ICANN87 Bali | AGM – GNSO Council Meeting (Part 1)
Wednesday, October 21, 2026 – 13:15 to 15:15 WITA

TERRI AGNEW	The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on the 21st of October 2026, part 1. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Nacho Amadoz?
NACHO AMADOZ	Present, Terri. Thank you.
TERRI AGNEW	Welcome. Jennifer Chung?
JENNIFER CHUNG	Present. Thank you, Terri.
TERRI AGNEW	Most welcome. Hong-Fu Meng?
HONG-FU MENG	Present. Thank you, Terri.

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.

TERRI AGNEW	Most welcome. Samantha Demetriou?
SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU	Present. Thanks, Terri.
TERRI AGNEW	Most welcome. Ashley Heineman? I don't see Ashley in the room. Let me quickly check on Zoom. I don't see Ashley in Zoom. We'll circle back. Volker Greimann?
VOLKER GREIMANN	Wouldn't miss it for the world.
TERRI AGNEW	Gaurav Vedi? Gaurav?
GAURAV VEDI	Present.
TERRI AGNEW	I know I saw you in here. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?
LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS	I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW You're welcome. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT Present.

TERRI AGNEW Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Welcome. Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW Welcome. Julf Helsingus?

JULF HELSINGUS Here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Farzaneh Badiei? Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADIEI Present.

TERRI AGNEW Joining us remote will be Peter Akinremi. Peter?

PETER AKINREMI I am remotely present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Welcome. And in case of connectivity issues for Peter, the proxy will go to Tapani Tarvainen. Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje? Those that are remote, you may not have heard that, but he said present as he walked in the room, so he is here. Bruna Martins dos Santos?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS Present, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW Christian Dawson? Does anyone see Christian? Let me check the Zoom really quick. Christian is not in the room or in Zoom. All right, one moment. Anne Aikman Scalese?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE Present.

TERRI AGNEW Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS Present.

TERRI AGNEW Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW You're welcome. You have your policy team supporting the GNSO in the room. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as the call is being recorded? All are welcome to use the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select everyone. Councilors, if you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom.

Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak, and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record, and speak at a reasonable pace. There will be an open mic at the end of this session where attendees' microphones will be activated.

Those in the meeting room will be invited to queue at the stand-alone mic and we are going to move it to the middle, just between here, shortly, about that time, so you'll see it moved. Those

participating remotely will be able to raise their hand in Zoom and unmute their mics when called upon.

As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest. And really quick for roll call, I do believe we were missing Ashley Heineman, but in the room, so if you want to acknowledge...

ASHLEY HEINEMAN I am here, and I apologize. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW No problem. Oh, and Christian Dawson made it! There you go.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Yes, I did. I'm also here, present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Most welcome. With this, I'll turn it over to our GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you very much, Terri. Okay, hi, everyone. Welcome to our Council meeting, at least part one of our Council meeting on the 21st of October 2026, which is taking place during the ICANN87 meeting in Bali. First up, I guess we should just see if anyone has

any updates to their Statements of Interest. Not necessarily expecting any, but perfect.

Then I'll also note that the minutes from our 10th of September meeting, so that's our last meeting, have been posted in the usual manner. So, they were posted on the 24th of September, just noting that.

Does anyone have any amendments to the agenda? I do have one item, but I'll just pause and see if anyone has anything else. Okay. All right, well, then I think that Vivek asked for an opportunity to speak, so I'm going to just let Vivek take the mic.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah, thank you, Susan. Hi, everyone. This is regarding the candidacy for chair. I withdraw my candidacy to be the GNSO Chair and I'll share some reasoning for this. I want to thank everybody in NCPH for their support, their encouragement, and campaigning on my behalf to help me become chair. But we had a long discussion with leadership today and one of the possible outcomes of this chair contest could be that we might not have a chair at the end of this session and the whole process might be delayed for 30 days or longer.

As you know, I'm all for efficiency. I hate wastage. And so in discussion with leadership, it was decided that I will withdraw my candidacy and I request everybody who was either on the fence or were planning to vote for me to please vote for Sam so that we have

a definitive leadership and we can move forward quickly on all aspects. So thank you, everybody, for your support, especially on campaigning on behalf of me, but I think this is the best way forward. So, thank you, everybody.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Vivek. That's very appreciated and very gracious of you. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands, so I think we are on to our next agenda item, which is our regular item two, the review of the projects and actions list, and just a general sort of focus on what's on our slate.

We don't go through the action decision radar and the action list in detail at our meetings, but councilors are all expected to have familiarized themselves in readiness and so on. So, I will note that we do have some agended updates coming from the liaisons for PPSAI IRT, from the Curative Rights IRT, and from the SPIRIT.

So, leaving aside those, are there any other liaisons to working groups or IRTs that have additional milestones or things that they want to give an update on?

Okay, I'm not seeing anyone, so I think with that, we will move on then to the next agenda item and I'm going to turn the floor over to Peter, who's going to take us through the consent agenda.

TERRI AGNEW

Peter?

SUSAN PAYNE Is Peter online?

TERRI AGNEW He is. Make sure -- Oh, we did lose Peter. Let me double-check if he rejoined. We did lose Peter at this time. Peter has dropped. Do you want to go ahead, Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG So, this is Jen, the other vice chair, doing this because I think Peter will be rejoining us very shortly. There's a connection problem. So, this is the consent agenda. Thank you, Susan. For this month's consent agenda, we have the reappointment of the GNSO Council liaison to the GAC.

We previously discussed whether to reconfirm Sebastien Ducos for a second term as council liaison to the GAC during the 13th of August Council meeting and also during the 10th of September Council meeting. On the 30th of September, Sebastien submitted the GNSO liaison to the GAC report to the Council, noting his activities and accomplishments over the last two years, as well as sharing his plans for the next two if reappointed.

I hope all councilors have had a chance to review his report. Today, the GNSO Council is being asked to reconfirm Sebastien Ducos for a second two-year term to serve as GNSO liaison to the GAC. I will now ask Terri to assist us with the vote.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. And before we begin the vote, I just want to check for Peter one more time. And it does not look like he has been back, so good thing we received a proxy and so that we'll have no problems with this. Here we go. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye. Hearing none, would those all in favor of this motion please say aye?

VOLKER GREIMANN Aye.

GREG SHATAN Aye.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. Tapani Tarvainen for Peter Akinremi, please say aye.

TAPANI TARVAINEN Aye.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. With no abstention nor objection, the motion passes. Back to you.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thank you very much, Terri. And now I will pass the floor back to Susan to introduce agenda item four.

SUSAN PAYNE Okay, thanks, everyone. So, our agenda item four, really excited about this one. This is the vote to approve the recommendations and the report from the Latin Diacritics PDP process. The final report, well, the PDP was initiated in November 2024 and the final report was delivered to us on the 31st of August 2026.

And so that's less than two years and given that it was quite a complex topic, I think that's really tremendous and was ahead of schedule. So, we've had good briefings from Michael Bauland, the chair, both during our last meeting and also during the preparatory webinar that we had before we came into ICANN87.

So, I'll turn over now to Christian Dawson, who's our liaison to that PDP and take it away, Christian.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Thank you, and I'm very excited to be able to walk people through things and see if there are any questions before we move to our resolved clauses. I'm also very excited to be able to get a chance to move this forward today. We are at a point right now where we have in front of us 57 final outputs: 45 policy recommendations and 12 implementation guidances contained in the Latin Diacritics PDP Final Report that as you said was introduced to the Council in the September Council meeting.

There, we had a chance to hear from Michael, the chair of the working group. He gave us a high-level overview and we've also had an opportunity to ask him questions when we had the Council prep webinar.

So, there have been a couple opportunities that we've already had to go through this and make sure that everybody has what they need. And so I do want to create another space for final questions before I move to the resolution clauses, but I also want to take a moment to thank a lot of people that have gotten us to where we are right now.

Because I think that this is the opportunity to say we've done something pretty remarkable in a short amount of time. This is exactly what it is we as a Council need to look to do to make sure that we're advancing the role of ICANN through this Council process.

And so I just want to acknowledge some of the people that have helped us achieve what it is we're doing here today. First of all, obviously, our chair, Michael Bauland, who's done an incredible job managing this process and for answering our questions in the past two cycles that we've had moving things forward. Also, our vice chair, Mark Datysgeld, for his leadership through the work.

Also want to thank Saewon Lee, John Emery, and Steve Chan for their policy support; Terri Agnew, Devan Reed, and Julie Bisland for keeping our meetings and the progress running smoothly; Ariel Liang, Isabella Colas-Edginton, Sarmad Hussain, and Pitinan

Kooarmornpatana as ICANN org liaisons for their timely input on future implementation-related and technical issues. There's just been this entirely incredible amount of behind-the-scenes technical guidance to get us to where we are, and I really appreciate it.

And I want to take the opportunity to extend a huge thanks to Amitpal Singla, I'm sorry, our current board liaison, who really helped us out right until the end to try to sort of massage some things that we needed to deal with during the public comment process, been very helpful; Alan Barrett, our former board liaison, who supported the process from the beginning to help us reach a desirable outcome; and also the person who had this role before me on Council, Prudence Malinki, who was the one who helped bring this project forward and through the scoping process at the beginning, carried it, and I've just sort of stepped in at the end to try and fill a hole and hope that I could sort of do her right through this process.

So, now we're at a point where before I move into talking about the resolved clauses and getting everybody to support this incredible work, I want to pause to see if there are any final questions or concerns that need to be raised. Jen has one. Please, Jen, go in the queue.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thank you very much, Christian. Well, first of all, it's a commendation for the incredible effort for LDPDP. It's incredibly

difficult to get anybody interested in anything to do with IDNs or diacritics. It requires a set of skills and understanding, so I commend all of you.

The one small question I had, I think is one that Tapani brought up and I'm wondering when that other issue may be brought to Council because that was mentioned in some way, shape, or form. Of course, it's nothing to do with LDPDP, but if that can be conveyed in some shape or form to Council also quickly, that would be really good. Because, again, driving out IDNs, LD -- is a long time.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

Sure. I spoke with Tapani after our last meeting. And there is an ongoing issue that you wanted to raise as a point of future consideration and even talked about the possibility of trying to do it through some sort of a micro-PDP or some process that would allow you to address something moving forward. We're going to continue to have that conversation and try to see if that can be surfaced and even maybe commune with staff about what the best way to not just get that on paper, but put it forward in a way that sort of fits the work mode of the Council.

So, I can work with you to make sure that that's advanced cleanly and effectively. I don't think it should hold us up from our work here today. So, seeing nothing else in queue, I'd like to move to the resolved clauses so that I can put these forward for us to queue up a vote. So it is resolved that the GNSO Council approves all 57 final outputs and recommends that the ICANN Board adopts the 45

policy recommendations contained within the Latin Diacritics PDP working group's final report.

Should the final recommendations be adopted by the ICANN Board, the GNSO Council requests that ICANN org convene an Implementation Review Team, an IRT, to assist ICANN org in developing the implementation details for the Latin Diacritics PDP final recommendations to ensure that the resultant implementation conforms to the intent of the approved recommendations.

The GNSO Council recommends that the IRT should operate in accordance with the IRT principles and guidance approved by the GNSO Council in June 2015. The GNSO Council thanks the leadership, members, and liaisons of the Latin Diacritics PDP working group for their commitment and hard work in completing the final report. These are the actual words that we are voting on. So, do I call the vote or do you call the vote?

TERRI AGNEW I can help with that. Are we ready? This will be a roll call vote, so here we go. Gaurav Vedi?

GAURAV VEDI Sorry, what am I supposed to say?

TERRI AGNEW Yes or no.

GAURAV VEDI Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Or abstain or...

GAURAV VEDI Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Okay. Thank you. Benjamin Akinmoyeje? Volker Greimann?

VOLKER GREIMANN Yep.

TERRI AGNEW Bruna Martins dos Santos?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS Also yes.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. Peter Akinremi, I do believe he's back online. Peter, are you able to unmute? I'll circle back. Hong-Fu Meng, sorry, that's who I meant.

HONG-FU MENG Yes. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. Sorry, everyone. Farzaneh Badiei?

FARZANEH BADIEI Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. Nacho Amadoz?

NACHO AMADOZ In favor.

TERRI AGNEW Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Julf Helsingus?

JULF HELSINGUS Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Ashley Heineman?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Osvaldo Novoa?

OSVALDO NOVOA Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Samantha Demetriou?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN Yes, indeed.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. Peter, are you back with us yet? Are you able to hear us and unmute? All right, how about we go with -- And Tapani Tarvainen, why don't you take the proxy for Peter Akinremi?

TAPANI TARVAINEN Yes, for Peter as well.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR Yes.

TERRI AGNEW Thank you. With the Contracted Party House vote at 100% and the Non-Contracted Party House at 100%, the motion passes. Back to you.

SUSAN PAYNE Back to me, I guess. I can't tell you how pleased I am about that. It feels really nice to be going out on a high. All right. Our next agenda item, agenda item 5, is a celebration of accomplishments since ICANN86. Oh, we have slides. That's even better. And this is something that we talked about at one of our strategic planning sessions probably two or three years ago.

And we talked about the fact that maybe we didn't do enough of a good job at highlighting our work and the work of the GNSO to kind of a wider audience, and in particular, that we didn't celebrate milestones and highlight milestones well enough during the meetings.

So, we've started a process of doing this at every AGM to just flag what's been achieved. And so first off, Latin Diacritics. If we hadn't had that vote, we would have been sort of referring to the fact that group has wrapped up its work and submitted its final report to Council.

And as we've just seen, we've actually in Council just adopted that. So, that's a super thing to wrap up, and those recommendations then will get passed on to the Board and ultimately hopefully, assuming adopted, will get passed on for implementation. It's a really important achievement. It reflects a huge amount of effort and commitment from the working group and leadership, from the Board liaisons, from the staff team as well, as Christian's been highlighting.

So, really just want to congratulate the leadership team, the members of the working group for all of their work, and huge thanks to our Board liaisons and org liaisons, in fact, and to the org staff team. So, that's one really super thing to be able to celebrate.

The second one is DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1. Whilst this isn't quite at the same point in its lifecycle, it did hit a really important milestone in August where the initial report was issued for public

comment. And that public comment, that which was well ahead of schedule as well in the time plan for that working group. That public comment has closed. The working group has been reviewing the public comment input during this meeting, and they're working towards delivering their final report.

We know according to the work plan the final report should be delivered to us not later than May 2027. I'm fairly confident that that final report actually is significantly sooner than that coming to Council for approval. So again, congratulations and thanks to the working group for their tremendous efforts and moving that project forward really in a very prompt manner.

So, really just generally, both of those are a real substantial progress on important policy issues and demonstrated the work that's being carried out within the community and by the GNSO, the work of people who put their hands up to be leadership and take that forward, liaisons from Council who participate actively in that effort, and as we've said, the kind of support that we get from Board, from org, and from the support staff.

So, it's just again this opportunity to kind of flag that this work is happening, that important milestones are reached, and that we really appreciate everyone's strong spirit of sort of volunteerism and getting the work done. So, yeah, I think that's probably all I need to say on this, but I will just pause in case anyone else has any comments. There's some nice comments going in the chat certainly, and yeah, just I think it's important for us to do this to

make sure that we do speak about our successes when we have them.

All right, then I think we can move on to agenda item 6. And that, I believe, is an update on the IGO-INGO Curative Rights Implementation Review Team, or IRT. Damon will be giving us an update in a moment. We last received an update from Damon, I think in June at our meeting in Seville.

Since then, obviously, the work's been continuing within the IRT and they've passed some important milestones. They had a public comment over the summer with some proposed updates to the URS or Uniform Rapid Suspension, and the Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Policy or UDRP, to bring into effect these IGO-INGO curative rights provisions.

That also is a comment that closed in August. So, I think this is just an opportunity now to turn to Damon and just get a brief update on what's currently going on in that IRT. So, thanks, Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT Sure. Thank you very much, Susan. The public comment, the deadline was August, and there were quite a bit of comments submitted. I think the tally on the comments was about 17 total comments came in that represented around 150 individuals' and companies' viewpoints on this issue.

So, there's quite a lot that happened. They last met in October. As far as the IRT goes, we have another meeting which is today at 4:30

if you're interested in that. And I want to thank Peter Eken from ICANN staff for doing such a great job as the staff liaison to that IRT.

Some of the comments did have some questions about different things that were significant. So, we've got things to work through. As far as the timeline goes, we're really trying to get done by end of Q1 of 2027, because the goal would be to release the IGO acronyms later that year.

So, that's the goal. It is still behind schedule, but overall, this is sort of the revised schedule and this is where we're at. So, I would encourage you, if you have more questions about the IRT, to go ahead and to attend the meeting at 16:30. If anybody has any questions, go ahead and let me know. And thank you very much, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you, Damon. I'm not seeing any hands in the Zoom room at the moment. I suppose I have one question. Just in so far as you can say at the moment, do there seem to be any thorny issues that are likely to be causing problems or do you feel that things are on track?

DAMON ASHCRAFT I don't think things are off track at all, but there were a lot of comments that I think -- I couldn't attend the meeting in October, I was on vacation, but reading through the summary, there were quite a bit of few things that were raised. I think we'll work through

them. I think things will stay on track, but it is going to be some diligence on the part of the IRT to get things done. It wasn't a sleepy public comment or a sleepy October meeting, if that makes sense.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thanks for that, Damon. Okay, just pausing to see if anyone else has any questions for Damon before we move on. And I'm not seeing any, so we will move on to our next agenda item, which is agenda item 7, which is the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues, or PPSAI, policy IRT update. All of these titles are really wordy and quite challenging.

Okay, so the PPSAI policy recommendations have a pretty long history. The ICANN Board approved the working group's final report in August 2016, including 21 policy recommendations. There was an Implementation Review Team convened in 2016 and some work continued until 2019, and then it was paused due to overlapping issues with GDPR and data processing and the work on the temp spec and so on.

But in June 2024, org reconvened the PPSAI IRT, allowing implementation work to resume after that pause. We then had, I think most recently, org has shared a draft of the PPSAI consensus policy with the IRT for its review, and that was on the 6th of August 2026.

So, that was obviously marking quite a big step forward in the implementation work. Now, obviously that the IRT, as I understand

it, is reviewing that at the moment. But this is a good opportunity, again, for us to hear from the Council liaison, who is Ashley Heineman, just on what is currently going on and what we can expect as the implementation continues. So, Ashley, over to you and thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Thank you, Susan. Ashley Heineman, currently the Council liaison to the PPSAI IRT. And yes, as highlighted by Susan, ICANN org has drafted and shared a draft consensus policy considered to be version one. That happened in August, as noted, and there was a bit of a pause in the meeting of the IRT so that they could read it, digest it, develop some thoughts and comments and reactions. And they had their first meeting post the draft policy on October 1st.

And since then, we just had a meeting prior to this where the group got together and had a conversation about their reactions and views. And for awareness of Council, there does appear to be, while this meeting just before this was very constructive, there does continue to be a bit of a divide within the IRT with respect to the draft policy.

And I think there's some constructive next steps with respect to how to proceed. There is going to be a version two of the draft consensus policy that is going to be developed post ICANN87. But when it comes to the divide, it's really essentially with the consensus policy on the implications, as well as pertaining to some

of the Council guidance that we provided to the IRT. And this is largely with respect to whether or not it was intended by Council to limit this effort to affiliated privacy proxy providers.

There are some different interpretations of the language in our response back to the IRT. Right now, they are continuing to proceed based on the guidance that was provided them, even though there are differences of interpretation, and still working towards resolution and reaction to what will be version two of the policy.

I will pause there and just to end that again that we had a very good meeting right prior to this, and looking forward to keeping you updated. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you, Ashley. There's a lot of hands in the Zoom room when I go back to it. Perfect. Gaurav, first, please?

GAURAV VEDI Hi, this is Gaurav, GNSO councilor and non-commercial appointee to Contracted Parties House. So, the initial PPSAI report was published and approved in 2016 and 10 years later consensus policy initial draft was prepared. And reading through both the policies and draft, it seems there is a gradual shift from a terminology, ICANN accreditation versus authorized service provider, which totally makes sense and I understand the rationale.

However, the initial policy also includes specific rights or preserves the rights for the registrants or the consumers in case ICANN accredited registrar or the service provider goes out of business just to avoid unintended disclosure of the information. Has IRT considered similar provisions to be included or preserved in the similar report just to make sure that in case if authorized service provider goes out of business, the unintended disclosures should be avoided?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Thank you, Gaurav. I'll be completely honest with you, we have not gotten to really a full, substantive discussion on that particular subject. Right now, we're really focused on other aspects that are kind of, I would say, a hurdle before we get to those level of conversations. I'm happy to be corrected if I'm wrong, but noted, and will be sure to make sure that is taken back to the group for consideration. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE Oh, sorry. Is it a quick follow-up, Gaurav?

GAURAV VEDI Yes, it's a different question around similar context. Section 11.6 of the consensus policy provides final granular details around standard requests versus urgent requests. And as we know, there's a separate or parallel track that everybody is working on, SSAD supplemental recommendations. And I understand that some

discussions have already been held regarding the PPSAI. Has IRT considered those similar recommendations from SSAD, or what is the plan and eventually will those recommendations be incorporated with the consensus policy? Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Gaurav. So, again, there's quite a discussion on a number of other issues. There is in the draft policy a section on a disclosure framework, so that is in there. We are not at a point yet of having substantive conversations, particularly vis-a-vis SSAD, but well aware a number of the people on the IRT are also involved in the SSAD. We're just not yet at that level of conversation, but it is in the draft policy.

GAURAV VEDI: Thanks, Ashley.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Okay, Farzi, I don't know where you are, but...

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to put it on the record that privacy and proxy services are used by vulnerable communities, underserved regions, as well as people who want to express their opinions freely on the internet or provide services that are life-saving but illegal in some part of the world.

So, this is a very important piece of technology that unfortunately we had to come up with these creative ideas because the crowd didn't want to give privacy and data protection to domain name registrants in the first place. And I'm really glad that it is restricted to just accredited. Ashley, this is what I got. So, it's only about the accredited? No? So, it is about...

ASHLEY HEINEMAN I think the crux of the conversation that's happening right now in the IRT is whether or not who this is applicable to or who this accreditation process would be applicable to. And the group has not reached agreement on that.

There are different perspectives depending on where you stand in the community, or I guess what perspective you have. But there is some desire to have unaffiliated providers, whether they're known or not, to be included. And there's some concern amongst the registrars, in particular, who believe that if you're not already an affiliated service provider, that the registrars don't know who they are. So there continues to be dialogue on this and trying to figure out what is operationally feasible and what is not, but that is where the conversation is at the moment.

FARZANEH BADIEI Oh, so we have not solved that part?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN I don't want to get too in the weeds, but as you recall, there was a small team on Council that drafted some guidance. And there is some language in there on this subject, but the way it was drafted, there are different interpretations as to what the guidance actually says on the matter. So they're continuing to work through the conversation as to what parties are actually party to this particular policy.

FARZANEH BADIEI Thank you. I went, "Ah," but so, well, I take back the expression of happiness. Continue your conversation, we'll see where we get.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks for that. Damon, I think you're in the queue next.

DAMON ASHCRAFT Sure. So, it sounds like, Ashley, that we had given some guidance in an effort to help and that guidance caused further confusion, or at least, do you anticipate issues coming back to Council for further guidance in the future on this topic?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Yes, and that's something I failed to mention in my update. It is a possibility. We're not at that stage yet. It has been brought up a couple of times as something that could be pursued, but right now that is not the case.

SUSAN PAYNE

Okay, brilliant. Thank you very much for that update, Ashley, and obviously, I guess the councilors will sort of watch this space and stand ready should there be anything coming back with a request for further guidance. I'm not seeing any other questions now or any other hands, so I think with that, we can then for now move on to the next agenda item, which is item 8, I believe, regarding discussion on accuracy small team educational materials.

Just to kind of remind everyone of the genesis of this agenda item; we had in late 2024 Council initiated an accuracy framing assignment to help inform the next steps on the accuracy of registration data, and that included sending some threshold questions to the SGs and Cs to answer. And with the receipt of the responses from the various groups, we then convened a small team, which was led at the time by Paul McGrady, to review the responses and ultimately that group produced four recommendations for Council to consider.

The recommendations were essentially trying to bring the divergent perspectives together, and Council ultimately did approve those recommendations from the small team. They weren't policy recommendations to be clear, but they were small team, Council small team recommendations on things that would be worth considering and taking forward.

And so this item relates to one of those recommendations, recommendation 2. And that was a recommendation about the

creation of clear and user-friendly educational materials for registrants that could be provided before, during, and after domain name registration to help assist registrants in understanding the importance of providing and maintaining accurate registration data through the lifecycle of their domain registration, how their personal data is processed and protected, and the consequences that there might be from inaccurate data or from not verifying the email or phone number within the timeline required under the current policy.

So, we did have this item on our agenda in March 2026 in our meeting in Mumbai, and we noted that org at the request of the registrars had produced a one-page document to highlight the importance of maintaining accurate registration data. That wasn't a document that was produced in response to this particular small team recommendation. It was something that I think was underway as a separate effort.

So, one of the things that we looked at, and it was circulated to Council to gather feedback on whether that particular document would meet the needs of that recommendation 2 or would serve at least as a jumping-off point to meet the needs of that recommendation on the clear and user-friendly educational materials. Having had that discussion in Mumbai, the Registrar Stakeholder Group volunteered to take the document back and look at some additional materials. And so that is what we are here now thinking about.

Hong-Fu Meng on behalf of the registrars circulated some additional materials on the 18th of August, and really I think looking for feedback. They noted that the focus of the document was on the content particularly, rather than the formatting and presentation. So, don't get too hung up on how pretty or non-pretty it is, but more is the material, the actual information in there something that we think is meeting that recommendation 2 and will be useful to registrants.

We didn't have enough time in September to really cover this off, and so councilors hopefully in preparation for this meeting have reviewed those materials and we can now have a discussion and get any feedback that there is on them.

So, before we start that, I guess I'll just pause and see whether Hong-Fu or any of the other registrar reps want to give us any more sort of color on this before we open this up to the floor. And so I'll just do that first. I do have a couple of people in the queue, but Hong-Fu, did you want to say anything or did any of the other registrars want to say anything before we start?

HONG-FU MENG This is Hong-Fu speaking for the record. Susan, you're perfectly on the spot. So, I've got not much to add. Just want to confirm that this is solely on the content of the paper. And the format will be decided after whether ICANN will handle it or we as Registrar

Stakeholder Group can take it back and format it further. So, this is on the content. Thank you very much.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Hong-Fu. Okay, I do have a couple of hands in the queue. So, Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Susan. And thanks, Hong-Fu, as well for the document. With all due respect to it, the document contains some inaccuracies that I think need to be corrected. For instance, you have a section talking about data minimization that doesn't talk at all about data minimization.

At some point, you refer to it as data, as contact data, as personal information. So, maybe aligning the language would also be relevant. There is no information on data rights. It would be very important to have it there, as well of technical specifications as about how you store the data and the legal basis for collection.

This is a privacy notice mostly, or could be seen as a privacy notice. I'm not sure if from ICANN, from the registries, or anything that, but if we're going towards that, it would be important to correct or even add some language on data rights and some of the points I mentioned. And I can help with that in any case, even if I'm leaving Council.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks for that feedback, Bruna. And it may well be helpful to have some assistance on that, I think. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS To start with, I think we need to say a big thanks to our registrar colleagues for being able to put so much information into two pages. Something that strikes me that I see here is on both pages of the document there are sections around suspend. I think on the second one, it's suspend or cancel. From my read of the material, it interprets that after 15 days if a domain is termed to be inaccurate, it gets suspended. Is this the current reality that we face?

Do we suspend domains after 15 days? We need to be accurate with the information that we provide, especially since it comes out I guess endorsed. And how do we determine that it's inaccurate? From what I read in the document, it appears that if you -- since there's supposed to be an email or a phone number, are we saying that registrars have to contact or have to validate those information within 15 days and after 15 days if they don't get feedback, it gets suspended?

Is that the current practice, or will someone need to trigger a report of inaccuracy to get the domain suspended in 15 days? Just some clarity so we're sure of the kind of information we're pushing out there. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE Volker, I suspect you've put your hand up to answer this, yeah?

VOLKER GREIMANN Yes. Just to come back on that, that is the case. This is not policy. This is part of the 2013 RAA that was negotiated between ICANN and the registrars prior to their previous round of new gTLDs. And it requires registrars to suspend a domain name after 15 days after a registration, transfer in, or major update to the registration data if the email address of the registrant is not verified. That means that there's no proactive response from the registrant to the registrar that confirms that the email address is working.

This can also be the telephone number, so the RAA gives both options, but most registrars have elected to use email verification instead of telephone verification. So, that is the case. That is something that the community wanted and that registrars agreed to at the time.

SUSAN PAYNE Farzi, did you want to go in the queue?

FARZANEH BADIEI So, I'm a bit confused because GAC keeps telling us -- We had a small team on accuracy and we looked at the verification, the time for verification, and updating the data. And one thing that GAC keeps asking is shortening that verification. Does that mean that the window that they want to shorten is from 15 days to an even shorter window? Oh no, we can't do that. Okay, thank you, thank

you! And now contractually -- I'm sorry, I thought it was 30 days. So contractually since 2013, 15-day window has been in place. Okay, good to know.

SUSAN PAYNE: Lawrence, is that a new hand or an old one?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks for the clarification, Volker. And since it is current practice, definitely, I think we're safe to go with this. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. I think it's important again to remember the purpose of this. Obviously, we don't want it to be misleading and we do want it to contain useful information and information that ought to be there. But it is also, let's be realistic, it's meant to be kind of user-friendly and in easy-to-understand language and so on. And also to highlight to registrants that there are certain things that could happen.

There may be a situation where their name isn't necessarily going to be immediately deleted, for example, but it does refer to the possibility that if you're not keeping your data up to date, that's a risk for the future. You may not get a renewal notice, that kind of thing. It's to try to ensure that registrants do understand that there are good reasons to be contactable. Okay, I'm not seeing other -- Oh, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Very quickly. Is it possible to see once this is implemented if it helps in any way or not? We are in the whole measure everything and see whether all the work is done is actually doing the benefit that we are working towards it. So once this policy is implemented and when we register a domain, it says, "Please be accurate." Does that actually improve anything or not? Does it say anything in here or maybe anybody from registrars can say is there a process by which they would measure it? Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

That's a good question. I think cleverer people than me will have to answer that one in terms of how it can be tracked and captured. Couple of people in the queue, probably on that, but Farzi's there first. So, Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADIEI

Just a short comment. Actually, this was one of our suggestions for educational materials for the registrant because we want to give people autonomy and an understanding of why they should keep their data updated and remind them of their rights and responsibility. So this is really good, and I'm glad that registrars followed up and came up with this. Thank you. Of course, it needs improvement, but...

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN Yes, and thinking about this proposed additional information make me think about another part of the 2013 RAA where we were basically required to put a link to a document of ICANN's, the Registrants' Benefits and Responsibilities document. Maybe this can just be integrated into that document. There could be combination, because the more we laden additional information on top of each other in the registration process, the more we basically include friction in the process.

Friction drives away customers. Maybe not necessarily the best idea. So, if we can combine it with something that's already there, that could be an idea to reduce the friction or keep it at the same level that we currently have. So that we basically provide that information, but provide it in a context that already exists.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Volker. Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN I was just checking to see if Vivek needed a response to his question or Farzi's response was sufficient.

VIVEK GOYAL Any thoughts you can share, Ashley, will be helpful. Otherwise, it was just a suggestion that if we can get a data point that will help

us maybe in one year to see did it make an impact, then it'll be good. That's all.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: So, yeah. I agree with Farzi that this wasn't the intention of this particular exercise, but it is a conversation that we're having in the context with the GAC. And we've had a couple of registrars who are doing their own individual studies on this. There isn't something that we've done collectively as registrars, but the evidence that we have from registrars is that there's not a tremendous amount of impact, but there's other sources that say there is some level of impact. So, I guess it's a question of how much impact people want to see. So, anyway, there's no official requirement to do it.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Ashley. I think we've gone on to two different topics, actually. I think what Vivek's asking is if we keep putting new requirements and responsibilities and new pieces of work, is there a way we can measure when this gets deployed, can we measure whether it's had any useful impact or not? I don't know what the answer is. I don't know if you'll have an answer.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: My apologies. No. No, we don't.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. I think that's Ashley's hand is an old one. So, Hong-Fu.

HONG-FU MENG

Just speaking on my own registrar, because we are mainly based on corporate clients, so most of our clients have already entered their registration data. So, for us, they are accurate from that regard, and we actually verify that and confirm that at the time of registration. So this is from our registrar alone, our experience. And to my understanding, this is based on the 2013 RAA, so this is already in implementation, if that answers Vivek's question. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah, I think we're getting confused with the 15-day verification requirement. So, this is the way I see it: the community saw a problem that the registration data is not accurate. So we did some work, we came up with a policy that before, during, and after registration there should be some educational material for a registrant to see that keeping your data accurate is important.

All I ask is it will take resource, money, effort for registrars to implement it. All I'm asking is, is it possible for us to maybe in a year see whether the data accuracy improved because of this or not? That's all. If it's possible, it'll be great. Not possible, that's fine. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE I don't know for sure if that is -- Okay. Lawrence, do you mind if I go to Farzi first or...

FARZANEH BADIEI So, Paul McGrady, when he was on the Council, he chaired this accuracy small team. That team, of course, we could not agree on everything, but there were certain issues that we suggested, there were recommendations. One of them was that it would be good for the registrars to tell the registrant why they should keep their data accurate and provide some educational material so that the registrant can update their data. So, it was not a policy thing at all. It was just us, the Council in this small team coming up with it.

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS Thank you. It's clear to me now that definitely this is ongoing practice. It's not something that is just starting. It's a standard as it is. I'm curious to know if ICANN itself has put in place a system of tracking accounts that have been suspended due to inaccuracy or not. Is there public page that warehouses that? And if there isn't, then definitely I'm sure that in terms of auditing and co, compliance has some way of taking care of the fears that have been raised with some of my colleague here.

Bottom line is if this is already operational, it would be nice to also see what data has been collected, and that might inform how further iterations of this particular documentation or PR material can be redeveloped. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Lawrence. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL Yeah. Thank you, Farzi, for that clarification, that helps. Here's my question: is this just a suggestion that registrars can choose to ignore, or is it mandatory that every registrar needs to do?

SUSAN PAYNE Since it's not a policy recommendation, I don't think it's mandatory, but it certainly was something that was being proposed, and materials being made available so that they could be used, I think.

VIVEK GOYAL So, it can be completely ignored and no problem anywhere?

SUSAN PAYNE Ashley, maybe you're going to help me out of this hole?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN It is mandatory. It is in the RAA.

SUSAN PAYNE The 15-day, yes, but the materials are not -- Is in the RAA?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN I guess I'm getting confused as to what's being asked.

VIVEK GOYAL Ashley, this educational material, is it mandatory for registrars to put this up on the website, or this is just a guidance which can be done on a voluntary basis or completely ignored, since it's not policy? That's the question.

SUSAN PAYNE I've got an answer from staff who are helping me out of this hole. It isn't policy, and therefore, no, they're not mandatory. But it was a recommendation from that small team, and so these materials will be available, and it is to be hoped that registrars will deploy them. Here we're just talking about the materials. The obligations to do the verification within a certain time period is something that is mandatory, absolutely.

Okay, so there is some feedback, which is helpful, of some suggestions for improvements, and I think Bruna has volunteered to help with that. Also, some questions on things tracking in terms of what tracking there currently is on the accuracy and whether there's any way to see whether these materials have an impact. I

think I'm going to take that one away for the leadership team and staff to maybe have a look at.

I know there is some work done on registration data accuracy. Before the small team started its work probably, there were some briefing materials and so on. It may be that that sort of reminder of what currently happens needs a recirculation because it's probably now a year or two since folks have reminded themselves of what that said. So I think that's probably something that could be recirculated. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sebastien, not vis-a-vis the GAC. Just you have to remember that ICANN doesn't have any data. So doing any sort of view from an ICANN, from a neutral point of view on accuracy has always been impossible because they don't have the data. I just looked very quickly to answer to you, Lawrence, the registry monthly reports report the number of deletes, but there's no specific metric on deletes because of an inaccuracy that doesn't exist.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks, Seb.

SUSAN PAYNE: All right, thanks, everyone. I think really good discussion. I'm glad folks have reviewed these materials. A little bit more work to be done, hopefully to get them to a place where people are happy with

the content. So I'm guessing there will be a bit of sort of work behind the scenes and then it will hopefully be coming back to Council maybe at one of the next meeting or meeting after that for maybe a final nod.

Okay, we can move on, I think, to our next agenda item, which is agenda item 9, is our Council discussion on the prioritization exercise next steps. And I'm going to hand over to Jen for this one.

JENNIFER CHUNG I'm seated next to the one who really doesn't want to talk about this. Anyway, this is Jen for the record, and back to the prioritization exercise topic. And thank you for the good discussion that we had during our working session. I think we received quite a lot of feedback from different councilors, especially taking it back from their SGs and Cs, and we talked about a lot of things that could be improved. Just to bring us back to why we started this topic.

Obviously, the improvement part, the discussion of what the mechanism looks like, I think that is a conversation taking all that feedback that probably will be best left for the SPS coming up. I think that's a longer period of time for us to kind of work through, probably good for the new iteration of Council also to work together.

Again, scoring, interpretation, weighting, all of that that can be saved and all the lessons learned to look at and refine for the next iteration. But the beginning of the conversation does give us quite

a lot of good input in looking at what practical next steps actually exists for the upcoming projects. We don't have to talk about solving what the methodology looks like today. I don't think this is a conversation we should have right here. And so we're not looking at a mathematical answer. We're not looking at that at all, but we are going to look at sequencing.

And I think one of the slides that we showed during our working session kind of mapped what we were thinking about in the three buckets of the advance, which is short-term things that are ready to start work on.

Then we had the bucket called prepare, which means there's pieces of work that do require a little bit more thinking, a little bit more research, one more piece of work before Council really gets into it. And then, of course, the last bucket is the monitor items where that could be probably put into a longer term, probably in 2028, looking at that.

So looking at it in a portfolio instead of these five separate pieces in isolation, I think this is really important. We talked to the GAC, we talked to the Board this morning, they were all asking us about what's going on.

And so I think this is still valuable exercise for us to go through. Is this this slide? Next slide. Yep, iterative, managed over time. So this is the proposed, still the three buckets that I just mentioned. I think there were questions, I think from different councilors, from Lawrence and others, about a little bit more information on the

level of effort. And I think there's been a little bit of update also in that column that you see there: timing, level of effort.

Of course, this is just one slide. Council will receive something that's a lot fuller with information as we go through, and this is just to put it there for you to take a look at, to understand what the actual items that are needed for each one.

And then the next slide, we can take a look. I think there's been an update, and I know probably you may not remember, but I certainly do because I was looking at these slides. We've moved up the amber kind of section there, because of course we know in our discussions that the DNS abuse remaining gaps from the final issue report, those things definitely do still need nuanced thinking, nuanced discussion around prioritization there.

The green parts, I can't see it far from the screen up there, so I'm going to look at my computer. So the advanced part is still the transfer dispute resolution policy there. Of course, the green parts still require us as Council, those are the items we do before we actually get into the PDP.

I know also that Farzi and others have also mentioned there's a possibility of when you're looking at the piece of work, that it might be a larger umbrella, noting that the gap is still in the issue report. Holistically, Council still needs to take a look at that if that is something that we do want to look at as well. Again, this is just a straw person. This is something to put on the map for us to look at,

to see what steps look like when mapped to the different quarters of the next year and then, of course, thereafter as well.

And the key question is taking everything together with our policy goals, with what we've been articulating to the Board, the GAC, the community at large, and everybody within the GNSO Council constituent parts, does this sequencing make sense?

And that's really what we want to kind of get to, the practical steps: does this make sense? And of course, saving all of the lessons learned to SPS when we refine and rejig what the mechanism actually looks like. So I think now we can open the floor. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

So, like I said earlier, it doesn't matter what is 1, 2, or 3 as long as the work is concurrent. They can be 1a, 1b, 1c, for all it matters. If you can go back, my question is more on the dates used. This is just for discussion. Why are we not starting something in November this year? Why starting in January? And it shows here, maybe this is just for depiction, but it says request issue report and the way it is put, it takes a month and a half to request issue report.

Shouldn't that just be an email? For example, technically, if we send an email out before the end of this month and it takes 45 days for issue report, then we'll have an issue report by 15 December done. So just wanting to understand is there a reason why we're starting in Jan or if there is, happy to know about it.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thanks, Vivek, for that question. I'm looking over at staff, and Feodora?

FEODORA HAMZA Thank you, all. This is Feodora from ICANN org. So for the Council to request an issue report, the last time when we did this for DNS abuse, a motion was needed, so that would take a little bit of time. And once that is in place, staff would have 45 days to develop that and submit to Council. It doesn't have to take 45 days, but that's the allocated time.

And what you see on screen is more an attempt to show when it would start and not necessarily how long it would take, because that's difficult to say. Sometimes it's indicated in the boxes, but as you said, request issue report would be the motion, and once that motion is in place, then the timeline of the 45 days would start. Just hope that helps.

VIVEK GOYAL Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thank you, Feodora. Thank you, Vivek, for the question. See hand from Tapani.

TAPANI TARVAINEN Thank you. Tapani for the record. Just commenting on this exercise, that kind of spreadsheet is actually could be very useful

for Council to prioritize our work, but just don't take it as single number that determines everything. There are some things that I want to -- and I will not go into detail at this point, but I think by the SPS we can suggest some things how it can be improved.

Notably, I want to highlight that we want some kind of margin of error visible there, like you want in any Gallup poll you want to see that the margin of error is actually bigger than the differences shown, so it makes no sense. And also experiment a little on how different kinds of changes would make it work. So maybe we can really make something really useful out of it, but I think I will follow this up on the mailing list because it will be perhaps easier to explain these mathematical things I want to mess with. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you very much, Tapani. Thank you for offering your expertise. I'm sure staff will be very happy to work with you and we can discuss during SPS. I don't see any other hands. The question here is, obviously with the question also from Vivek about timing as well, does that sequencing still look okay? Do we have a general kind of thumbs up to start the work on the things that we have indicated that it can move forward?

Shall I take silence as we need coffee or silence as yes? Okay. Silence is golden. Oh, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Jen. This is Sam. Yeah, I think first pass, I think this sequencing looks like it makes a lot of sense. It's certainly a starting point to go off of. I would suggest that we in the off time between now and the next Council meeting, we should get a hold of these slides and each consider it for ourselves, and we can start tweaking it in preparation for the SPS.

Also just putting kind of on the radar for those discussions at the SPS that our first task here is to translate the five items, the five work items into a roadmap. And in addition to tweaking and adjusting the methodology, as we've discussed that we need to do, we're also going to need to figure out how to take new items that might get suggested and slot them into an existing roadmap and what the methodology would look like for that too.

So just flagging that that is probably going to be something that we'll need to address during our SPS discussions. But thank you, guys, for all the work on this.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Sam. Good thoughts for upcoming discussion as well there. Okay, I think I don't see any more hands there. I think we are generally agreed to take a look at that. We know what the motion deadlines are for the timing, so I think Vivek or other councilors, if you want to put that together, that could be done. And I think with that, I can hand this off to Susan for item 10.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, Jen. Yes, so item 10 relates to the transfer of IANA intellectual property rights agreements. This is something that on the 2nd of October we received an email from Greg Shatan regarding the proposed transfer of certain IANA intellectual property rights agreements, or IPR-related agreements, from the Internet Engineering Task Force, or the IETF Trust, into the IETF Intellectual Property Management Corp.

That's a mouthful. And just to be clear, Greg was sending that request for our review and input in his capacity as someone who had been a representative in a -- I don't even know what it's -- I think it's a CCG group. He was one of those appointed sometime back on behalf of the naming part of ICANN. And so he was coming in that capacity rather than in the capacity as the At-Large or ALAC rep to the GNSO Council.

So I think that it's helpful to remember that. It's essentially looking for some support from the GNSO as part of the naming community to the transfer of these agreements. So just as background, the IANA stewardship transition took place 10 years ago now.

The IANA IP rights were transferred into the IETF Trust. There's been a kind of restructuring process then going on within the IETF, and the idea was that that trust would be replaced by the IP management company or management corporation for the purposes of this holding of these IP rights at least.

And where you transfer IP rights, then agreements that deal with them do also need to be transferred, and that's done by a sort of

complex kind of contractual system of innovations and agreements. Greg is therefore seeking that approval from the GNSO in his capacity as one of the reps on behalf of the naming community.

So I'm going to ask Greg to provide some more detail on this, and we also have Sam Eisner with us from ICANN Legal as well, should there be questions. Sam is also here to help assist us. Thanks, Greg.

GREG SHATAN Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record, appearing as the GNSO representative to the IANA IPR Community Coordination Group. So just to add on to what Susan so ably summarized: at the time of the IANA stewardship transition, when the IANA IPR was transferred to the trust, this was done in order to create an oversight and accountability mechanism over ICANN that would allow the IANA function to be transferred away from ICANN if that became a necessary accountability measure.

However, ICANN continued and continues to be the IANA function, and in order to do that without owning the IP anymore, there were put into place five total agreements: one was an assignment agreement that assigned the IP from ICANN to the trust; three licenses going back in the other direction for the names, numbers, and protocol parameter uses of the IANA IPR by ICANN; and lastly, a community agreement, which created this CCG, which has nine representatives, three each from names, numbers, and protocol

parameters, numbers being the RIRs and protocol parameters essentially being the IETF, and the names community represented by myself, Maarten Simon from the ccNSO, and Christopher Wilkinson from At-Large.

And we've all managed to survive in those roles for a decade without much anybody noticing until the IETF decided that the trust needed to be replaced by the IPMC for two reasons: one, due to unrelated litigation in generally in the trust area, usually involving the assets of wealthy people. Due to the amount of litigation, it's become prohibitive to insure the IETF Trust and to give insurance to the trustees of the trust, because they're being charged as if they were a bunch of thieves and the like.

So, it's not possible to insure or it's very prohibitively expensive to insure. And also, a trust is actually not a good vehicle for holding trademarks because due to quirks of trademark law and trust law, the individual trustees are deemed to be the owners of the intellectual property and not the trust.

And so for those reasons, the IETF decided to basically restructure the trust into a non-profit corporation, and has been undergoing a process for quite some time in order to do that. We're now very close to the end of that process, and in order to complete or nearly complete the process, what needs to be done now is to transfer the IETF Trust's position in each of those five agreements to the IPMC.

So, it's basically an assignment, although it's being done as a novation, which is just a form of an assignment which assigns both

the rights and the obligations of an agreement, and technically replaces the agreement with an identical agreement between the new parties. And in order to do that, the counterparty, which in most cases is ICANN, needs to consent to that, and these agreements need to take place. The CCG, which I mentioned, has a consent right as creating oversight over this entire structure and process.

And so the IETF Trust and IPMC came to the CCG seeking our collective consent and approval for these transfers. Protocol parameters and numbers have already indicated they will provide their consent, as has the ccNSO representative.

The At-Large representative abstained, not because he has an objection to the novation agreements themselves or the novation of those agreements, but rather because he is concerned with some of the governance aspects really of the CCG, and also concerned about the IETF's ownership of the RFCs through the trust, which actually has nothing to do with the IANA IPR.

So, I respectfully disagree that any of that is germane to the question of consent. I have reviewed and discussed with ICANN Legal the assignment documents and the overall process, and we've given a number of comments over the last two years in order to get this done.

And while there is no formal need for me to seek the approval of the Council, I want to make sure that you are aware of this on behalf of your groups and the names community, and that there's at least no

objection and that there is clarity and transparency about this happening. And so that is why I put this on the agenda.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks very much for that, Greg. Sam, is there anything you want to add now, or -- There were some questions in the chat, particularly about how much IP is there even here, which maybe Wendy has already answered by saying it's the IANA trademark and some domain names.

GREG SHATAN It's the four IANA trademarks, or five different IANA trademarks, logos, and the like, and also all the IANA-related domains, and they're registered both in the United States and in a number of foreign jurisdictions.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks. And Sam, did you want to add anything?

SAMANTHA EISNER Yes, and I'm sorry, I've not logged into the Zoom room, about to lose my battery here. So, I wanted to confirm from the ICANN side, so we have reviewed all of the consent and novation documents. We are comfortable that they transfer all of the rights and obligations that currently go to the IETF Trust, that those are appropriately transferred over to the IPMC.

There is a unique aspect to the IANA community agreement, and so ICANN is actually not a party to that IANA community agreement. It is the three communities: the names, numbers, and protocol parameters communities that are party to that agreement.

And so the names community is represented in that in that agreement basically through ICANN, but we only act based on the consent of the communities. And so we as ICANN will be signing that document, but on behalf of the names community, and so we are not comfortable moving forward with that signature until we know that we have that consent.

Again, the other groups, the names community and the protocol parameters community, have a few months ago have completed their signature portion, so we're waiting for this. We from the ICANN side, we are supportive of moving this. We think it's a much safer place for these items to be held for the protection of everyone who's relying on them.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Sam. So, Damon, you have your hand?

DAMON ASHCRAFT Greg and Sam, thank you very much. I wanted to confirm, so the only IP we're talking about are trademarks and domain names, and there is no patents, copyrights, or trade secrets, with the concern being is there something that is needed from a technical perspective that is in this trust? Thank you.

SAMANTHA EISNER: So, for the purposes of this conversation, it only covers the IANA-related trademarks and domain names. They are listed out on a schedule within the assignment documents. There is no nothing that goes to any sort of processes or anything. It's just those, public naming right, basically.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks. I did have a question as well. Are there particular time constraints on getting this kind of consent or non-objection from the GNSO? I'm really just thinking about whether this is something on which the GNSO ought to formally come to a sort of formal decision and hence would be a vote, but is there a time constraint?

SAMANTHA EISNER: So, the better person to ask about that would be Wendy Seltzer, who I understand is in the Zoom room. She is a current chair of the IETF Trust as well as the IPMC. They've maintained both organizations pending the completion of this novation and consent, because this is actually the only thing that they need to conclude and wind down the IETF Trust.

From the ICANN side, we are not setting the timeline. We do think that this is a good thing to get completed as soon as we can. This has been pending for a very long time, and it would be nice to bring this to conclusion and to allow this to just move forward cleanly

and to focus instead on making sure the CCG has good governance principles, et cetera, and closing out this issue.

But the timeline would really be driven by the IETF Trust, and I understand they've been waiting patiently, very patiently for this to come to conclusion, but it was not their job or ICANN Legal's job to bring that to the Council, so it might be putting some time pressure on the Council from that end.

SUSAN PAYNE Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS So, my question to you, madam, is based on the transformation that is taking place, is there a role for the CCG to play now in terms of how things have been structured from the IANA period till date? And if there isn't, what role does the community or will the community play going forward in this arrangement on ground?

SAMANTHA EISNER Thanks for that question. At the time of the transfer of the intellectual property, there was a role carved out, as Greg was explaining, for each of the community served by the IANA functions to have a view over the to make sure that the IANA was performing its work appropriately and to make sure that there's no need to move any of the functions away from IANA.

And then that comes through and it's expressed through this CCG mechanism where each of the groups can take a look and see if make sure that everything's still working. There are other oversight mechanisms over the IANA function itself, which are separate outside of this agreement, those also remain unchanged. Within this document, this is really about whether something has changed externally that then would impact whether the intellectual property itself should be maintained for ICANN's use as part of the IANA functions, and nothing changes about that either.

It's just changing the organization that the CCG liaises with, so it's changing it from the IETF Trust, who holds obligations to the CCG to give them notice of whether there's structural changes or things that they need to give notice on, it's changing it from that IETF Trust to that IPMC, the IANA Property Intellectual Property Management Corporation, or the IETF Intellectual Property Management Corporation. And so it doesn't change the community's role at all.

GREG SHATAN: If I could just add to answer Lawrence's question, the CCG will take and has already taken the same role in its oversight of the IETF IPMC as it had over the IETF Trust.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS As much as we have patent people, folks here, why is this being discussed on Council? This seems to be a little bit out of our remit, no? I don't see the connection, but I might be missing it, so yeah.

GREG SHATAN Could I just answer? Because I am in there as a representative of the GNSO, and therefore, I did not feel comfortable giving my consent or approval, although I feel comfortable substantively, I didn't feel comfortable just acting on my own initiatives when I represent the names community, and specifically the GNSO part of the names community, which you also represent. And therefore, while I'm not required to get your formal consent or approval, I want to make sure that there's no objection, no concern, and that I am doing my job as you all do of representing the GNSO in this aspect.

And also, as Sam indicated, since ICANN is signing on behalf of the names community, therefore, ICANN wants to be comfortable that the names community indeed wants that signature to be executed.

SUSAN PAYNE Thanks, Greg. I think I will say this is probably something none of us recall. It does go back a little bit in history. It dates back to when the work was done on the transition, which was kind of 10 years ago, and this group was set up, which probably hasn't had a great

deal to do, but as mentioned at the beginning, there were three appointments, as I've discovered, three appointments for the names community: one being Greg for the GNSO, and then one for the ccNSO, one for the At-Large.

And that's it's one of those things, it's kind of lost a little bit in the mists of time, but as Greg is saying, he's there as a rep for the GNSO, so he felt he should come and seek our thoughts before just proceeding. Vivek?

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah, this is a longer discussion than this subject needs, but I have a question. You mentioned that you're seeking the consent of the ICANN community, so are you -- Sam, I think you did mention the word "community". So, my question is, besides this GNSO Council, do you need anybody else's consent or no objection as well, or just us?

SAMANTHA EISNER

So, the IANA Community Coordination Group that is collectively the parties to the to that community agreement has three required signatories: it has the numbering community, so the RIRs; it has the protocol parameters community, so the IETF; and then it has the names community.

The names community is defined in that agreement to basically include ICANN's SOs and ACs. ICANN is not responsible for identifying which of who within ICANN is supposed to give it that

consent. The way that the CCG is created, it has nine representatives across those three communities, so there are three CCG representatives for the names community. ICANN is bound to receive consent from the names community before it can sign, and so we have worked with each of those three reps to see if we have that authority to sign.

So, we've received it from Maarten Simon, we've received an abstention from Christopher Wilkinson, as Greg mentioned, and then Greg, we're waiting for the consent on behalf of Greg as the third CCG representative. And so anything we can do from the ICANN side to facilitate that engagement and consent, we'll do, but it's not ours to collect. We're waiting to receive it.

VIVEK GOYAL My question was very simple. Besides this Council, if we say, "Please go ahead," are you good, or are you going to wait for others also to approve this?

SAMANTHA EISNER We are waiting for one more rep, from Greg, to say we're ready to go, and then we're ready to go.

SUSAN PAYNE Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADIEI

I see that there is a sense of urgency to this, Susan. Wendy Seltzer in chat also says, "Please, please decide on this." First of all, I think this is a really small issue, and we should just decide and move on. And I don't know if we want to do a formal vote or anything that, but we should decide on this right away, and let these guys do their job.

SUSAN PAYNE

Perfect. And that's a nice segue then into what I think is a wrap-up, which is essentially we've had this request. My suggestion would be that we proceed on the basis of non-objection, unless anyone, any councilor here feels that this is something where we should formally approve and have a vote, which would not happen in this meeting. So, I'm pausing to see whether anyone has any concerns about proceeding by means of non-objection. I'm not seeing any, so I think we are going to give Greg that instruction that we have no objection to him giving the consent. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN

And thank you for your non-objection.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, everyone, and thank you, Greg, for bringing this to us. You've caused all sorts of confusion amongst people who didn't recall your appointment, and maybe that might be something for a future iteration of this Council to think about as

well, just a reminder of where we have maybe a few reps in funny places that no one recalls. But thank you for your service.

Okay, I have an unstable internet connection, which is very concerning at an ICANN meeting. We are at the AOB section of our meeting. We do need to keep 10 minutes at the end for the open mic, but before we get to the open mic, we do have just a couple of other orders of business. The first is an update from the SPIRIT on the Registry Service Provider issue.

There is some intro to this. I maybe will allow Lawrence to give the introduction on what he is coming to tell us. There was an issue, it came to Council previously, but I'll perhaps in the interest of time turn straight over to Lawrence and he can he can give us that update.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Susan. So, since the Council's resolution on the 10th of June to refer the RSP issue to SPIRIT, the SPIRIT collaborated with ICANN, ICANN org to seek possible solutions. Now, in the SPIRIT charter, the SPIRIT can endeavor to reach an agreement with ICANN org on appropriate implementation paths in a timeframe not more than 30 calendar days.

In this particular issue, it was however resolved that it will take longer than 30 days to resolve, which prompted that a temporary measure will be put in place, and then a permanent solution, given

time for a permanent solution for the SPIRIT and ICANN org to come up with a permanent solution.

So accordingly, a temporary solution was put in place at the end of July, precisely on the 30th of July, and most recently, a permanent solution has now been scheduled for implementation by ICANN org. In terms of the temporary solution, ICANN org first of all indicated that the RSP applicants could answer no.

Prior to now, the applicant could only tick a box with regards to the EPP extension, but now there was now a second option created, which is no, they don't want to use the standard EPP that was in the application for RSP. Where they ticked no, it meant that they would be moved to a different workflow in terms of implementation and all that. But all of the other questions, they would have an opportunity to proceed with all the other questions unharmed.

During this phase, the applicants will be able to pass through the technical screening portion of the evaluation for all the questions. Now, the applicants that answered no to the EPP extension-related questions would have their technical screening evaluation conducted once the phase two actions, and the phase two actions here is the permanent solution that ICANN will now come up with.

Once ICANN, sorry, comes up with a permanent solution, they will be able to complete the required documentation that was uploaded to the applicants' portal. The RSP applicants will then be

selectable of the new gTLD time system once they pass the technical screening and all.

It was vital that these changes were communicated to the RSP applicants, and added to the public FAQ page to explain the interim solution as soon as possible, and these actions were completed on the 6th of August, just before the application rounds closed.

All RSP applicants, whether they selected yes or no, were reached out to basically explain their options to them. The proposal was specifically laid out to avoid disrupting the current RSP application period, or denying or delaying the 2026 application round.

Now, subsequently, phase two, which again refers to the permanent solution of the proposal, introduces the permanent change to the RSP evaluation framework. When this proposal was first introduced, a precise date was not yet determined because there were consultations, and ICANN org also had to look at how they would need to re-engineer their systems to be able to accommodate the different options that were now being proposed.

ICANN org has since announced plans to the SPIRIT that they will complete implementation of the second phase by no later than 28 February 2027. So they will be able to do all the engineering works required and then take further action.

The further action will include updates to the RSP handbook, RSP portal, the RSP application publication system, and the registry system testing and evaluation. By and large, the temporary

solution was to create a fix wherein anyone who didn't want to go with the EPPs were able to do so before the application closed.

And now ICANN has implemented a system whereby the 27th of February next year, they will be able to come out with their permanent solution, which means that if anyone picked no, they will be able to go through their standard flows, provide more details on the EPP system they intend to use, and get tested and evaluated by ICANN going forward.

I will want to stop at this point, stopping to say that first of all, it was gratifying to note that the problem and the concerns of the SPIRIT were addressed before the application round closed. And now we have a permanent solution. I believe if by the 27th of February there are other issues, this will be brought back to the SPIRIT, and will also be brought back to the attention of Council. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you very much, Lawrence. That's really good to hear that that issue has been resolved successfully and that the SPIRIT process appears to have worked as it should. Pausing to see if anyone has any questions or comments before we move on.

Okay, thank you. All right, we are on to the 11.2 item, and I'm handing to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Susan. And I know there's some beautiful slides that staff did for our six GNSO councilors rolling off of Council today. Rolling off, I don't know if you guys are expected to tuck and roll right here. Definitely not. On behalf of all of Council and leadership and staff, I'd like to thank you all for your contributions to the GNSO Council and the progress you've helped us make over your tenure on the Council.

Please join me in a round of applause as we thank the following individuals for their dedication: Anne Aikman Scalese, our NomCom appointee, non-voting; Bruna Martins dos Santos, our councilor from NCSG; Susan Payne, our outgoing GNSO Council Chair; Julf Helsingus, our councilor from NCSG, with a hat on, too, now; Nacho Amadoz, Nacho from RySG; Osvaldo Novoa from the ISPCP.

Thank you. Thank you so, so much. Without all of you, Council would not have been able to do all the work that we do. And I think people are putting on their hats right now. I'm going to hand this to Susan. Do you want to say something before we go to the next thing? Does anybody want to say a little bit of something before we go to the next thing?

SUSAN PAYNE

If any of the outgoing councilors would like to say a few words, quick words, that would be happy to have them. But we will then

go to the open mic, but I don't want to stop anyone having the opportunity to say goodbye if they want to.

Not seeing any hands. Of course, we all are going out for dinner this evening and have the opportunity to say goodbye in a much less formal setting. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS Just one thing, because Farzi is going to take this steer from us and Christabel, don't shut down human rights. Please help us continue the discussions, and I appreciated a lot being with you guys.

SUSAN PAYNE Yes, and I will just quickly say thank you very much, all of you. I've had a tremendous time on Council. I've really enjoyed it. Thanks to everyone for your support in the last year where I attempted to chair the councilors as well as I could, with occasional failures, but hopefully overall, we've made it to the end of the year. So, thank you all and it's been a really enjoyable experience working with all of you guys. Thanks. Damon, go on then.

DAMON ASHCRAFT Susan, I just wanted to thank you for being a great chair. It's been great to work with you, and Sam, you have big, big shoes to fill, but you'll do great. So, thank you very much.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you. That's very kind. Okay. I think then we should move on to our final order of business for this meeting, which is our open mic. We instituted this a little while ago as an opportunity to ensure that the wider community can come and tell Council whatever they would like to do.

Generally, our Council meeting, the mic is only available to councilors or particular invited guests, so this is the opportunity now for the wider community if there's anything you want to share with us. Although, Sam, is your hand up for open mic or was it before that?

Okay. So first off, I have Sam, I don't know if I have anyone else. Perfect.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thank you, Susan. I did want to address Vivek's withdrawal. I should have addressed it when you first said it, but I'll admit that I was a bit stunned and I wanted to take a moment to collect my thoughts.

First off, Vivek, I wanted to thank you for volunteering and running for chair in the first place. It's really no small thing to put your hand up for any leadership role in ICANN, but especially a job this when you also have a whole business that you run. I think that spirit of volunteerism is exactly what the Council is all about, and I really admire that you were willing to throw your hat in the ring in the first place.

And then I also just want to thank you for such a gracious exit. And the humility to kind of put the needs of the Council before your own is really admirable, and I just really appreciate you. I appreciate you asking everyone to support me, and I think we owe Vivek a round of applause again.

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you, Sam. Oh, goodness, there's a stranger standing at the mic. I don't know who this guy is, so perhaps he could introduce himself.

PAUL MCGRADY Hi, this is Paul McGrady, and I never do open mics, but I just wanted to, on the same topic with Vivek stepping away, to thank him for that. We have had this gentlepersons' agreement in place since the James Bladel days where we orderly transfer the chair back and forth rather than fighting over it the Council used to do. When the Council fought over it, it was a big mess, and we didn't look good in the community or good in the world.

And so I just want to say how grateful I am that a big chunk of the peace between the houses seems to be holding, and I think that as the Council goes forward, I hope that you do recognize the leadership quality that it took for Vivek to step away. And I would not be sad if he ends up in a vice chair role, but now I'm just openly campaigning.

But anyways, thank you, Vivek, and Sam, thank you for your kind words, and I just think we should celebrate for a moment that we are where we are and we've had peace for quite a while now, and I think that's good for the community. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Paul. Anyone else? Anyone else for the open mic? This is your opportunity in the wider community to come tell us what a bad job we're doing, or what a great job we're doing, or what we should be doing that we're not doing. So, please come up if you want. Otherwise, we'll -- Oh, Anne!

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: It just now occurred to me, Susan, that at some point, there was a decision that you and I could both be co-liaisons to the SubPro IRT, and I think we both found that we're able to work well together and that there was a lot of work involved in that role. And so, just urging the Council to be creative about how we address future collaborations. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Anne. And you've reminded me that there will be a bit of a task, which I think probably happens tomorrow in the wrap-up meeting, to fill some of those slots that are being vacated because councilors who maybe have liaison roles are standing down. So I'm glad you reminded me of that as well, but I agree that finding ways to get the work done and share it out is all good. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG

That felt very formal. Thanks, Susan. I wanted to make sure that no one was in the open mic and then taking up more time for the thanks, but I really want to acknowledge being on the leadership team -- oh, maybe I should stop. I should stop before -- Okay. Being on the leadership team with Susan was incredible. You all see her hard work in front of Council, there's so much more work behind that staff and leadership team does.

So, I don't want to speak on behalf of Peter, but I certainly think that being on this leadership team with Susan was just an incredible thing, and I'd like us to recognize that she puts in so much more work behind the scenes that you all be able to see. So, thank you so much, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

At risk of turning this into a bit of a love-in, I would say that back to both Peter and Jen. There's an enormous amount of extra work that goes in outside of what you guys all see, and it's been a really wonderful experience, great people to work with.

I'm going back to our queue now. Also someone I have no idea who you are, so please introduce yourself, young lady.

MANJU CHEN

Hello. My name is Manju Chen. I represent nobody. Well, I work for some organization, but I'm here in my personal capacity. I just

wanted to echo everyone to thank the leadership, although I wasn't there when you lead, but I think you did a good job.

I think Susan and Jen, both of you did a very good job. Peter was not here, but you are okay. It's because we're from the same stakeholder group, so I can be a little bit harsh on him. Yes, thank you very much, and I wanted to you to get what you deserve, which is all of us appreciation. Thank you.

TOM BARRETT

Hi, everyone. Tom Barrett. I'm the outgoing chair of the Nominating Committee. And so, I wanted to give you a quick overview of what positions the Nominating Committee is looking to fill this year.

So, of course, we have three for the Board, including Tripti whose term-limited, one for ccNSO, three for ALAC: Africa, Latin America, and Asia, and then finally two for the GNSO, one for the Contracted Parties House and one for the Non-Contracted Parties House, both are voting positions.

And so, we're here to ask for your help, because even though we doubled the number of applications last year, 71% were for the Board positions. So, we fall short of our target goals for these kind of type of policy roles.

And so, we're asking for the community to help us with outreach. You'll see social media start to come out. The window, by the way, is December 18th to February 16th. And so, we're going to do social

media campaigns, and we ask when you see these, you start to amplify it to your networks, so we have a robust applicant pool going forward.

So, that's a quick ask is think about what candidates not only for GNSO, but the other positions, too, and amplify that message to your networks. And if you have questions, obviously, you can contact me. The new chair is Charles Mok. Rhonda Silva is the chair-elect. If you have any suggestions, reach out to any of us with your questions or suggestions. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Tom. Okay, I'm not seeing anyone else in the queue or in the Zoom room, so I think maybe this is the end. And for part one, at least. Part two will come back shortly. Staff are going to remind me what time people have to come back, because otherwise, I'll get it wrong. I think it's at 3:30. 15:30, guys. You all need to be back here at 3:30, and we'll have the formal kind of rotation of the Council, I guess.

TERRI AGNEW: All right, we can end the recording. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]