recommendation, or

even the financial impact of any policy work, which is something that we had discussed with ICANN Org at the intersessional meetings in L.A. over the last couple of years.

When, as council, we kick off policy work, be that a PDP, an EPDP, some other kind of report or paper, there is a financial impact for those things. But, unfortunately, in many cases, we don't really either have visibility on that or I don't think there's a kind of a tradition of these things being run by council and by other members of the broader ICANN community as if they were actual work products. I mean, there's a finite budget and a finite set of resources.

So I think that's something that people should be looking at moving forward in general.

Specifically around this thing on the SSAD, look, myself and others have said things repeatedly over the last few weeks on this. And it's clear from conversations we've had with members of the ICANN board and others that they are taking this very seriously. And as directors of an organization, they cannot blithely sign off on expenditure unless there is a proper kind of assessment done in terms of the return and cost and everything else.

I just hope that whatever engagement is conducted, that it is -- it's clear that there is a cost-benefit analysis done, and that what ICANN commits to spending on this is the right amount and that the way that those monies are recouped makes sense. Because ultimately saying that ICANN is going to pay for something doesn't mean that ICANN is going to pay for something. If ICANN has to spend a hundred million dollars on a project over a ten-year period, ICANN has to get that hundred million in from somewhere else. And the sources of revenue are registries and registrars, which means that ultimately, registrants and other users of domains and other services are the ones who will ultimately pay for this. So just bear that in mind.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Michele.

Marie, you're next. Go right ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you, Keith. Marie from the BC.

Very briefly. As you will know, my colleague from the BC Alex Deacon has done some scoping work on a basic model for this already. His premise, as we already presented to the Board in our CSG meeting, was quite simple that ICANN itself already has

ticketing systems. One is based on Salesforce. It could be evolved into something that would work for the SSAD. So using the existing ticketing system, be it Salesforce, be it something else at the core of developing an SSAD which does not need to come out from scratch. We already have functionalities and known software within ICANN that does work.

So purely to say that. The BC is very happy to share that with you if you haven't seen it, but we are looking at practicality, as always.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Marie.

Rafik, you're next, and I think that's probably where we need to draw the line. Go right ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Rafik Dammak speaking.

Yeah, just to be brief here, I think the whole idea is really to -- to outline how we'll have this dialogue with the Board and to be clear about the objective. So we don't want this to last for too long.

And also, when we suggested this, the cost/benefit analysis really to help in term of discussion about that specific recommendation. But the whole dialogue is really to clarify, to respond to the Board, to help them in term of consideration. And this may be something we should have often in future for PDPs in a way that, for example, to avoid like a PDP Phase 1 when we got two recommendation back, that we could prevent that and respond to the -- any clarifying question at early stage.

So I think for the Council, we need to be Claire about the parameters. We should not, for this dialogue and this discussion, should not last for too long. So we need to finish it in due time. And probably to start working on maybe some question or anything we can expect the Board to ask for.

So unfortunately, I won't be with you guys to work on this, but I count on the next Council to follow up on this and to prepare for this discussion with the Board.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Rafik.

This is Keith. So I'm told that we still have about ten minutes left on this item if we need it.

Maxim, I'll come to you next, but if we could pull up the transmittal letter to the Board. And we don't necessarily have to wordsmith this right now, but I think in fairly short order we need to make sure that folks are comfortable with this letter as it relates to this particular topic of seeking this further consultation. And so this is an action item that probably can be, you know, taken for the working session. Try to wrap up this week so we can get the transmittal out to the ICANN Board of the package, but also to clarify the Council's interest in the next steps on this topic.

So maxim, you're next. Thank you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript.

Since the current Salesforce platform was mentioned I would not recommend to put this particular task on it because, as a registry, we are interacting via that platform and requested some, yeah, usual features like different levels of access, detailed levels. And no luck so far.

So I'm not sure that the system, which will have access to personal information eventually, request personal information should be based on this platform. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Maxim.

And then I see John McElwaine, your hand. Go right ahead.

JOHN McELWAINE: Thanks, Keith. John McElwaine, for the record.

One, maybe, question or idea to throw out there, perhaps for our working session and adding to this letter, if at all, is whether we think, as a council, it might be useful to suggest some of the more specifics or topics, studies, et cetera, that we think the ICANN Board ought to consider in looking at this topic. Maybe give them a little bit more detail on our thinking might be useful in this communication.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, John. So it sounds like there could be some additional discussion or work on this topic. Maybe a small team of council to focus on this and to try to make sure that the letter sends the right message and sets out the upcoming engagement in the most constructive way possible that has the support of the new Council.

So I do think this is probably a topic for further discussion, a small team, maybe, but it probably needs to be done fairly quickly. So maybe I'll suggest that this is something that could be discussed further at the working session without interfering too much in the agenda of the next Council.

Any other questions or comments on this one?

And I don't know, is there anybody from our staff colleagues who would like to speak to this? Marika, I don't know if you would like to speak to this topic and provide a little bit more context or frame it for the Council?

And if not, no worries. Okay. Not a problem. I'm seeing a text.

Okay. Well, let's go ahead and move on, this en, and table that for another -- another conversation in the near future.

All right. Next item on our agenda is item number 7, which is a Council discussion of the consideration of a delay of the request for a policy status report for expiration policies.

The GNSO -- is basically the opportunity to consider when to request a policy report to conduct a review of two expiration policies, the Expired Domain Deletion Policy, the EDDP, and the Expired Registration Recovery Policy, the ERRP.

And as noted at the top of the call, as we were reviewing the action/decision radar and the -- all of the work that the Council will have in its pipeline in the coming year, concerns about capacity along with circumstances that no known issues have presented themselves with these two policies, the Council leadership team is suggesting that the request for policy status reports for these two consensus policies be delayed by a period of 24 months, assuming no substantive issues arise during that time.

And so this would have the effect of deferring the request for a policy status report on these two consensus policies until at least November of 2022 and where it could be discussed again to see if a request is timely. So just sort of going through the discussion language there on the screen in front of you.

So with that, I'm going to turn this over to Berry Cobb briefly for maybe some additional context, and then we'll open it up to any questions or concerns or consideration from Council.

Berry.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Keith. Berry Cobb for the record.

You really just stole my thunder, but in essence what we're seeing here is kind of the first aspects of attempting to prioritize work across the GNSO.

You know, this particular item was coming out of the former working group EDNER (phonetic) where the policy needed to be reviewed. It had been on our project list for a little bit. And in terms of the 2020 strategic planning session, there were ideas being discussed about how we can prioritize work based on urgency and need. And we also, with the Council, had a small little survey about trying to prioritize or place in order the urgency of these particular policy topic. And this particular one came in very low on the list. It hasn't seemed like there have been issues with relation to that policy out across the industry. So this kind of made sense as a possible item to defer for a while, given current bandwidth and resource constraints.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, thank you very much, Berry. And again, this is -- sorry for stealing your thunder, but this is going to be very important work for the Council during the upcoming working session as well as the SPS, to try to figure out how to prioritize and how to deal with all of the varying demands and requirements and

pressures. And so if there is not a clear need for something and the opportunity to defer, it does give the Council the opportunity to -- you know, to prioritize up some other items that perhaps are more urgent of.

So what anybody like to get in queue on this one? Any thoughts, feedback, concerns about the proposal?

James, go right ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Keith. James Gannon for the record.

I just want to say this is actually a great thing. I hope the Council does more of this. I agree that both of these are likely low-hanging fruit for us to put off for a few years to focus on bigger topics, and has my support. And I would hope that for other ones that we -- that the next Council also identifies we can have a similar process such as this.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, James.

Pam, you're next.

PAM LITTLE:	Just very briefly. Thank you, Keith. Pam Little for the record.
	I also support the delay of these two -- two policy reviews. It is really a matter of bandwidth and prioritization, and the Council is also going to kick off a PDP on the transfer policy. So from a registrar perspective, we are also pretty stretched. And this policy really is not -- not on our priority list at the moment. So completely agree with the approach.
	Thank you.
KEITH DRAZEK:	Okay. Thanks, Pam.
	Rafik, you're next.
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Thanks, Keith. Rafik Dammak speaking.
	Yeah, I think this is a good example of what we are supposed to do at the Council in term of prioritization and using the project management tool. So based on that, we are making here a decision and, like, delaying this. So I just kind of wanted to highlight that this is what the Council is expected to do in term of decision in future. I don't mean that they are expected to delay, but it's kind of an example of what should be -- should be

done based on the priority bandwidth, capacity and resources, and so to make such kind of decision.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Rafik.

Would anybody else like to get in queue?

All right. Very good. I don't see any additional hands so I think we can move on now to our item number 8 on our agenda, which is the last item. We actually have two points to this, and we're going to -- we're switching the order and moving to an open mic. And then we will have, as the last order of business, a farewell to our outgoing councilors, of which there are many.

And so we'll probably want to save ten minutes at the end, but let's go ahead and move to an open mic.

I'll run the queue. And I know that there were a number of questions and comments that were put into the Q&A pod that we didn't get to immediately. So the floor is open for anybody who would like to raise their hand. And I think you probably need to go through the process of unmuting yourself and making sure that -- you know, that you're unmuted on the operational end as well.

I see Jeff Neuman has his hand up. So, Jeff, please, go right ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yep, thanks, Keith. And thanks, everyone.

I just wanted to -- and I'm glad we moved this, by the way, to being before the farewell, because I think that that should be a happy ending to the meeting.

But I just wanted to make a point about the operational design plan. And I kind of get the feeling that I think it's being misunderstood by some of the comments that I've heard.

I'm not sure why there's a tendency to view these types of things as trying to remove policy from the council or from the GNSO. In fact, far from it. These -- this operational design phase is -- makes complete sense. And, in fact, it's like a -- more of a business plan than it is anything to do with policy. In fact, you know, these are the types of issues that, frankly, the policy participants aren't qualified to make.

So, for example, how many staff is ICANN going to need to implement the program? Where are they going to get the money from? What are their financial projections for the round so that it makes sense? What vendors are out there that exist to provide

these types of evaluation -- so I'm thinking like -- sorry -- of Sub-Pro, for example. I should have said that at the beginning. For things like Sub-Pro, right? Who are the potential evaluators who are out there? What is the process and how long is it going to take to develop an RFI for those evaluators? These are not items that are, I think, legitimately within the scope of a PDP. In fact, ICANN has done this historically on their own. And, in fact, they could still do it on their own.

I think it's wonderful that ICANN's actually opening it up and seeing if there's a way that the community can participate in this process. And I think it should be looked at from that respect. Yes, could there be guardrails? Absolutely. And could we put in a couple things to make sure that it's not policy? Absolutely.

But at the end of the day, I would urge the stakeholder groups, constituencies, and others to think of this as a much more positive thing as opposed to some kind of power grab away from the council and the GNSO, because I don't see it that way at all. I think it makes complete sense. It's logical. And, frankly, it'll help the board make a decision and know what it's getting into.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Jeff. Thanks very much for the input. I certainly know that, you know, as it relates to subsequent procedures, one of the things that you've called for in the past, including to the GNSO Council, is, you know, the concept of a pre-IRT to sort of get things moving. And it sounds like this operational design phase that's been proposed is somewhat similar in approach. And so I think the key here, and what we've heard from councillors and stakeholder groups, is that the guardrails are important; right? And I think that, clearly, the ICANN board, as it considers recommendations and considers cost and complexity, they should benefit from as much information as they could possibly have. But I think those guardrails are very important to ensure that policy recommendations are not altered through, you know, a costing analysis and that -- you know, that the community efforts are respected.

So I think -- I think there's an opportunity for us, through our comments, to ensure that those guardrails are in place.

Jeff, is that a new hand or an old hand? And if anybody else would like to get in queue, please jump in. And I see Amr. Go right ahead.

If we could unmute Amr's line.

AMR ELSADR: Hi, this is Amr. I think I've been unmuted now.

KEITH DRAZEK: We've got you.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Keith. This is Amr again.

I just want to track back to my questions in the Q&A pod about recommendation 7, thick WHOIS.

I just want to just point out a personal perspective on this. And I say this as a former member of the thick WHOIS PDP working group.

Recommendation 3 coming out of that working group addressed the issue of conflicts of thick WHOIS with privacy and data protection law. I'm going to paste that recommendation into the chat box.

But the thing is, when you consider that in the context of recommendations 7 and 27 coming out of the Phase 1 of the EPDP, to me, it seems like the thick WHOIS, amongst all the other policies that have been developed and need to be considered, is probably one that has been -- is more set up to be revised just because of the nature of the recommendation on the

privacy and data protection law. So it's not -- to me, it doesn't seem so much as an issue of, you know, the policy being repealed. And I'm addressing the policy recommendations here, because my understanding is that this isn't actually a consensus policy until the IRT comes up with consensus policy language.

So right now, they're still policy recommendations that they suspend a thick WHOIS IRT is supposed to be addressing.

But like I said, if you think about this in the context of recommendation 27 and recommendation 7, and particularly because the PDP working group on thick WHOIS back in 2013 considered the issue of conflict with privacy and data protection law, I think this policy is actually in a much better place to handle the outputs of Phase 1 of the EPDP. And I do hope that the GNSO Council and the small team working on this take this into consideration, because this recommendation, recommendation 3 is what actually enabled a full consensus amongst the working group members back in 2013. There initially wasn't full consensus until this recommendation was the final one -- the last one that was finalized, until it became a thing, and then subsequently, there was a full consensus vote on this on the GNSO Council, again, in part due to this recommendation.

So I do hope that the GNSO Council and the small team take this into consideration when discussing this.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Amr. And, obviously, with your history here and the context that you've got, I'm sure that the small team would benefit from further conversation with you, if you'd be available. So thanks for that input.

I'm going to go back to Rafik. I think Rafik wanted to respond or to speak to the previous issue that Jeff raised.

So, Rafik, you're next.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith.

And thanks to Jeff for the comment.

I think it's important to stress here, it's not that people are saying it is negative or positive. It's really about to be cautious. We just received a few days ago this proposal. So we think all of us are trying to digest, to understand. And we read the paper. So to go through it, try to understand what is proposed.

But at the same time, we are trying to be proactive and see how we can help. I think it's important to not dismiss any concern. That's not going to really be constructive. So we should hear each other. It's not about supporting or not. It's first to understand what's proposed, why it's proposed, how it will work, and what will be the impact, but also the side effects. For any new change, there is side effect that we should be careful about, and to acknowledge.

So I think we're all trying to understand what is proposed here. And I think we just started this dialogue. And myself, I am encouraging the council itself, all the stakeholder groups, and constituencies to submit their comments so we can have different point of view from different perspective.

So -- and also, that's why I was suggesting that the council should be also more proactive on this matter. So maybe to try to cover one of the area.

I hear about other maybe elements like it's more like about implementation. But at the end, what is proposed here is before the board consideration. I'm not talking about implementation itself. It's between the GNSO approval and the board consideration. So I think that's likely different from the implementation as we know, and that what after the ICANN Org will do in terms of finding vendors and so on.

So I think it's slightly different. But, anyway, we have all these maybe different interpretations and understanding, and so it's good for us to ask the questions to get more details. What we got, just a few page, may not be enough to explain the concerns that may have some impact in one way or another.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Rafik. And thanks, Jeff.

So I think the key here is that -- I don't see folks approaching this in either positive or negative. It's more about approaching it with appropriate caution. This is -- this paper has been put out for public comment or public feedback. And so we have an opportunity as a community to ask the appropriate questions and to ensure that the guardrails are put in place.

I think there are clearly instances where this type of an approach would be very beneficial. And there could be some other instances where there might be some legitimate concerns. And so I think we just need to make sure that we go through the process of, you know, being deliberate in our questions and in our feedback to ICANN Org. And I think that's the -- I think that's the road that we're on at this point.

And I apologize for jumping around a little bit on the various topics.

But, Alex Deacon, you're next, if we could unmute Alex.

ALEX DEACON: Thank you, Keith. This is Alex. Can everyone hear me?

KEITH DRAZEK: We can. Go right ahead.

ALEX DEACON: Yeah, so I wanted to just chime in on the Rec 7 discussion earlier, both as a member of the Phase 1 EPDP and the current IRT.

The so-called impasse is purely procedural. It's nothing else. For the sake of this intervention, let's all assume that the intent of Rec 7 was to kill -- or to -- sorry, perhaps "modify " is a better word -- was to modify the existing thick WHOIS consensus policy.

Let's remember that -- also that the Phase 1 EPDP did not make this explicit; right? And because of this, the board instructed the IRT that it must not include language in its documents that modifies this existing thick WHOIS consensus policy.

The motion that's currently drafted, however, suggests that the Rec 7 language be included in the IRT document. This would, however, modify the thick WHOIS consensus policy and do exactly what the board has instructed us not to do.

So this is the impasse. It's purely procedural. And we have two conflicting consensus policies. Both of them are correct. Both of them approved by the board. Both of them approved by the GNSO Council. All of that.

So it's clear to me the only path forward is for the GNSO to set up a PDP that would explicitly modify, if that's what the GNSO Council wants to do, the thick WHOIS consensus policy. That seems to be the process moving forward. Any language in the current IRT process that does this surreptitiously I think would put us in direct conflict with what the board has instructed the IRT to do. And I think we need to avoid that.

So, hopefully, this is helpful. And I'll leave it there. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much, Alex. And I'll see if Pam would like to -- actually, there goes Pam's hand.

So, Pam, over to you.

EN

PAM LITTLE: Thanks, Keith.

I think it's a matter of interpretation as to whether -- how thick WHOIS is impacted or repealed.

We, as the council, gave a very clear and broad mandate to the EPDP Team. We asked the EPDP Team to either confirm or modify the temporary specification, the requirements in the temp spec.

And if you consider data processing, including transferring of registrant data -- sorry -- registration data from registrar to registry, is part of the data processing activity or requirements in the temp spec, clearly, then, that is within scope of the EPDP Team to modify temp spec requirements, whatever the requirements were in the temp spec.

So they did that. The process was totally transparent, open, and deliberate.

I don't get this notion that it was sort of a so-called quiet repeal or shadow repeal. It was a deliberate and open and transparent process. We gave the mandate to develop whatever policy that's complying with GDPR and other data protection laws, and they came up with recommendation 7, which impacted an existing policy, which they clearly recognized and made another recommendation in recommendation 27 asking that those

ICANN|69
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

policy to be reviewed, including the thick WHOIS transition policy. It cannot be clearer than that or more explicit than that.

Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Pam.

Alex, is that a new hand or an old hand?

Old hand.

So -- and, Alex, thank you for your comments, you know, concerning the path forward to deal with this inconsistency or this conflict between the two consensus policies, is to actually run another process. And that's exactly what the motion -- the draft motion that's before the council for discussion actually would do, is to initiate that follow-on policy work to deal with the inconsistencies between the preexisting thick WHOIS consensus policy and the new EPDP Phase 1 recs consensus policy.

And so I think that, clearly, that was, as I said earlier, anticipated in rec 27.

It was anticipated and pointed out in the wave one report interest ICANN org. Ask I think it's incumbent upon the GNSO

Council to take this next step and to initiate that follow-on policy work to deal with those inconsistencies.

That said, I think that, you know, as we look at the implementation of policy work, the next step in this process is for ICANN org, working with the community IRT, to publish the proposed policy recommendation, policy language for public comment, right?

And I think the key question here is what does that -- what does that language need to be? And I think the question is is it consistent with the Recommendation 7 language from EPDP or is it not?

And I think, you know, the view is that it needs to be implemented as approved by the EPDP team, by the GNSO Council, and by the Board. And that if follow-on policy work indicates something else, then that's the opportunity to change the newest recommendations.

So let me pause there. We need to fairly soon move to the farewell part of our agenda, but I want to see if there are any remaining questions or comments for our open mic session. We have a few more minutes if we need it.

Would anybody else like to get in queue?

All right. I am not seeing any additional hands for our open mic. Thank you all for participating and contributing to that. And I am going to shortly hand over this next session to Pam Little to run as farewells, but I just wanted to take a moment to make a few comments myself, if I may.

As the outgoing chair after -- GNSO chair after five years on Council and two years as chair, I just wanted to take an opportunity to say thank you. Say thank you for -- to the councilors I have served with. Thank you in particular to Pam and Rafik as the Council leadership team. And I really have to note that Rafik is also leaving the Council having been termed out as well. And I just -- I just really want to underscore how important to me, personally, both Rafik and Pam have been in terms of being able to manage the work of the Council. Frankly, I could not have done it without them and without their support and engagement. And I really believe that we were a team in every sense of the word.

So I just wanted to acknowledge Rafik, as he's being -- as he's also departing, and Pam for the excellent work that they've done in supporting the work of the Council generally but myself as well. So just a genuine, heartfelt thanks to the two of you.

And then just as importantly, I have to say thank you to the ICANN staff and our ICANN staff colleagues who have been just

unbelievable in terms of the work that they do. Their professionalism and -- is just unparalleled. And you don't see it every day unless you're working behind the scenes in terms of engaging and the planning and the preparation that goes into the work of the GNSO Council and, just as importantly, in the work of our PDP working groups. The ICANN org team, our colleagues from ICANN org, serve in many different places and in many different ways in support of us as a community. And I just have to just comment what a true honor it's been to engage with them and to work with them and to get to know them personally and professionally. They have my utmost respect.

So I just wanted to say those words. Thank you all.

And, Pam, I'm going to hand this over to you next. Thank you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. I'm going to turn my video on as an exception so you can all see me on this special occasion, Keith.

So, Keith, thank you for indulging me to manage the queue. And so I will go first, and then I'll see whether there are other councilors who would like to speak.

So thank you, Keith. Two years ago in Barcelona we elect you as our chair. It feels like ages ago, but it also feels like yesterday. So time flies.

By design, you know the council members come from different backgrounds and represent very different interests within the GNSO, but I feel during your tenure you always tried to maintain neutrality and promote consensus and make sure everyone has a goal and their views are heard. So I think that was really vital for the council, and you did that really exceptionally well.

One other thing I wanted to say is about WHOIS, as you can see how vibrant our discussion can be in the council. And so it is one of the most challenging policy topics in ICANN. It's often contentious and even polarizing at times.

In hindsight, I think it's probably fair to say none of us fully appreciate the complexities and enormity of the first EPDP ever in ICANN history. But I think you made sure throughout the process that different roles and responsibility are respected, and processes are followed. And your strong and steady leadership really got it through and guided through many uncharted waters.

Thank you, Keith, for your service and your contribution to the GNSO and the Council over the last two years.

Rafik, it's been -- I want to say a few words about Rafik. It's been a great pleasure to -- and honor to work with you. Our commitment and dedication was -- has been exceptional and inspiring, especially as Council's liaison to the EPDP team and in leading the PDP 3.0 work.

Your contributions will not be forgotten, but I would remember you most as just a very decent, nice guy.

Thank you, Rafik. All the best!

And I -- it would be remiss of me not to say something about my colleague Michele who is also leaving the Council. I want to thank Michele for doing most of the talking on behalf of the RrSG on the Council so that Greg and I didn't have to do so. But even if we try, we will never be able to do it as well and as charmingly as he did.

Thank you for also doing all the heavy lifting and keeping our registrar members up-to-date in the middle of the night so I could sleep.

Thank you so much, Michele. We certainly will miss your Irish accent and your sense of humor. All the best, and good luck.

I definitely echo what Keith said about staff. The effort you put in to support what we do is just simply extraordinary. We will be lost without you.

You keep the GNSO train running, and you even anticipate our needs. We didn't even know we need the things you -- but you already thought of that and came up with solutions. And you suggest a lot -- you would suggest options and alternatives, path forward when we were seemingly stuck. Thank you so much for each one of you. Thank you.

So with that, I will see whether there are other councilors who would like to say a few words.

I have Rafik in the queue.

Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Pam.

So we need to -- I mean, the three of us to speak.

First, I want to thank Keith and Pam. It was pleasure to work with both of you. I think we did good work, and we were a good team. I do believe that. It was not always easy. I think I will go -- I will stop complaining sometimes about the early calls to

prepare for the council meeting, et cetera. I will miss those calls, I guess, because it's -- it was a pleasure to work to prepare, to volunteer and to do something that I believe it was -- I hope was useful.

It was also a pleasure to work with the staff, to be in touch with them. It's not just about PDP or council update, but (indiscernible) sharing opinions, and arguing sometimes. But at the end, we did well.

I want also to thank all my colleagues on the council. I mean, we -- sometimes we argued, we disagreed, we agreed also. But at the end of the day, what we can get, it was fun. A fun journey in the council. For me it was four years. I hope that you do also your four years, maybe more if you want.

And so I will leave I think with good memories. And I will miss all this fun. I was looking forward to be free, but I do believe that I will miss this.

Thanks again. Thanks to Keith, Pam. Again, I'm not sure how much I can express my gratitude to both of you. It was fun again. And thank you all, and see you soon.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Rafik. Look forward to seeing you and giving you hug when we meet in person.

                         John, you're next. Then Philippe.

JOHN McELWAINE: Thanks, Pam.

                         So this is to Elsa, Erika, James, Julf, Michele, Rafik, Scott and, last but not least, Keith. 2020, probably a good year to leave council, but what an interesting year to have joined the GNSO Council.

                         Last time we got together I believe was -- all together in person was at the strategic planning session in Los Angeles in January. I had just joined after this meeting a year ago, the Montreal meeting. And at that strategic planning session, I was struck. You all were so welcoming to me as a new member of the GNSO Council. And what impressed me the most was the collegiality and the team that it was clear that you all, the outgoing councilors, had built over the last two to four years together. You all were growing in the same direction, you were speaking the same language, you had the acronyms down, and me and the other new folks joining felt like we were trying to keep up and just row with you.

At that meeting and along this year, you all have become friends and mentors, and clearly great leaders to the ICANN community. And for that, I thank you, and I know that the ICANN community thanks you for all of your hard work.

I'd be remiss if I didn't thank Rafik. Rafik, I've worked with you before on the Nominating Committee and then followed you on to the GNSO Council. In a little outgoing card to you I joked you need to tell me what your next gig is going to be because I'll probably be joining you in that. So thank you so much for your time, your effort, your leadership.

To Keith, special thanks to you for your leadership. It was great to have a fellow southerner nearby and being such a great captain of the GNSO program management ship. I know that you wanted to land a number of planes, a number of programs. You did. There's been a few flight delays, but those are coming in, and that you're to be commended for.

I can only imagine how much hard work it's been for you. I'm sure your familiar and your work colleagues are going to enjoy getting some more of your time back. I, for one, thank you for your leadership, and I know the community appreciates everything that you have done.

And lastly I'll chime in, a big thanks to staff. None of these councilors and us could have done that, anything this year without you. Thanks.

Over to you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, John.

Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Pam.

I won't waste your time. It's all been said on Keith's leadership and Rafik's hard work.

I just want to -- I just want to emphasize how frustrating this is. I'm sure that all councilors are with me on this. Having Zoom meetings is just fine for work, but then farewells are not meant to happen virtually. So I just wanted to say this; that is it wasn't meant to be this way. There's nothing we can do about it, not much. But I do hope that sometime we'll meet again and that we can do this -- things properly, but I just wanted to share my frustration at the moment.

Thank you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Philippe. We share the frustration.

Michele, you're next.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Thanks, Pam. Michele again for the record. Thanks Pam and others for the kind words.

I'll probably miss you in some strange, bizarre way. It's been an interesting few years.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, John.

Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Pam. I won't waste your time. It's all been said on Keith's leadership and Rafik's hard work.

I just want to -- I just want to emphasize how frustrating this is. I'm sure that all councillors are with me on this.

Having Zoom meetings is just fine for work. But then farewells are not meant to happen virtually.

So I just wanted to say this: That it wasn't meant to be this way. There's nothing we can do about it, not much. But I do hope that sometime we'll meet again and that we can do these things properly.

But I just wanted to share my frustration at the moment.

Thank you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Philippe. We share the frustration.

Michele, you're next.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Pam. Michele, again, for the record.

And thanks, Pam, and others for the kind words.

I'll probably miss you in some strange, bizarre way. It's been an interesting few years.

Rafik, Pam, and Keith, as chair and vice-chairs of council, you've had a tough job. I mean, it's not easy to cat-herd. The schedule, the people, to try to maintain a level of neutrality at all times, and just to manage that entire thing I think has -- is hard work. And for Pam in particular, and Rafik, I mean, both of you, with

the time zone differences, I mean, it's meant that a lot of those meetings have taken place in the middle of the night, which is hard work.

I cannot say anything more that has been said about the ICANN staff. And they are fantastic and underappreciated. And as Philippe says, hopefully when all the madness ends, we will all see each other again in person and be able to consume crazy quantities of alcohol or fruit juice.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Michele. Count me in joining you in the back.

Elsa.

ELSA SAADE: Hey, everyone. It's been a while.

I just wanted to share that it was a great journey being amongst you all in council. I want to thank you for welcoming me so warmly into the council a couple of years ago as your youngest member.

I want to thank every single one of you. I learned a lot from you all, particularly during those most challenging times for us in council.

I want to thank Rafik particularly. He was my mentor during my time at ICANN, which is ending, as my council journey is.

I want to thank Tanya for being my council buddy, James for all the proxies, Ahmad for always providing support, and many folks who are not on this call for accompanying me on this journey.

I want to thank Nathalie, Steve, Julie, Terri, and Merike for being a constant support on the back end.

I've learned so much from you all, particularly Keith and Pam. It's been a pleasure watching you work. And it's been a pleasure hearing every single one of you speak during council meetings. I've learned so much.

It's been rewarding, and I'm honored to have been entrusted by my stakeholder group to be here as much as I could in the last two years. And I'll leave saying I surely I hope we commit to acting in good faith within this GNSO Council and within the space of ICANN generally. And I hope that the GNSO Council's role will remain clear and steady in managing policy and not going into nitty-gritty substance discussions, something I committedly spent 80% of my time on council pushing for.

So I'm going to leave with that. And thank you, all, again.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Elsa. Very kind words.

James, I'm going to go to James, Keith, if you wouldn't mind, so you can have the last word.

James, over to you.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Pam. I'll keep it very brief.

Echoing what Elsa said, it's been a pleasure. It might actually surprise some members to know that I was actually less than a year on council, which feels strange.

It's nice. I'm not going far. As I actually said, I'll actually be taking up a seat on the PTI board. Hopefully, that won't stop me from speaking out on things now and again.

Yeah, I plan to stay around the GNSO and the work you do. I think it's incredibly important. Expect best of luck to everybody. And thanks for -- thanks to Keith for his guidance over the past number of years. And I think it's been an excellent time for the GNSO, albeit a turbulent and stressful time. And, yeah, I think the next few years are going to be just as interesting.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, James. And good luck with your role on the PTI board.

Keith, over to you. You have the last word and close out the meeting. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Pam. And thanks for running this portion of the meeting. Very important, I think, for us all to have this connection, you know, and to look back and think back. And thanks to staff and everybody who pulled together the photos and everything. That was a really nice touch.

So just, I guess, my parting thought here is that I am, like, supremely confident in the next GNSO Council. I think the leadership team that we have returning and coming in, I think, will do an excellent job.

But the one thing I will call on each councillor, each new councillor, is to get involved, be active, be engaged, and volunteer. I think the one thing that I would take away from the leadership team and the support of staff is that the more engagement and the more volunteerism and the more input that we receive from council and from councillors, and from our stakeholder groups and constituencies, the better off we will be.

So I just want to note, just looking ahead -- and this is especially true in this time where we're all remote and we're not able to get together and to socialize as much, or at all. And so I just want to call on everybody looking ahead to make sure that, you know, you're supporting your council leadership and staff and you're contributing to the extent possible. Not everybody is going to want to volunteer on everything, but it's really important, based on our experience, for people to engage and continue to be active.

So with that, I want to thank everybody for your collegiality, your friendship, your professionalism over (Audio dropped) this meeting now.

So thanks, everybody.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, everyone.

Bye, now.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, all, for joining.

Council meeting 2 will take place in a different Zoom room. Please refer to your schedule and join that forum.

Many thanks to all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]