

---

ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Meeting  
Monday, October 25, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 PDT

BRENDA BREWER:

Hello and welcome to the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers membership meeting at ICANN 72 on Monday, 25 October, 2021. My name is Brenda Brewer and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, raise your hand from the “reactions” icon on the menu bar. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your first and last name clearly and at a reasonable pace and mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

And with that, I am pleased to introduce Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, chair of ISPCP. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thank you very much, Brenda. Hello, everybody. This is our first session at ICANN 72. The agenda is displayed by Brenda. And I would like just to ask for any statements of interest. I don't see anybody. Thank you very much.

So let's dive into the agenda. The topics of the agenda are mostly related to the preparatory topics for the further meetings during ICANN 72—in particular, as usual, the meetings on CSG level. We will have a meeting with the ICANN Board later today. And then the other meetings

---

***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.***

---

with the CSG are postponed after ICANN 72 and will be done separately. For example, there shall be a meeting together with the CPH, with the Contracted Parties House and the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group as well. That is still under preparation.

So that's it. We have also a topic with regards to the goals of Göran Marby, the CEO of ICANN, for the Fiscal Year 22. And one of them is related to our own specific activities. And that's what we are talking about as well—how we can cover that and how we can be engaged here. So that is so far to the agenda. Is there anything else that you would like to add to the agenda? I don't see a hand.

So then let's talk about the meeting later today on CSG level with ICANN Board. I wonder, Brenda, whether you have the two topics, as well, which could be displayed. Otherwise, I can read them.

BRENDA BREWER: Yes. I will put that up in just a moment. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. So we'll start with that. The Board usually is asking the communities that they are meeting ... They are asking them in advance what kind of topics they would like to talk about. But on the other hand, in some cases, they will come up with one or two other topics by their own. They would like to get input or they would like to discuss those topics.

---

One of the topics is about the ICANN engagement with governments. The request of the Board here was, “Please provide input or comments on how you think we could efficiently identify and work more closely with governments globally, as well as educate, train, and interact when it comes to geopolitical issues relating to ICANN’s mission.” That’s a really broad topic with regards to the relationship of ICANN and governments. And in a smaller circle, on the leadership level, we just prepared some of this item and how we understand that.

We also allocated, let me say, the lead of the topic, from our point of view, who should participate mainly in this discussion. And this is Susan Mohr on the one hand and Tony Holmes. They have provided some input for this topic. And I just wonder whether you both could share, just briefly here, since we have also other members from the ISPCP here available, that they can hear what we have in mind. And maybe there is some additional input to that topic as well.

Usually, it is an open discussion with the Board. There is no, let me say, formality on that so it is like we understand the question. We can raise questions from our side. We can contribute in part. And then we will see what is going, what is our request on that, and what the Board can do with our input on that.

Would somebody of you, either Susan or Tony, just chime in? So, yes. Here is the text. You can see the first part, “Please provide input/comments,” and so on, as I have read it. Hi, Susan. Thank you.

---

SUSAN MOHR:

Hi, Wolf-Ulrich. Thanks for the opportunity. Yes. We did get together and had a chance to put together some thoughts. Essentially, our view is that ICANN is an international body but they're often unknown by some of the other international organizations. It's important for them, as they interact with governments, to stay within their remit and to ensure that they are focusing on issues that are related to the Internet.

We think that, as they're developing their strategy, that it will be important for them to develop a script so that we can all speak from that same script. But it's unclear, at this time, how they're going about doing their engagement with international governments.

So we're going to be asking for some specific information on what they're doing—specifically, which governments are they targeting? What is the DNS/Internet-related policy issues that they're trying to address? What sort of messaging have they created to do that? And then I think once we have some of that detail, we'll be in a better position to provide some more specific recommendations.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Yes. I think that's a good input and that will trigger, also, the discussion. You have seen, for sure, the input from the other constituencies, from the IPC and from the BC, which was just shared. It's in a similar direction—first to understand from their point of view as well what the Board is targeting here, what does it mean, and then also having some input from their side.

---

Is there anything we should specifically raise? I'm just asking here to the audience. When you see that topic, is that something which should be specifically raised? Anyway, since it is an open discussion, it is not just that the ISPCP leadership or the members will participate in a discussion. It's an open discussion. Everybody from our constituency can chime in and raise his hand to contribute to that discussion. I don't see a hand. Susan, is that an old hand? It seems to be.

SUSAN MOHR: That is an old hand.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thanks. So at the time being, I don't see another hand here. I think that we'll go as we have prepared for that. For me, it's also interesting to hear what the Board is meeting, especially what ICANN has in the pipe with regards to their work on that—so as they have people, for example, following on the ITU side, what's going on there, and they are much engaged, also, with all the GAC topics.

Okay. So that's one point to be discussed tonight or later today. And the other thing is related. What we, from the CSG side, have asked to talk about the topic of the reviews and the prioritization of already-decided or agreed recommendations, may it be coming from reviews or it may come also from policy development. And as you could follow, over the ICANN prep week, during the discussion specifically with the Finance Department, with Xavier, on prioritization issues, that is a major issue.

---

ICANN has made a suggestion how to move that ahead in order to come to a prioritization of the outstanding issues to work on.

And that is, let me say, if I got that correctly, that is more or less to kind of put the community together and discuss with them together which items have to be prioritized in which way. That should be done at the beginning of next year for two or three months.

And then that has to be discussed, on a higher level, with the Board and others, so that in June next year—that is their plan—there shall be a priority plan agreed, which parts, which recommendations should be worked on in the near future and later on. So that’s the plan, to start with a pilot of this prioritization effort, which is in the plan. It’s planned to do that regularly, per fiscal year, per planning cycle. So they will start with that as a pilot.

Our specific interest in that was with regards to reviews—to move ahead with the so-called holistic review—which we, for several years, have brought up to the Board. And it seems now that this holistic review will be a follow-up on this pilot of prioritization. That means that the holistic review will be also a pilot, which we discussed in former times. So we will have pilot after pilot.

So under these circumstances, it is expressed by all constituencies here from the CSG that that process to really move that head, on the one-hand side, is really not very much transparent and is really slow. And on the other hand, also, here is not very clear what are the obligations of the Board and how can we ... That is our question. How can we put the

---

Board more in obligation to really follow up here, that the timelines are kept, and that the prioritization is on their own agenda?

That is a short comment from the CSG side, what was discussed on the CSG and what is the related input of that. Tony, I'm just referring to you if there's anything else we should put forward here.

TONY HOLMES: Wolf-Ulrich, sorry. Can you hear me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. A little bit faint.

TONY HOLMES: Okay. Thank you. I think we should [discuss] the [inaudible] that the [inaudible].

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Tony, I can hear you but I can't understand you. Okay. He may have an audio problem, a mic problem. Okay is there anything—any other idea, any other input, any other request from anybody here internally? No. I don't hear that. Okay.

Let's move to the next topic and that is the preparations for the GNSO Council session. We know from Philippe, from last time, that there shall be taken a decision on EPDP 2A. And the question is what is specifically on the agenda. Is there anything, any support asked for, Philippe, for anything else, for something? Are there other decisions to be taken?

---

That is usually what we would like to hear from you if you need some support from us. Philippe, can you chime in here? Yes, please, Philippe. Go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Certainly, Wolf-Ulrich. Can you hear me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. Good.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Hi, Wolf-Ulrich and everyone. Yes, indeed. We have two Council votes and two items under the consent agenda. So I'll go through them briefly. On the consent agenda, we have the appointment of our liaison to the ODP on SubPro. There was a selection made by the Standing Selection Committee, of which Osvaldo is a member, I think, on behalf of the ISPCP. Jeff Neuman was selected. We offer an endorsement by Council of that appointment. The second item is the reappointment of the same Jeff for his role in the liaison to the GAC.

For both, I don't think there's a particular issue for the ISPCP. I personally see no reason to question the recommendation by the SSC, all the less so because we have Osvaldo with them. And the reappointment is very much in continuity. There's probably not an issue but the need to understand that the role of the ODP is limited in remit and I think that is something that the motion insists on. But



---

leaving that aside ... That's a go-between, essentially, between the ODP Team within staff and the Council.

So with this, I think we can support the items under the consent agenda. And I would like to have your confirmation of this. So I'll move on. Maybe I'll stop here and ask whether there are questions on the consent agenda—I'm sorry—and see whether Osvaldo and I can have your support.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much for that. So are there any questions to Philippe with regards to these points—the consent agenda? I have only one, Philippe. And that is regarding the role of Jeff. So Jeff, to my knowledge, he's not a councilor. He's a liaison. Or is he a councilor?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: No. You're right, Wolf-Ulrich. Jeff is currently the liaison to the GAC. And as such, he takes part in the preparation of our bilateral meetings with the GAC, although I have to say that on maybe not all accounts but several accounts, he sometimes has a free voice in our exchanges on Council. So to your question, he's not a councilor, indeed, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thanks very much. The only question, to me, is I think there's a description of the role of the liaison. I know Jeff very well from one time when he was vice-chair and I was vice-chair. He's one of the most active guys here in the GNSO, in several roles, from several parties he came

---

through. So he knows all these things very well. He's a good guy and he's a good contributor to that. But you shouldn't forget, as Council chair, his role in that respect. So that is just a question from my side. Nothing else.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I have to say that I have the same as yours in that regard. We've had several exchanges with Jeff on this. But you're right. He's a contributor to our work. I have a lot of respect for those who actually do work and he's one of them. But it's also something that the SSC noted. And that's why I mentioned the limited remit of the ODP liaison's role. And I think, again, we'll stress that in our motion. But I think having that in mind, the SSC, nonetheless, considered that he was the best candidate and I think we should go along with this.

But yes. You're absolutely right, even more so because the role is really a go-between and there shouldn't be any element that would only be processed by the liaison and not go back to Council if there are questions raised by the ODP. Those questions should be brought to Council and not processed by the liaison even if Jeff, in that case, is the former chair of the PDP. You're absolutely right, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Okay. Thanks very much. So asking the others whether there is any other contribution to that point with regards to the appointment of the liaison and the appointment of Osvaldo—a continuation of Osvaldo in

---

the SSC. Any question to that? Otherwise, I would say we leave it. It is accepted and you can take it with you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So I'll come onto the votes now, not in the order of the agenda. I'll take the second first—the review of the job description for NomCom, for their nominations of GNSO councilors. We did that and I mentioned it several times with you here. We started it in August and repeatedly shared the proposed updates with Council, for whatever reason. So we have a motion to approve this at this meeting.

For whatever reason, it seemed that, given the circumstances, etc., it went—I wouldn't say unnoticed but to some parties it seems that ... It's a bit fresh as a discussion and it seemed that although, in good faith, this seemed like a pretty harmless revision of the job description, maybe we're going to need more time.

The substance of this revision is about the affiliation of candidates to NomCom for the GNSO Council seat. And our idea is—our proposal—was to recommend that the candidates would have no affiliation for them to be nominated for a Council seat. That's very much along the lines of what the ccNSO does. Otherwise, it seems to blur the borders between the constituencies and it wouldn't be very helpful.

I'll cut it very short but it seems that maybe we're going to need more time for this. So maybe we'll just defer the vote on the motion later on. So we won't have to vote on this one, very likely. My proposal is that if

---

we do, we would support that way forward. But again, it seems maybe a bit early.

So I'll go on to the next item, which is the Phase 2A report. The question is what our vote should be. So as you would recall, in our discussion last time, last month, on this, I suggested that we would support the motion on the Final Report. The reason for that is that the PDP was followed. And there was a question in September about the scope of the Final Report as it relates to the original charter. There were questions put forward by the CPH. And that's relative to the recommendations on the distinction between legal versus natural.

I think, on all accounts, we could have done better in terms of communication, maybe. But there's no question that the decision by the PDP chair as well as the discussions that we had on the topic were right and proper. And there was nothing untowards, process-wise, in the way that it was handled.

So the question for us is, again, whether we want to support the motion on the report. And the question is, essentially, it's not really whether we like the report or not. That was essentially a call by the PDP, by the working group. The question is whether the PDP process was followed.

And in that regard, I think it's fair to say, even speaking personally, on certain items, I could have wished that the group had gone beyond what's in the final report. But the fact of the matter is, the consensus is what it is and the end result is what it is. Being a liaison, I can confidently say that what we have in the report is the best we can achieve at this point in time, given the inputs that we had and the work

---

conditions that we had. So in that regard, the consensus call, the process, the charter, all of this has been adhered to. So I would suggest that we support the approval of the Final Report.

With this, happy to take questions or diverging views if there are any. I'm sure those representatives that we had in the working group, their views would be welcome. But from what I took from the report that they gave us along this PDP, I would assume that what I've just said is consistent with what they said along the way. So again, Wolf-Ulrich, happy to take questions.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Philippe, for that. I think we understand it was not an easy path to go here. So I saw in the chat, also Christian, as one of the members of the PDP group, he fully agreed to what you said and the support to the report. And Thomas as well. Yes. So that's the vote from our side, to support that.

The question is then do we have any signs from other sides, what's happening from those? I'm not sure whether here, as well, minority reports are available in this phase or is that different. I'm not sure about that, if there are any signs from others that the support may be weak, or solid. What do you mean, Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. We have had, at Council and within leadership, some inputs on this. I seem to understand that our friends from the CPH would have, as I said, issues with the scope of the Final Report and

---

possibly the process. I also understand that they would, nonetheless—and despite what they consider as possibly an oversight—they would nonetheless support the Final Report. That’s what I’m hearing. Maybe I’m not hearing the right thing but there we are, in these days, with our respective channels of communication.

I asked you Wolf-Ulrich, about the CSG. I haven’t heard about the BC so far. I’m hearing from the IPC that, consistently with the minority statements that they filed during the final stages of the Final Report ... I said consistently but it’s even arguable that it is consistent with having a minority statement but they might not support the motion, not because they consider that the process was followed but they think that they would object ... That’s my reading of this but they think that the Final Report and the recommendation should have gone further than what the report is at this point so. So it’s more a question of the end result than actually the process.

My view on this is that, as I just said a moment ago is that the result is what it is. And that’s not the question that is asked to Council. Our role is essentially to determine whether the process was followed. The reservations, relative to the end result, to the recommendations, are captured in the meeting report. The question is whether the consensus call was duly followed. And I think it was. And I’m not hearing from the IPC that it wasn’t. So there’s potentially a disconnect there.

I don't know whether the current debate over what you just said, Wolf-Ulrich, that the holistic review has a play in this. Maybe it has. I don't know. I’m hearing that there are split views within the IPC so that’s all I

---

can share. And that's really, apart from the details, all I have at this point.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Hello? Does somebody like to comment? Okay. So let's wait and see for that. But as I told you as well, or I think noted to you, that on the CSG level, in the ExCom, the last time we did not discuss that. So there was no point related to the content of that, which was so problematic to the others that they put it to the table of the CSG. There was no discussion on that. So that's what I think, also, that we may take it as it is. Okay. So thank you for that. Anything else from the Council? Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I'll stop here. I think there are other items I'll keep you updated on. But just mindful of time, I'll stop here. Those are really important issues and I appreciate the time that was devoted to it at this meeting. And I think that the guidance that we have, Osvaldo, is very clear. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much for that. Let's move to the next one, which is an item coming up after ICANN 72. That is our potential engagement with the ICANN CEO with regards to his Fiscal Year 22 goals, specifically the goal number three, which could be touched on. But I can also briefly read that. And we should have just a discussion how we take that and how we move that forward. I would like to ask for ideas.

---

The goal for Göran, as it is, establish the right relationships with connectivity providers, both service providers and manufacturers. Provide information, knowledge, and interaction so that we can be a part of the conversation, including standardization discussions. So that is what he had in mind. And we should think about what does it mean? How could it touch on our own business here? How can we engage in this case? And what can be expected?

In addition to that, I would also mention we can see the activities of the CTO, from OCTO, from the Office of the CTO, regarding establishing more relationships on the international front. So for example, there was an MOU assigned with the NANO, the North American Network Operators' Group and there may come others as well regarding those groups in other regions.

And I would like to ask, also, for volunteers from these regions where people are very close to those groups, that they may chime in here and may participate in the discussion on how we can deal with that item and how we can move that forward and also to our benefit in relation to ICANN.

So the first thing what I have, before Christian, just a point to make, is I have ... After the meeting we have had, as Christian was participating in the meeting with Göran, also there was a summary made and also I've sent back over to Göran the proposals that will come up to have a meeting with him and his guys from OCTO or whomever he likes to make attend this meeting together in order to have an exchange—on the one hand to better understand what has he in mind with that, on



---

the other hand, also, to discuss what is our potential in that? What can we do? What do we expect from that?

Justin first opened the discussion and I asked Brenda to find out a common, agreeable time to discuss that after ICANN 72. I think that could be the second half of November or so. So that is just the idea of the process of doing that, and [inaudible] further idea. The other thing is then everybody from the ISPCP is invited to participate in that effort and then to come up with ideas. So stop here and Christian, please.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON:

Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I appreciate it. Tony put in the chat what I was going to say, which is something I'll build on a little bit. He said, "We need to understand this goal much better. More dialog is required between ICANN CEO, OCTO, and the ISPCP."

This could be a great opportunity for us. We, as a constituency, have had one particular problem that I see in our ability to be as active and powerful a voice as we could be to represent ISPs and connectivity providers. And that is that in an ideal world, providing the technical perspective of technical operators of networks is something that I would aspire, as an ISP group, that served the needs of our helpdesks, with regards to the DNS providers, as something that we would aspire to do.

It would be great to be able to leverage the CEO's office in order to aid us in gathering up technical operators what would be an active voice to help us move forward the agenda of the ISPs with regards to the

---

ongoing conversations around what’s happening with the DNS, especially in the era of increasing cybersecurity threats. Having their voice as part of our membership would be fantastic.

But we don’t really understand who he’s going after, and for what reason, and on what projects he would like them to be a part. We are not certain that that aligns with our policy goals. We are not certain that that aligns with our membership goals. We’re not even certain that we’re operating out of the same definition of connectivity provider.

And so making sure that we have the close dialog and we find the areas in which we are aligned and taking advantage of that is something that I would like to be a part of the process. Understanding that we may not have perfect alignment means that we cannot go into this situation with a goal of making it happen. We need to be able to walk away if, indeed, we aren’t aligned. But ultimately, it could be a great opportunity for us to solve some longstanding problems.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks very much, Christian. This is a bunch of questions we have to raise to Göran as well. And I understand. When I see that is the goal, the question is for me, is that goal ... He has that goal to achieve. So what he can do, he could do anything in order to achieve that. He could refer to us, which is close. It’s a first idea. But he also could try, as he did in the past on several occasions on international meetings also, to get in contact directly to big providers—big connectivity providers, telcos, whatever else that ICANN is going to ... Or is he doing this NANOG or these other operating groups? ICANN is open to do that.

---

So we should think about what is better, also, from our point of view— if it's good for us in order to have a kind of focus here in our group or ... Yeah. I expect it's depending on the engagement we show to him. So that is what I think. Maybe we should think about that.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: So this meeting that we're going to have, that we've already asked to facilitate, is the key discovery period in which we'll need to make those things clear. And having a good showing of members, I think, would be an important next step.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thomas, please.

THOMAS RICKERT: Hi, everybody. I think, maybe for this initial discussion, we should just ask the questions that were raised by Tony and Christian and supported by Susan. I think we should have the discussion but maybe at a later point.

The reason why I'm asking us to be a little bit cautious is that we all know that ICANN has a very limited mandate, particularly in the area of DNS abuse, which is discussed in various places at the moment. Those who are dealing with the topic know that ICANN registries and registrars have a limited means of dealing with this. So we need other types of intermediaries to have that discussion. And whilst that is perfectly okay

---

to have that discussion, I'm not sure whether ICANN is the right forum to have these discussions.

So maybe we use this as a fact-finding mission to see what's behind the requests and then reconvene and discuss what we can do and to what extent we can participate.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thanks, Thomas. What I get here from your input—from Christian, and yours as well, and I think others as well ... Tony was asking that we have to better understand what is behind that. And this is, I think, an agenda for the first round.

Maybe also, he could shed light on what he's doing in the international arena related to that. You'll remember we had sometimes, in former times, we had Yrjo in our meetings. He was presenting also similar ideas. So is that what we should do in the first round to become more clarity on that? So I think that that is what it is. Is there anything from your point of view? Also, I'm just looking to the chat. Yes. Susan was also supporting this approach.

So, Brenda, I would like to ask you again, just after ICANN 72, to find out a date with the others. I'm not sure. It's not easy. But we should be a little bit flexible from our side because we have a lot of members. Maybe we send them out a Doodle so that we can see who is willing to participate in that discussion actively. And then we will fix a date and have that available. Brenda, I think that is the process as usual. And as

---

I understood also, David, he will support that to find a date for that. So that is our next step in this regard.

Then we can leave that item to meet our deadline. Very last question to Christian—where we are with our charter.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Can you hear me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you. I'll be very brief about this. I'm going to work to try and resolve this as quickly as possible. We have been in the same place for quite some time but we're about to move off of it. We realized that we were stuck on this one part, which is basically the scope of membership requirements. And we were unable to get rough consensus on any change aspect.

So we circled back to the idea of trying to keep an existing language. There's a group within the drafting group that has a problem with the existing language. So what I proposed was an exercise wherein we talked in our last session about how to make sure that we get clarity about what types of organizations qualify under existing language with an idea of not changing any language and to move on and try to get rough consensus and move on the next stage once we have achieved that clarity.

---

As an exercise, I presented a list of 10 companies. And I wanted to go to the drafting group and the executive leadership of the organization and say, “Do we all have a common agreement as to which of these would qualify for membership and which not?” If we did, the idea would be that the current language is sufficient, and we don’t need any further conversation, and we can move on to the next stage, which is to bring this to the general membership.

I presented the list of 10 companies that I wanted to do this exercise with to the people that need the clarity. And I haven’t gotten responses back. But I think what I’m going to do is I’m going to bypass response and go ahead and send it to the drafting group right away so that we can just jump right into the exercise.

And once we’ve completed that exercise, if we’ve got very good clarity across the board as to which quality for membership and which don’t, I’m just going to go ahead and move the process along and bring the document, in total, to the general membership for further comment. So look for that e-mail today if you’re in the drafting group.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

I think that’s a good approach. Yes. We need that way. I remember. We agreed to do that. And I think it takes, sometimes ... Somebody should—because for example, I personally don’t all these companies which are on the list but there are websites available so we can also look at this. We even could comment, “We cannot comment,” in case we don’t know this company, for example. That could also be done. I

---

think it's a step forward. We should follow that and we are expecting—  
looking forward to your e-mail, Christian. Thank you for that.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Fantastic. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. So we are at any other business. We covered already SSC membership and supporting Osvaldo for that. Are there other items to cover here? Any other questions?

If it's not the case, then let's look to the calendar briefly for the next meeting. Brenda, do you have a suggestion, when we look after ICANN 72? Today is the 25th of November. When shall be the next Council meeting after ICANN 72? And then let's look at the Monday before that meeting, that have usually our meeting on Monday.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I do see that the next GNSO Council meeting is Thursday, November 18th. So you would like to having a meeting on the 15th?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. That would be my suggestion.

---

BRENDA BREWER: I think that will work out just fine. I can send out our normal time. It's generally between—

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I have a question, Christian. What is your time you cannot do? Would that be okay? Let me say, what did you have—you have had before?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: My standing meeting?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Oh. I don't recall.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: That was a problem last time. If we go for 15:00 UTC, for example ... Brenda, please.

BRENDA BREWER: 15:00 UTC on Monday, November 15th?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: It's just a question. And Christian should be able to participate.



---

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: That's 11:00 AM Eastern. I'm sorry. What's the date again?

BRENDA BREWER: November 15th. Eastern time would be 10:00 AM, it looks like. I'm not sure with the time change. I'm sorry. One moment. 15:00 UTC.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: With that much notice, I'll move whatever I need to move. So if we can get out a calendar invite this week, with that much notice, I can move any internal meeting I need to with that notice.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Then let's do 15:00 UTC on the 15th of November, okay?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you very much. So just a little off the hour. Thank you very much. And see you later at the follow-up meetings.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Brenda. And thank you. Good-bye. The meeting is adjourned.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:            Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Bye, all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**