

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 18 September 2025

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 18 September 2025 at 05:00 UTC: [Event Time Announcer - GNSO Council Meeting](#) 22:00 Los Angeles (Wednesday); 01:00 Washington DC; 06:00 London; 07:00 Paris; 08:00 Moscow; 15:00 Melbourne

List of Attendees

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

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Prudence Malinki

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou (apologies, proxy to Jennifer Chung), Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans (joined late)

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts (joined late), Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii (apologies, proxy to Manju Chen), Bruna Martins dos Santos (joined late, after vote), Julf Helsingius, Tomsin Samme-Nlar (apologies, proxy to Julf Helsingius), Peter Akinremi, Manju Chen

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests:

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Lead

Lars Hoffmann - VP, New gTLD Program Management and Deputy Program Lead, ICANN org

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management (apology)

Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO) (apology)

Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support (apology)

Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)

Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)

Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO) (apology)

John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO) (apology)

Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO)

[Zoom Recording](#)

[Transcript](#)

Item 1: Administrative Matters

1.1 - Roll Call

1.2 - Updates to Statements of Interest

1.3 - Review / Amend Agenda

1.4 - Note the status of minutes for the previous Council meetings per the GNSO Operating Procedures: [Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 10 July 2025 were posted on 28 July 2025.

[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 14 August 2025 were posted on 2 September 2025.

Susan Payne, IPC, updated her SOI that her company has acquired another company that has a .Brand gTLD.

Item 2: Opening Remarks / Review of Projects & Action List

2.1 - Review focus areas and provide updates on specific key themes / topics, to include review of [Projects List](#) and [Action Item List](#).

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, noted the current open public comment proceedings for DNS Abuse and RDRS.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- Confirmation of GNSO Members to the Review of Reviews Cross Community Group (RoR CCG): Sophie Hey and Osvaldo Novoa
- Approval of 2025 Customer Standing Committee slate:

Pablo Rodriguez (NA)

Appointing Organization: ccNSO

1st Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Maarten Simon (EU)

Appointing Organization: ccNSO

1st Term: 1 October 2025 – 30 September 2027

Gordon Dick (EU)

Appointing Organization: RySG

1st Term: 1 October 2025 – 30 September 2027

Rick Wilhelm (NA)

Appointing Organization: RySG

2nd Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Liaisons:

Joe Abley

Appointing Organization: SSAC

Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Tracy Hackshaw

Appointing Organization: GAC

Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Hiro Hotta

Appointing Organization: RSSAC

Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Houda Chihi

Appointing Organization: ALAC

Term: 1 October 2025 – 30 September 2027

John Gbadamosi

Appointing Organization: GNSO (Non-Registry)

Term: 1 October 2025 – 30 September 2026

Selina Harrington

Appointing Organization: PTI

Term: No term limit

ASO has not appointed liaisons to the CSC 2025 slate.

Alternates:**Maarten Aertsen**

Appointing Organization: SSAC

Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Gloria Atwine Katuuku

Appointing Organization: GAC

Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Daniel Migault

Appointing Organization: RSSAC

Term: 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2026

Erwin Lansing

Appointing Organization: ccNSO

Term: 1 October 2025 – 30 September 2026

Anil Jain

Appointing Organization: GNSO (Non-Registry)

Term: 1 October 2025 – 30 September 2026

[Vote Results](#)[Action Items:](#)

- GNSO Secretariat to notify selected members of the RoR CCG. *[COMPLETE]*
- GNSO Secretariat to inform the GNSO-appointees that they have been selected. *[COMPLETE]*
- GNSO Secretariat to send a response to those applicants who were not appointed, thanking them for their interest and encouraging them to apply for future opportunities as they arise. *[COMPLETE]*

- GNSO Secretariat to notify ICANN Org staff supporting the CSC no later than 22 September 2025 that the GNSO has approved the 2025 CSC slate of members and liaisons.

Item 4: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Prioritization of Upcoming Work

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Nacho Amadoz, Interim GNSO Co-Chair)

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Next Steps

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, introduced the [updated prioritization document](#). He noted these are large-scale projects that are demanding and time intensive to frame the discussion.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, emphasized that staff added a “levels of effort” column, which was quite difficult, but they have tried to add in the best guess for next steps. Based on those anticipated next steps, staff included a level of effort. He outlined the underway or expected including relevant timelines or projects. Once you get to three projects you get a bottleneck for staff and community resources.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, expressed her personal view that forming a PDP on DNS abuse is almost certain is problematic and suggested not to cave to what GAC wants. DNS abuse mitigation is emphasized, but not due process or remedies for access to vital online services that could be hampered because of this. Her opinion is to reject GAC’s request. NCSG has supported this and is preparing public comment.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, expressed his personal opinion that not just the GAC pushed for this, many in the community are also interested in this including the registries.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, speaking of SSAD or RDRS, the timeline is wishfully short given the amount of discussion over the prior recommendations. This will likely be a much longer endeavor. In thinking about the next year 2026, we need to take into account our planning that there is not much capacity for work given that the timelines listed will likely be expanded.

Susan Payne, IPC, noted that the IPC had previously supported the priorities as DNS Abuse, RDRS, and Accuracy, and to some extent RPMs. Reviewing UDRP and ensuring it is conducted in a responsible manner as there have been many deferrals. It is important that it is set up for success with narrow chartering when it does come up.

Vivek Goyal, BC, asked about going to the constituency with the priorities after the discussion. Second query was: does the Council have anything to do with new gTLDs?

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair important to reassess priorities as to what is manageable.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, Council has committed to the Board and broader community on clarifying statements locking the new gTLD program into rounds as opposed to an ongoing rolling process. Note that the timeline of 2026 means that you have 3 relatively meaningful pieces of work. Council should be mindful of what it commits to for 2026 with narrowly scoped work and may have an impact on other work potentially.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, homework then is to help set the expectations of what is feasible as 2026 is already packed.

Vivek Goyal, BC, gTLD has nothing to do with the current round. He proposed going to constituencies and seeing commonalities to list priority wise. Should not limit based on bandwidth to start with. We don't want another SubPro, but cannot stop discussions. He suggested prioritizing first and then coming back to Council with each group's priorities.

Peter Akinremi, NCSG, wanted to clarify the resources needed for this kind of work and support from staff.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, noted this is an educated guess from staff based on experience and not to take on too many things at the same time and then manage expectations to avoid perceptions that the Council is not doing its job.

Action Items:

- Staff to recirculate the Prioritization document to Council list with a deadline of feedback from SG/Cs of 9 October.
- Councilors to share the document with SG/Cs to establish group priorities and share feedback with Council not later than 9 October.

Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Urgent Request Timeline and Related Topics

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Thomas Rickert, GNSO Council Liaison to the Registration Data IRT)

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, introduced the topic discussing two issues: 1) IRT and its progress and 2) liaising with LEA at the global level. The discussion is not limited to IRTs but also in RDRS Standing Committee and EPDP, it is something that is popping up everywhere. It has not been discussed satisfactorily. Motive to start and drive the discussion in a productive way and to manage expectations.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, stated there remains an open discussion of the definition of urgent requests and who is authenticated. Proposed language is not finalized yet. Issue of how much the CPs can accept for binding timelines with a challenging legal point of view. If CPs accept language that requires them to respond to ICANN Compliance. The issue in general is different scenarios with (1) local LEA to domestic CP, that is easy to deal with; (2) where they are in different jurisdictions, but a legal framework exists such as MLAD; or a (3) where no such legal framework exists. He pointed to a new [document](#) from the European Data Protection Board that should then maybe refer to the MLAD system to reach and request data from CP. It concludes in guideline 02.24 that companies should refuse direct requests from LEAs and refer them to the MLAD system if the agreement exists. Thereby the international LEA would contact domestic LEA that could then request disclosure from CP. In sum, the European Data Protection Board notes how much of a legal challenge this is, and CPs represent an even bigger challenge.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, his view is that LEA are working on authentication mechanisms. Assumption that if it were authenticated then disclosure would then be okay. But CPs cannot be forced to do something illegal under local law. If we come up with a process for CPs to deal with LEAs that suggests that disclosure is possible. IRT members have suggested that this could potentially be automated, but that cannot be true in all jurisdictions. Need a discussion around legal frameworks to map out who can disclose to whom. ICANN has no means to obligate LEA or others with its policies and cannot make

MLAD systems fast enough. ICANN can help with this with PSWG, GAC, Board, etc. Cannot afford to let discussion continue as is for what the limitations of ICANN can facilitate and what CPs can do, otherwise the MSM will not look good. Thomas volunteered to take the lead even beyond his tenure.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, noted that in the past she had been supportive of clarifying certain jurisdictional issues, but that the CPs have that ultimate decision. She disagreed that there is some kind of obligation to disclose if LEA mechanism is used, and that is not true. The GAC has clearly acknowledged and so has the PSWG Authentication group that Authentication does not equal a requirement to disclose. It is always up to the parties who incur the risk of noncompliance to determine whether they are legally obligated to disclose or not. She reiterated that authentication ≠ disclosure.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, Urgent request is also the result of a PDP process that cannot be relitigated and the timeline is the IRT issue. She disagreed that this is not ripe to go to the Board. How do you as a LEA ensure that you have verifiable email lists and are not misleading to CPs. Update from PSWG they are trying to establish that to be helpful to CPs. Issues related to CPs respond to timelines through IRT and PSWG. The Board cannot or should not be resolving the issues as Council has asked them to reopen the IRT. Finally, groups need to verify jurisdictional issues and in no way is it ready for the Board.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, noted this is one topic that Council will want to raise with the GAC. Possible trilateral dialogue with the Board.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, agreed that authentication does not equal disclosure, yet he noted that it is brought up over and over again. His aim is to broaden the discussion of urgency since he believes the jurisdiction issue needs to be discussed more. Possible compromise for a broader discussion to keep all relevant parties apprised to manage expectation and results wise. This is not just about urgent requests but every communication between the law enforcement community and ICANN and its CPs. It is not about getting results up to the Board, but this is an overarching issue that needs to be managed expectations and results-wise.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, summarized that there may need to be a distinction between urgent requests and the wider scope of jurisdiction to make sense or affect other areas beyond that issue.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, added that the PSWG task force turned into this group that would have meetings to talk about how they got their data authenticated internally and those were very useful and those should be picked back up. Also, relevant points that other jurisdictional issues need to be considered.

Action Item: Taking into account the discussion from the September Council meeting, Thomas and Anne will work together on preparing the proposed talking points for the Urgent Requests topic during the GNSO Council bilateral with GAC.

Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Board Readiness Small Team Recommendations

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Kurt Pritz, Small Team Lead)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, introduced the topic and thanked Kurt Pritz for his leadership

and the writing of the Board Readiness Small Team report. He noted that normally staff prepares a draft, but Kurt committed considerable time and effort to this process beyond his tenure on the Council. He thanked the Small Team and Kurt for their work.

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Chair, shared the following [slides](#) presenting the Board Readiness Small Team [Final Report](#).

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, asked about ICANN staff role in the readiness exercise and the GDS liaison and they were not specifically mentioned in the slides.

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Chair, noted that there were three ICANN policy support staff interviewed. There should ideally be some coordination between the Board and ICANN staff.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, mentioned that in Dublin there will be a discussion of the Council liaison role for this. The expectation is then the Councilor in the liaison role will take it on to improve the process.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, emphasized that Councilors will have to read the report and do their homework prior to ICANN84 as it will be discussed during a working session.

Action Item: Councilors read the Board readiness [final report](#) and come prepared to discuss the small team's recommendations and associated questions for the small team during an ICANN84 GNSO working session.

Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Proposed Agenda for GAC and GNSO Bilateral Meeting at ICANN84

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, introduced the topic noting that this meeting should not be a presentation, but something more collaborative.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, shared the following [slides](#). He reminded Councilors that 1 month before GAC discusses topics that could be a topic of discussion and present that to leadership for a preliminary discussion. If Councilors agree on those then GAC goes to its topic leads to formulate answers to questions received. He would like to try to pivot that process. The questions are often very specific from the GAC to Council and reporting rather than a collaborative discussion. He queried if there were other topics in addition to the four listed: Accuracy, DNS Abuse, Urgent Requests/LEA, and RDRS. There is a possibility for additional items from Councilors given the short 45-minute time limit for the bilateral.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, GAC leadership meeting was for Councilors to raise topics for AOB. These four topics will be the main discussion, but GAC leadership will be made aware of topics that they want to raise.

Susan Payne, IPC, asked will the GAC topic leads be on board with a more collaborative process? There won't be any surprise on their part?

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, replied yes in a way, it was discussed before Prague, but suggested this on the planning call.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, queried about an informal group at Council and a part of GNSO on WSIS+20, that has to be an issue for the next meeting and would like to raise Internet governance. Would human rights be discussed regularly for DNS abuse with the GAC?

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, noted the limited time and that will be added as an AOB. If we do, we need to reach out so they know it is added.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, wanted to ask about getting questions in advance. That has been answered. Hopefully there is time during the working session to work through that. Kudos to Seb with GAC topic leads on DNS abuse for ST progress and Public Comment and GNSO working session. If there is a collaborative way to frame those questions she volunteered.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, suggested reaching out to them directly.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, proposed separating the topics on urgent requests and LEA. She volunteered to work with Thomas on this to coordinate.

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, likes the idea of enhanced discussions and the questions in advance. She added the additional context of temperature check and expectations. Great dialogue and conversational flow, best to understand the temperature for GAC on all of these topics. Temperature is the most important topic, and something that does not get discussed enough at Council. Overarching objective is to be productive and not combative.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, over the last three ICANN meetings there have been communiques without advice and the last one was with advice was for DNS Abuse. The question for this group and their topic leads is: will that suffice? Is it a step they see as proactive enough to alleviate the concerns from a couple of months ago and the topic leads are the ones that will set the temperature on their different topics.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, thanked Seb and noted that anyone who wants to raise additional topics on list for possible AOB discussion with GAC.

Action Items:

- Councilor topic-leads to seek out GAC counterparts to coordinate and align prior to ICANN84 meeting.
- Staff to reach out to Farzi to discuss what she would like to achieve with an AOB item of human rights with the GAC.

Item 8: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Disagreement Between ICANN Staff and the IRT on Implementation

8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Anne Aikman-Scalese & Susan Payne, GNSO co-liaisons to the PDP)

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Step

Susan Payne, IPC, highlighted that a [discussion paper](#) was circulated for an issue that has arisen in implementation for SubPro. It is complex and raises political issues, but it is important to remember that

it is a relatively narrow issue for a small number of strings. It relates to whether a certain group of non-delegated names are assessed against for the purposes of string similarity when someone files a new application. She used the language from the 2012 round names because the terminology has shifted and has not helped for this round. There were some names that were reserved (ICANN internal names, etc.) and could not be delegated. If an application was filed and would be assessed on that list for string sim evaluation. There was a separate set of names like ICRC and IOC for strings ineligible for delegation. Those names were not going to be assessed against String Sim review. PDP was kicked off IGO/INGO PDP 2013 recommendations issued to keep ICRC and IOC and added some additional names. There should be an exception process, if the red cross wanted red cross, they could apply.

Susan Payne, IPC, later on with SubPro and IDN-EPDP, neither changed what the IGO/INGO PDP had said. Now implementing the AGB a question of how those names should be treated. They should be assessed for string sim review even though that was not the case in the last round. Staff put together this [discussion paper](#) with two options. Staff and the Board are pushing for option 2 and many in the IRT are pushing for option 1 that matches the policy recommendations. There was a possible third path, but there was a feeling that would be a policy change. There is an urgency given the Board wants to vote on the AGB at Dublin.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, added that there was disagreement in the IRT as to whether or not option 2 was a policy change, both were implementation.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, asked Lars why staff think this is not a change in policy? IRTs can't change policy. That is the topic of a vast discussion of the PPSAI question. Question for Susan, is there a policy? The policy recommendations for the first round were at a very high level. AGB is implementation, then a SubPro PDP were in affirmation statements about the AGB, but is that policy or more akin to implementation guidance? NGO IGO PDP and if they look at SubPro questions, has that been policy and what recommendation adopted by the Board can we point to on this?

Lars Hoffmann, ICANN org, shared the following [slides](#). He noted that what came out of Paris in 2008/9 and the SubPro PDP loosely said that policies and procedures that applied in 2012 and are documented in the guidebook should be repeated in the next round. That is unless there are changes recommended in the report and that's how IRT staff have been working together. He agreed with the way Susan laid it out and this is how it was done in 2012 and should be repeated. He noted that there is no disagreement with IGO/INGO recommendations and no update in SubPro. IDN-EPDP also dealt with string similarity and no policy recommendation that would require any changes to string sim. To answer Paul, where is the policy? That is where IRT and staff currently disagree. He agrees that the IRT members do not agree with staff interpretation of IGO/INGO recommendations, so that is fair to say.

Lars Hoffmann, ICANN org, 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 discuss the protection of an exact match. So the IRT believes that means an exact match such as "redcross" is protected, but not anything confusingly similar is not protected. So the Red Cross conceivably could not get it in a future round because there is something already visually confusingly similar. He went through hypotheticals in the [slides](#). So, if you think protection is just on the exact match, then option 1 in the [discussion paper](#) is the way forward. If you think that Red Cross should be able to apply for a string at any point in the future, that means we would have to include them in the string similarity review, so that a confusingly similar string cannot be delegated before that.

Lars Hoffmann, ICANN org, emphasized that Red Cross was part of the PDP and raised concerns about string similarity in PDP discussions, but is not directly in the recommendations. This is just for additional context. The Board has written to Council on this and they say that those names should ideally be protected. Ultimately, the Board says this is a Council decision, but if the confusingly similar names were not to be included, then the Board has concerns about confusingly similar names being delegated.

Lars Hoffmann, ICANN org, Council should ideally get back to us before ICANN84, perhaps with an intersessional meeting. In the meantime we keep option 1 which is supported by the IRT and if Council disagrees and thinks it should be a part of string similarity then staff can change the AGB if they need to and another Board resolution would not be needed for that. If Council needs more time to discuss, then that is fine too.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, queried about timelines and what Council is being asked to do here. She asked if they were supposed to be the arbiters of whether or not this is a new policy, because the Council does not have that expertise.

Lars Hoffmann, ICANN org, responded that ideally the Board should approve the guidebook by ICANN84, so Council should try to have an answer before Dublin. Otherwise, it would have to be the end of December before the AGB is finalized. For the policy, it is what the protection entails for IGO/INGO recommendations.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, suggested perhaps an email vote.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, believed it would be good to consult with seasoned SGs and to have additional written material from Lars on a possible path forward. There is the possibility of a special meeting before Dublin to get thoughts together and have an answer before Dublin.

Osvoldo Novoa, CSG ISP, stated his participation in the IGO INGO WG when it was decided on the set matches it was not confusingly similar names, only exact matches of whole names or acronyms. If we were to include acronyms today it would be enormous and confusingly similar strings were never discussed.

Action Items:

- Councilors to review [discussion paper](#) and determine whether the intent of the relevant IGO/INGO PDP recommendations should result in option 1 or option 2, by 9 Oct
- Leadership and staff to schedule a 60 minute Extraordinary Meeting to discuss the item prior to ICANN84.

Item 9: Any Other Business

9.1 - GNSO Council SPS (Terri)

9.2 - ICANN84 planning and GNSO Draft schedule (Terri)

9.3 - [GNSO Prep Week Webinar](#) - 07 Oct at 21:00 UTC (Nacho)

9.4 - Next Steps for Accuracy Small Team Rec. 2 (Educational Materials)

9.5 - Initiating the Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team (SPIRT) (Steve)

9.6 - Update from PPSAI small team (Paul)

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, apologized for the rushed discussion and emphasized that the

missed AOB items would be done via email.

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, noted that the ICANN84 prep week schedule has been published. She stressed that funded travelers needed to register ASAP. She showed the tentative schedule for Council with GNSO working sessions on Sunday. Leadership and staff are working on the agendas and Council dinner is Wednesday night.

Vivek Goyal, BC, requested an email from staff as an action item for the prioritization document.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, agreed with Vivek. He added that the Council chair will be elected in Dublin.

Action Items:

Staff to send respective AOB items not covered during the meeting to Council mailing list [9.5
COMPLETE]

Meeting Adjourned at 7:02 UTC