

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 29 October 2025 Part 1

GNSO Council meeting held in Dublin, Ireland 13:15 - 15:15 GMT: <https://tinyurl.com/3m7ru8zw>
Coordinated Universal Time: 13:15 - 15:15 UTC 03:15 Los Angeles; 06:15 Washington DC; 10:15 London;
11:15 Paris; 13:15 Moscow; 21:15 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, Jennifer Chung
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Tomslin Samme-Nlar, 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

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)
Lars Hoffman - Vice President, New gTLD Program Management
Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support
Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO)
Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO) (apology)

[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 18 September 2025 were posted on 2 October 2025. [Minutes](#) of the GNSO Extraordinary Council Meeting on 09 October 2025 were posted on 25 October 2025.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, noted his updated SOI.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, noted her reappointment as ALAC liaison and ALAC vice-chair.

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](#).

Item 3: COUNCIL VOTE: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Interpretation of Intent for Select IGO/INGO PDP Recommendations (20 minutes) | scheduled start time 13:20 UTC

3.1 - Introduction of Topic (Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Interim Co-Chair)

3.2 - Council Vote (voting threshold: majority of each house)

3.3 - Next Steps

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, introduced the topic that the Council discussed at the extraordinary Council meeting and led to four separate motions. There were four motions submitted and Anne would be withdrawing the first three motions leaving only the fourth motion. There was a friendly amendment added to motion four from Desiree, which seeks to better inform potential applications of the reserved names list for the relevant organizations.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, she was unable to withdraw motions 1-3 as a motion for deferral is forthcoming.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, spoke to ISPCP under the assumption that the three options would be withdrawn. ISPCP would have preferred to vote in favor of option 3 leaving it to the Board as a matter of implementation. They were prepared to vote in favor of remaining option 4. He put on the record during the Board GNSO meeting that there was some miscommunication between the Board and GNSO. There was the view of some that the Board was inappropriately putting its finger on the scale to influence the process. Becky Burr clarified that she did not understand why this came across as a criticism, there was no intention to influence the Council decision. The fact that the Board chimed in was based on years of asking of the Board to be honest and transparent on their thinking. He noted that he will be gone after this meeting. There were large discussions amongst the Council that could have avoided the perception of undue influence of the Board on the GNSO process.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, encouraged Councilors to look at the transcript of the Board and GNSO bilateral meeting. She cited Jim Galvin's summary that the Board went back to sending a letter because that is what the Board knows how to do, and it was interpreted in the old way with all the baggage that comes with that. Council and the Board should continue to find ways to informally, semi-formally, and formally communicate so we do not get into this situation again. RySG requested a deferral of the vote of this

motion. Everyone has been trying diligently to get through this motion. However, there is a concern from the registries for Option 4 resolved clause F concerning the term “appropriate mechanisms” were not clear enough. Registry would prefer option F of 4 removed, where other SG/Cs will need time to look at the revised language and have time to discuss with their groups.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, IPC discussed this at length and came to the conclusion for a yes vote for version 4 even though there was concern about confusion.

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, registrars deliberated and planned on abstaining from this vote. There is a rationale provided should a vote take place on this issue if there is no deferral.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, noted the withdrawal of 1-3 was predicated on no changes to Item 4.

Lars Hoffman, ICANN org, if this is passed in the 13 November Council meeting there should not be an impact on the next round. There is bracketed text in the AGB that says this is pending Council decision, it will remain in there. The Board probably would not consider this a change for a second Board motion. Essentially the current AGB brackets would be removed when the Council resolves and publishes the final guidebook. As you are aware they are also waiting on the DRSP rules and the opening dates, which are likely to come by December. In sum, if this is reconsidered in the November Council meeting it would not have an impact on the timeline.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, considered the deferral and inquired on the proper procedure.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, cited procedure being the discretion of the chair.

Manju Chen, NCSG, requested a vote on deferral given that it was her final meeting on Council, but deferred to the chairs.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, accepted the deferral on all four motions.

Vivek Goyal, BC, queried how this would be resolved.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, clarified that this would be whittled down on list prior to the November Council meeting.

Susan Payne, IPC, was hoping to get a language finalized that people can be comfortable with. While the registries have a concern, she would hope that they provide an amendment and can have time for SGs/Cs to get a sense from constituencies and vote on it at the 13 November meeting instead

Vivek Goyal, BC, the November meeting can be a challenge and would be motivated to have an extraordinary meeting if necessary.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, in discussing whittling things down, we now do not know on motion 4 suggesting that a concrete motion stable for option 4 put forward then it is possible for an electronic vote, which would be faster than the November meeting.

Steve Chan, ICANN org noted that the meeting is 13 November and it would not be likely to have an electronic vote before then. He added that since all motions are deferred they are required to be either voted on or withdrawn after 1 meeting, so this will not happen again.

Peter Akinremi, NCSG, discussed leaving the four options on the table and wants to know which part will be addressed. If this is deferred then he urges the Council, which option will be brought back to the group and what could be the problems, as this could have a potentially bad impact. We want to see which options can be taken off the table to reach agreement. This will allow the groups time to discuss because this will have an impact as Council needs to come to consensus on a matter as important as this.

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, stated that it is good news that Lars had explained that the timeframe still works. It was a surprise as to why registrars are deferring it, but Jen has suggested that registries feel that there is more work to be done on F of option 4 to see if that could move things forward.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, Council should work on this list and get something ready before the meeting in November. Or if possible, if there is agreement in November and do electronic vote if it is possible.

Item 4: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Celebrating GNSO Accomplishments between ICANN Meetings

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Tomslin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Interim Co-Chair)

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Next Steps

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, celebrating some achievements from ICANN83 and ICANN84 as shared in the [slides](#).

Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Council PPSAI Small Team Responses to Threshold Questions (30 minutes) | scheduled start time 13:50 UTC

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Paul McGrady, Council PPSAI Small Team Lead)

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, shared the following [slides](#). He gave some background IRT sent questions and the Small Team drafted answers throughout 6 meetings and had diligent work to agree on compromise language. Today we will go through the draft answers to the IRT by acclamation and not by vote. He brought the Council through each threshold question and answers in the [slides](#).

Susan Payne, IPC, noted that the responses to TQ A were extraordinarily sensible and appreciates the work of the Small Team on this.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, continued on the models for accreditation in the [slides](#).

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, appreciates the challenge of the length of this process and it has a lot for registrars. When it comes to model 4 she notes she did not push hard enough in the discussion. The phrase “no accreditation” is also referred to as “accreditation by association.” She suggested the beauty of this model would be that a lot of what is called for in the policy is already being implemented in contracts. This would be a real fast track option and something that could be in the existing contracts

would not bind the affiliated P/P providers. Accreditation contracts accredits registrars and they are ultimately held accountable if they would let their affiliated providers do something that would get accreditation pulled. She would like to see this still be considered of what Model 4 really is, it is incorrect to say it is no accreditation as it is “accreditation by association” and she would like to allow the IRT to consider this model. She agreed that Model 1 is not fit for purpose, she would like to add 4 back into the mix.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, noted that he initially used “accreditation by association” and proposed the following compromised language. Paul suggested: “While the small team noted Model 4 calls for no accreditation program and is inconsistent with the policy and is not fit for purpose, registrars disagreed with this conclusion and believe it is accreditation by association.” He inquired if that would be agreeable for Ashley.

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, replied that she thinks it mostly is. She took issue most with the phrase that it is not fit for purpose. If the only way to address the issue is by saying that some agree and some do not, she would hate to say that it is not fit for purpose.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, asked if the IRT had considered the accreditation of the registrars themselves when some of the Small Team members determined that it would be inconsistent with the policy if they tied this to the accreditation of the registrar.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, responded that model 4 was not very well thought through, as it came about at the last minute from one or two people. As you see the threshold questions do not even mention model 4. The reason why he proposed the language that he did, allows model 4 to remain on life support in the letter back from Council. But overall the clear signal that models 2 and 3 are fit for purpose and implementable.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, replied, if Council is discussing being efficient and pragmatic, then it could use the RAA as a vehicle to get this done via model 4 it would be ideal. This language sounds too negative and could perhaps qualify that during Council deliberations they could not determine whether model 4 had been sufficiently discussed building upon existing accreditation.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, responded that the Small Team discussed this exhaustively and thought they had reached consensus and today we have a different point of view. So just because it is being discussed today he cannot say that the other members of Small Team suddenly have a different view.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, noted in the chat, “While the small team noted Model 4 calls for no accreditation program and is inconsistent with the policy and is not fit for purpose, registrars disagreed with this conclusion.”

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, agreed with Ashley’s suggestion and noted that they would want model 4 to be reconsidered and the only reason they did not was because she had the impression that it was inconsistent policy. However, what Ashley is describing is an interesting idea and NCSG would like to support it.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, appreciated the Small Team work on this and had a question about next steps, specifically on the frameworks. Any ICANN accredited program will be incurring significant costs and may create entry barriers to entry. It was probably discussed in the Small Team, but if it could be reflected in

the language that would be appreciated, especially when one considers it closely to identify the key challenges posed by registrations through such services.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, this issue of cost is exactly why the Small Team stated that Model 1 is compliant but not favored because it is too heavyweight and would create barriers to entry or make ICANN spend a bunch of money on something it does not need to build. That is why models 2 and 3 are favored. Next steps is to have the chair write a letter to the IRT stating these are the views of the Council.

Susan Payne, IPC, she liked the slight amendment, it is an accurate statement in terms of Small Team position, most thought it was fit for purpose and some do not agree and reflects the Small Team. That seems a mild amendment that seems to reflect the views of the Small Team and that is the point here, then Council can proceed as it sees fit.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, agreed, now that it is Registrars and NCSG agreeing with the concerns and Thomas with the ISPs there is enough around the table to say changing it to most believe this and some do not it is not precluded. A backup option would be to state we do not believe that Model 4 was well enough developed for Council to take a position but that would likely slow things down.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, likes the suggestion of most but not all as a good path forward. He appreciates the concerns, but that resolves this issue with everyone's desires reflected.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, agreed with Damon as it is clear that option 4 was part of the discussions and deliberations there is some kind of belief that no accreditation is required is some kind of risk. But it is a priority to not distort the work of the Small Team. Further consideration should be given to the IRT.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, absent any major objections of the language of most but not all is the language that was landed on for TQ B and Ashley agreed in the chat.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, continued on TQ C and TQ K in the [slides](#).

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, recorded her concern that starting implementation and there could be a new policy might be contradictory.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, reminded everyone that if there is new policy that is contradictory then the new policy governs. That happens with any policy within ICANN. If we have to wait until the community comes to a conclusion then there will never be another new policy on this issues before implementation.

Action Items:

- Staff to draft the updated language for TQ B Model 4 based on consensus reached in the Council meeting and circulate it to the Small Team for review.
- Staff to update the final report language for TQ K where there is some extra text.
- Prepare Small Team finalized responses for the Chair to forward to the PPSAI IRT and ICANN org.

Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Prioritization of Upcoming Work

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Tomlin Samme-Nlar, GNSO Interim Co-Chair)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, gave an overview as this has been discussed throughout the year to see how work needs to be prioritized. He shared the [updated prioritization document](#) so that staff added a projected level of effort and dependencies between them that could impact both staff and volunteers. Councilors were asked for further feedback and none was received, so today the discussion is open to discuss prioritization.

Susan Payne, IPC, expressed some skepticism about being at or near capacity. There has been discussion about 2-3 large scale PDPs is all that we can manage, but things like SubPro were enormous. DNS Abuse PDPs are pretty narrow issues, not boiling the whole ocean in one go. She is not suggesting that there is not challenging work to be done. But the work on DNS Abuse may not be a large-scale PDP, but Latin Diacritics is ahead of this timeline. New gTLD program what that might be from Council perspective, some issue and work may arise, but the implementation work at that point is done. Council should not start everything in a prioritization queue, but we should not be under ambitious about what Council can do.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, noted that focusing on how large-scale the DNS abuse PDP will be dependent on if they are sequential or parallel will help inform the approach for any other efforts.

Vivek Goyal, BC, agreed with Susan that there is a limit of resources if you believe there is a limit of resources and the same set of volunteers want to do everything. But he believed that there is capacity in the community to volunteer for things they are concerned about. He noted that Kurtis mentioned that ICANN org is committed to provide whatever resources are needed to move fast and Council can request those. He had repeatedly heard that these are the two constraints and he believes that in terms of DNS Abuse, the Council should take on more work and do things that have been hanging around for some time.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, was unsure if he was at capacity or not. Councilors will prioritize and make time for what is important to constituencies. The chart and the timeframes is a good start. There is a fantastic staff and Council and a lot can be done next year on this track.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, during the capacity session the GAC asked if Council could look at their timelines and do things faster. It would be valuable to put an estimation of staff hours needed for all those. There is a finite number of staff hours and there is a lot of work that they actually perform. So knowing the hours anticipated would be a start. Then if needed, we can ask for additional resources.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, agreed with Seb about putting in some hours to see where we are looking at with resourcing and this is a large community of volunteers. Acknowledging that Kurtis has allocated resources as needed for the communities to make the policies they need to make, especially for DNS Abuse. She then discussed many of the high priority items in the [prioritization document](#). There is PSR and expiration policies that still needs updating after the update in Council working session 1. She noted that for the registries for RPMs Phase 2 has been lingering and some other SGs/Cs need to take into account things that have been lingering for many years. She stressed that we have to close the loop on that, but also know the issue of the day. She cautioned Council to think about this in a bigger picture.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, stated NCSG is a civil society not for profit and there are members where civil society has resources being diminished globally especially for human rights work. NCSG must use its

experts in most of these undersourced. It is better for the process not to rush things so that staff and the Board do not feel like they have to come up with a policy. NCSG would like a lightweight PDP.

Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG, noted that NCSG is truly at capacity and would like many of those initiatives to not move forward without civil society input. Despite the DNS Abuse PDP or PDPs the perception that they may have a limited scope, there is currently not a charter and they could get big in the community, so she requested that Council consider the limits of the NCSG community.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, added about staff resourcing. He stated that when a PDP moves quickly and aggressively, it can be all encompassing. Preparing for a face-to-face takes a lot of time and resources into facilitating good discussions. Furthermore, if you are holding weekly meetings that is different than compressing many topics into a very short period of time. Every effort for staff hours is dependent on the makeup of the PDP and is dependent on the context.

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, suggested thinking about Board Readiness. She emphasized that we need the right people doing the work and not just the people that have the bandwidth. When SGs/Cs are saying they have capacity issues, you really should take that into consideration. Even though it may look like the work can be done, it has to be the right people doing it. Council has to ensure the quality of work that comes out isn't just fast, but needs to be right. Bearing in mind the board readiness recommendations, it is essential to ensure to pay attention to the constraints of constituencies to get the right people doing the job properly and not just quickly.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, asked if there is anything the Council can do to help that.

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, responded that considering the Board readiness recommendations the success of the PDPs is all interconnected. It is taking into account if the Board will accept or reject the recommendations, who is in the groups, it is all interconnected. So she suggested that Council take on the recommendations of the Board readiness Small Team and integrate the problems different constituency groups are facing.

Vivek Goyal, BC, suggested that staff rank priorities in an excel document and allow the SG/Cs to rank them then add it up to find the priorities.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, noted that input from the community is based on this particular topic of prioritization. The work ahead of us is not just centered on Council but the community has experts on different areas that are willing to weigh in. For resources, experts who can get aspects of this work going, double or triple track around DNS abuse, we have enough resources to not depend on a certain set of experts. How we eventually started to have certain constraints is when we push to get the work going. He only sees one topic that he would not like to focus on and that would be progressive rounds and that can be addressed after the next round goes through. He reminded the Council that policy development is the main goal of the Council and the community expects work to get done. Let us draw on the community expertise to get things done if we get stuck.

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, feedback will be integrated into the documents on prioritization.

Hong-Fu Meng, RrSG, in discussing Small Team we want a focused scope so the topics can be processed smoothly and timely if we can have narrowly scoped PDP in line with what was intended in the report.

Not only does the expert need to be specialized, but the recommendations need to be implementable and operable at the end executable.

Action Items:

- Leadership and Staff to continue working on the prioritization documents to integrate feedback from Councilors and determine next steps at the SPS in January

Item 7: Open Mic

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

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, wanted an understanding of the UDRP process to add it to the agenda to get an external study on it. At the moment the studies are from different stakeholder groups and they would like an independent study.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, for the UDRP there are studies that have been done for work to start and he believes that one has to analyze what is on the ground, but his take is that there is good information to start to work with. This is also Phase 2 so there is some expectation to build on previous work for UDRP.

Edmon Chung, asked about the single character Han TLD has been back and forth between Council and IRT. Queried whether further work will be happening on that.

Nat Cohen, commented that UDRP registrants have been waiting for 25 years for the UDRP. Policies for registrant rights that are affected and determined by the UDRP and there has been no policy development and it is long overdue for registrants to have and further delays will be of no benefit for civil society

Jothan Frakes, question about loosely following EDDP and ERRP it seems like something happened and now there is some sorry review for priority domains on what will happen in the process so the community can see what is finalized in these products.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, summarized that ICANN staff presented the policy status report and it went out for public comment. Expiration policies, prioritization, if there are groups that think it should be prioritized can bring that forward. The short answer is it is up for Council to prioritize work on expiration policies, but the PSR was not making the case that it was a neutral report.

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, responded to an additional aspect for that on the need to create a small group to merge the policies that she takes issue with and would like to continue the conversation.

Luc Seuffer, PPSAI IRT registrar informs that many registrars on the group for the Privacy/Proxy service do not share the confidence that the policy is not fit to be implemented as is from the many changes as the operational and business perspective.

John McCabe, PPSAI IRT you have heard the various things over the years and what has been left undone. Ask that GNSO keep in mind that there is in the report there are some proxy providers called. It is important that in what comes out it is easy to tell from the RDAP whether it is a proxy or privacy

registration, we would like to work that in as it is important and they are totally different and there is no way to tell them apart.

Zac Muscovitch, UDRP law practice for 25 years. Priorities and paths of least resistance and WIPO should be taken into account for 16 practitioners over 25 years. There needs to be procedural improvements made. Consulted with 28 experts across the community and came together with a list of 15 recommendations that all received consensus amongst all parties to find solutions.

Item 8: Any Other Business (10 minutes) | scheduled start time 15:05 UTC

8.1 - Update to Council on Latin Diacritics PDP Timeline (Prudence Malinki, GNSO Council Liaison to LD PDP WG)

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, updated Council on the timeline of the Latin Diacritics for PDP excellence. 2-3 months ahead of schedule and this is a model for effective PDPs, with fantastic char and group that want to get the work done. This is about having the right people in a PDP for an efficient PDP. The Initial Report should be coming out in December 2025. Encouraged everyone to engage in the public comment period. She also raised that final recommendations will be September 2026. Although the team is making great progress. The timing that the outcomes will not be included in the next round. This will not stop the progress of this. It was a remote chance, that is disappointing to a number of different groups. There is no possibility to have that included and she highlighted that there may be efforts outside of the PDP that may be working toward this.

Susan Payne, IPC, added the timeline never added up and that was in the charter. It was always predicted and obvious from the outset.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, understood that the GAC will come back to this for a request to authorize applications that would authorize that criteria and it will be coming.

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, thanked Seb for the heads up and noted that Council will respond in due course if that happens.

8.2 - Proposed Updates to ICANN Bylaws and Customer Standing Committee (CSC) Charter

Action Items:

- Staff to send an email concerning Item 8.2 to Council list.

8.3 - Farewell to Outgoing Councilors

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Interim Co-Chair, thanked all outgoing Councilors for their work and dedication.

Manju Chen, NCSG, "BYE".

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, said a thank you to Paul especially as he led multiple Small Teams and spent so much time and we would not be here at this stage without his effort. Incoming NCPH has big shoes to fill.

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, thanked everyone for the opportunity to work together and gave one tip for proactive incoming replacements. She said that policy is a patience skill that can take multiple rounds, and to choose your timezone wisely.

Meeting Adjourned 15:15 IST/UTC.