MONTREAL – ccNSO: Council Meeting
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

KATRINA SATAKI:	This is a really big room that we have here, so when you speak, please state your name clearly because others might not see and recognize you from afar. So, if I'm not mistaken, that's Byron, right? I don't know, Jordan, is that you?
JORDAN CARTER:	I think it's me.
KATRINA SATAKI:	Okay, great. Let's start and others will join us, it's quite a walk from the room there where we had our members meeting to this room. Can anyone count us? Count councilors, how many of us. Yes, number wise we definitely have quorum. European councilors, okay, one is enough, Latin America you have all three, well done, well done, African region all three, fantastic, North American region all three.
	Where are the Europeans? They're always lagging behind. Okay, so we have quorum, we can start. They will join us later. Meanwhile, you see Consent Agenda in front of you and the draft resolution. You also see in front of you, anyone would like to move.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I have a point of order.

KATRINA SATAKI: Point of order, okay.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I would like to have Item 6 removed from the Consent Agenda and considered on its own, and the reason I would like that is because it involves a resolution in our role as a decisional participant in the empowered community and I feel that any resolution that involves our role as a decisional participant should be considered on its own, as a matter of respect.

KATRINA SATAKI: I understand that but just if we talk about the process, aren't we supposed to have movers and seconds and then we start discussing? This always really bothers me.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Either way you want to do it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, but you already jumped in.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll do it again.

EN

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, draft resolution, anyone would like to move? Pablo, thank you. Seconders, thank you Hiro. So, now we start our discussion. Anyone? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Point of order.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I had to practice. Yeah, as didn't say before, nobody heard, I would like to have Item 6 removed from the Consent Agenda and dealt with on its own, because it involves a resolution in our role as a decisional participant in the empowered community and I feel out of respect for the process that it should be considered on its own. I understand the Board has recently done something similar with regards to what they do with anything that has to do with delegation or transfer et cetera.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, yeah, let's take it as a separate item.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Just briefly, let's go through everything that we have here, minutes and action items, minutes from the October council meeting were distributed and no comments. Action Items as you could see there are some ongoing, some have been completed. In the meeting decisions apparently we haven't done a thing. And this is one of the agenda items on the Consent Agenda, we formally appoint Barbara as new Chair of the Meeting Program Committee. So this is just formal, the ccNSO Council is expected to vote.

Next one, Number 5 is also on the Consent Agenda, we approve IANA naming function SLA change, please scroll down, and the Chair is requested to inform the CSC and GNSO accordingly. Okay, Number 6 we move out, which means that currently we can adopt resolutions under 4 and 5 by vote. So, anyone against? Anyone abstains? No, it means that we have approved 4 and 5. Good.

Now we have Number 6, as suggested by Stephen, we take it separately, separate vote. On that one I think that we really have discussed this at great length, we've had Community Forum Sunday early morning. Again thanks a lot to everyone who participated. We discussed that before you see the decision in front of you, the idea is that we formally approved the bylaw change that we suggested and we request the Chair to notify ECA accordingly. So, anyone would like to move? Pablo, second from Jordan, thank you. Anyone would like to add anything to this? Any questions, any suggestions, anything?

AJAY DATA: Pardon me for less knowledge around it, how does somebody know what is the real resolution which got passed here? What is the content of that?

KATRINA SATAKI: You see it in front of you.

AJAY DATA: So like because the decision says Section 6.1a but Section 6.1a is obviously not remembered in the mind, what is mentioned here.

KATRINA SATAKI: For that you have background information on top of …

AJAY DATA: I read this, I could not find any decision which seemed to be there.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: This resolution and everything else has been circulated on a previous call and was discussed in the previous call, that was the reason why it was included in the content or the consent agenda, so there is no

change in this one and this is the way resolutions are built always, so I don't understand the question.

AJAY DATA: My question is if I read this and Task 6 paragraph from the supporting approval to the decision, it is not clear to me what decision is really taken.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, maybe someone can help because we don't understand how to, yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: The decision is "approval," as one of the five decisional participants in the ICANN Empowered Community, four of us have to approve this change, I think is right, Stephen, isn't it?

KATRINA SATAKI: Three.

JORDAN CARTER: Three of us have to approve it and no one can un-approve it, no one can deny it, right?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Three approval for this one and no more than one objection, abstentions don't count either way, except against the three.

JORDAN CARTER: So the "approved" word means we've said yes, that's the decision. Without that happening, the bylaws can't change.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. No, no other questions? Thank you. With that let's go to the formal vote. Anyone against? Anyone abstains? Ajay, do you abstain? No, okay. So everybody is in favor, thank you very much. Let's move forward then. We have these updates taken from the meeting and that concerns Items 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

                      So let's go briefly through them. PDP3 Part 1 Retirement, we had update during the meeting. One question, maybe Council should request our Secretariat to look again at the timeline and see if there are any adjustments needed. So, what do you think about that? Stephen you as the Chair of the PDP, are we on time, let's say, or maybe we're a little bit ahead or lagging behind?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I purposely try not to match each and every teleconference and face to face with the revised timeline, however, I will say that we are cranking along and expect to have stress testing complete by Cancun, which will allow us to deal with Phase 2, which is the Appeals mechanism. So Bart Is the keeper of the master schedule so I will defer to him.

KATRINA SATAKI: Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: It could be that's a, given the status where the working group 1 retirement is in right now, so as soon as they finish their stress testing, there is no need to adjust the text anymore, that we could run the call for volunteers, et cetera in parallel and already at this stage That's assumed once we hit Cancun, the second working group can start, and you'll gain around three, four months that way.

That's why I suggested to Katrina, maybe it's a good thing to look again at the schedule, maybe we can gain some time by putting some processes in parallel, not doing it sequentially. So that was the reason for asking the Secretariat or the issue manager to update or have a look at the schedule.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, so the suggestion is that we ask, the issue manager happened to be Bart, to look at the timeline, see how it can be improved. Okay, thank you. Any objections to that? No. Let's move forward. We have updates from ECA, CSC and other updates, you we have some written updates being submitted before.

Actually this is one that brings another question. Some working groups did not present their work during the members meeting, they submitted written reports. It helped us to gain more time for

discussions and for some sessions during members meeting days. So we will of course ask that to the community but here I'd like to hear from the Council, so how did you feel about that? Should we encourage working groups to prepare and submit their reports in written form rather than present during meetings? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Having prepared such a report, I say yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. Any discussions? Yes, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. The measurement for having a working group update would be if feedback from the community is needed at the meeting, then it will be a candidate for being on the agenda. Otherwise I agree, it would be better to have a written update.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. Of course, sometimes when the working groups need to get input from members, it's clear that they need time on the agenda, but if it's just reporting back, then maybe for the sake of having more discussions and more sessions, more interesting topics covered, it would be beneficial. Stephen, anything else?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I was just going to say, some of the empowered community administration reports are just strictly read only. There's no reason I would ever come and ask for community input, but stuff like the PDP working group obviously as you saw today, occasionally, and given the import of what's going on there, I think that working group in particular should be open to questions from the community at every face-to-face opportunity.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, so we move to the general agenda. The one, the Next Steps regarding IDN ccTLDs, Agenda Item 16, could you please scroll down? Yeah, here it is. So we have here a list of proposed actions, hopefully you had time to look at those. So first is that we need to request an issue report, and for that we also need scope of the issues. They can already be identified by our preliminary review team who looked into the policy, and they have a list of recommendations, so that's something that needs to be taken into account.

We need to see how to structure the work of the PDP and there are two options, there is task force and working group. We also need to understand how we're going to proceed here. So if we aim at launching formally started thinking about ccPDP 4 during our December meeting then we should have a timeline that would allow a Council decision on the initiation of ccPDP 4 by the Cancun meeting, which means that we need this issue report and everything ready.

We also have to think hard about issue manager, and come to a point. Bart, of course, who else? No other great candidates for that. We will also have to prepare a report to the GAC, this concerns a ccTLD so hopefully that's of interest to the GAC, so we need to inform them and also invite them to be engaged in the process. Then we also need an oversight committee we have to seek volunteers, Chair is automatically part of the committee but we still need volunteers from each region.

16b, the second thing that was discussed today, the roadmap of IDN ccTLD policy. The proposed action we have to request an article change, the bylaws article change to make sure that IDN ccTLDs also can become members of the ccNSO.

Here again you see a list of proposed actions that we request we prepare a letter to the Board in which we request the change of Article 10 and Annex B of the ICANN bylaws to enable membership of the ccNSO. That discussed back in 2013 and today as we saw ccTLDs support the wording to make sure that we can welcome IDN and ccTLDs as our members. So these are the proposed actions, something to work on. Anyone would like to say anything? No? Does the plan look okay?

Yeah. So if there are no objections, let's proceed according to the proposed plan, which brings us to Agenda Item 17, and that's about the Council workshop. We're still working on summarizing results from the workshops, thanks to Giovanni who already wrote down all information from the notes. Thank you, but we still need to process

the rest of the discussions and we'll have something to work with at our upcoming council workshops.

However one thing while thinking about the most efficient way to get things sorted, we spoke to the triage committee, they discussed that. As you know and as I mentioned during members meeting day, currently we have Guidelines Review Committee looking at Workstream II recommendations and getting ready to implement the recommendations from the ccNSO review, then we have Review Working Party who also looks at recommendations, but when we talk about the Council perhaps our triage committee is in the best position to evaluate all the requests that come to the ccNSO because as you know, everything that is being sent to us, any requests that we receive, comes via triage committee and they look at those incoming requests and they try to see where they fit in our scope, our priorities, is that important for ccTLDs, and is this urgent, and so on.

So they also suggest actions. So this could be, probably is the best vehicle, the most efficient one, ask these three people, and those are Nick, Jordan, and Laura, to look at those recommendations and see which ones are the top priority for us which are relevant areas as we discussed.

So, we could task the triage committee with this and give them time until our February meeting, our February call, so that we could have time to prepare for the Council workshop in Cancun if there is a need for further discussions, in addition to the discussion that we already agreed upon, improvements of our PDP work. So, anyone would like

EN

to move? Alejandra. Next, second, thank you. So, any comments on this, maybe from our triage committee? Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I can't remember, but the report does have some indications in terms of the timeline for our response?

KATRINA SATAKI: The thing is the review working party will have to fill in those tables anyway. So the triage committee is going to look and probably give some advice and especially they will think about prioritization. Review working party has six months to deliver the work.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Six months, that's the number I had in my head but I just wanted to double check.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: The review work party is just looking at the recommendations included in the final report, just to be safe, and these are just the 14, of which a few of them are not relevant.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: 15, yeah, 14 is 2a and 2b, so that's 15. Got it, thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Nick. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Does this resolution include SOPC? Giovanni's?

KATRINA SATAKI: Which resolution?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: 18.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: We were talking about 17.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, I'm sorry.

KATRINA SATAKI: We're talking about 17.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: My apologies.

KATRINA SATAKI: So, if there are no further questions let's go to vote. Anyone against? Anyone abstains? Everyone is in favor. Thank you. Our next agenda item yes, one of the things that we started actually some time ago and we did review some of the charters, it was NPC for example, they have reviewed and updated the Charter. SOPC, that's already two years ago.

Those charters, they also have provisions saying that the charters are reviewed. It means that we have to reach out to Chairs of our working groups and ask them to work proactively and look at their charters and see where those charters do not meet requirements of the actual work. And it has happened, I know that it has happened with GRC, for example, we had to ask the Council to update the charters because the GRC was tasked with the things that were out of scope according to their Charter.

Therefore, now we also have the suggestion that we ask working groups to look at their charters, update those charters whenever that's necessary, and present them to the Council. One thing that at some point GRC wanted to introduce common framework for those charters to make sure that they all have certain parts described, all have similar structure, to make sure that if you know the structure you know where to find information of interest.

We have several, one ex, Chairs of working groups, how would you react to suggestion to have common structure for all the charters of

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

our working groups? Okay, this is something that we tried to do with the guidelines, they have certain internal part and then we address those issues in a certain way. Okay so we will produce and discuss with Chairs the structure of those charters and ask all respective groups to review their charters. Oh, and I started discussion perhaps before that, anyone would like to move? Giovanni. Jian second. Any other comments on this? Questions?

No, yeah this is something that needs to be done, not because we want to, but because really some charters are older than others and do not reflect reality. Okay thanks, then let's have a vote, anyone against? Anyone abstains? Anyone in favor? Just to make sure that you're not sleeping. Thank you.

Okay, next one, channeling communication to prepare agendas of joint meeting. This is something that we need to, we have tried to formalize several times, especially when we discuss agendas with ALAC. They have a committee to set up agenda, we had from our side, but somehow still, the communication is not quite clear, not always clear, and with ALAC probably it's very clear, with GNSO also clear, with GAC probably it's not so clear.

But still, even in those cases when it's clear. maybe we can think of ways to improve this communication, improve agenda setting. Maybe we should involve more Council, because as you remember during our discussion on don'ts, one of the don'ts was do not let everything be done by a few people, which means that more of us should be involved and here I also look at our liaison and liaison from GNSO and

ALAC. So maybe you already have something in mind. Have you discussed it, are they happy with the way we set agendas? Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Philippe Fouquart from the GNSO as liaison. I think people are very happy with the way it's done. The question is whether we can help, really, I'm willing, I'm sure Maarten is willing too, it's just a question of working this out, if it's some help for you and for the secretariat, but certainly willing. As to whether there's something to fix, as far as the GNSO is concerned, I don't think so, I think we're improving things.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, we usually have a lot of things to discuss and we're not trying to come up with anything artificially, so this is really good. Barrack, from ALAC side, any wishes?

BARRACK OTIENO: Not at the moment.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, I'm happy to hear that everything is fine. But this is something to think about and maybe it may be one of the possible topics for our workshop in Cancun. I think this was one of the topics we wanted to discuss, but we have as much time as we have, we can't cover all

possible topics that we'd like to discuss, but this is maybe something to keep in mind. Maybe there are some other suggestions? No?

Okay, let's move to Next Meeting. Next meeting is December 19th. According to rotational pattern this meeting is supposed to take place at 1800 UTC, I hope it works for everyone. And with that, we move to Any Other Business. We have this leadership training. I did not see if anyone responded to my lengthy email. Nick responded, but okay, sorry I didn't have time to read it because last time I checked it wasn't there.

Anyhow, yes, this is something that it's a really great program, very fantastic opportunity to get to know people from other communities. It's a great source for information, great source for exchange, discussion, learning. Unfortunately they happen once a year and at some point it wasn't even clear if they were going to happen, I think. But once a year and there are only two seats for the ccNSO.

AJAY DATA: I was today in leadership program update and I actually requested them to increase use everywhere because there are more takers. So they told me one thing that you can actually appoint alternates also if somebody is not able to go in the last minute, so you can beforehand you can send the names for alternates if you would like to.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, I just read Nick's email. I think that naturally a councilor should be on the top, because for councilors to be efficient and effective, they need to know people from other communities, they need to understand how other communities work, and we should not assume that other communities work and act the same way as we do, and understanding these differences helps a lot, really, I can't stress enough how important it is to interact with others, to come to this understanding.

My main point was that I believe that for the ccNSO, to make sure that we can work together now we have to collaborate with other SOs and ACs on agenda setting on the global ICANN level. So I believe for Barbara it would be really, really important to get the knowledge and get this network expanded.

If there are councilors who would like to participate and councilors with deep knowledge about the ccTLDs about ccNSO, to make sure that we can present the ccNSO there, but sorry Europeans, not from European region because I think it's really unacceptable to have both seats filled in by Europeans. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I just want to reiterate I was also at that meeting today that deadline that they propose is a hard deadline, it originates from ICANN Travel, so we can't dally.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, that is a hard deadline, usually everything is when we have to appoint people to events like that. So, yes, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: While they're thinking about this, when I went to the program, I went with you and it was great because I think you were the most expert on ccNSO and I was there to get all the knowledge, so I think that combination will work really well with Barbara. And of course it should be someone who has not done the program before.

KATRINA SATAKI: Absolutely, yes. It's not something that you take every five years or so. So, any councilors?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So, it's a great program obviously by the sound of it, and it sounds like we should try to have as many people through that program as possible so they can contribute efficiently. I'm also reflecting, sadly, on the review working group going through all of the organizational review guidelines about how we need to get new turnover and more volunteers and upscale people, have a pipeline of people prepared to step up into leadership positions and all of that sort of good stuff.

So I just put it down as a suggestion that there should be a sort of fairly transparent and inclusive process, we may end up in the same place with having a couple of councilors go but we'd like to put it out for anybody in the community to express interest because it could be

that none of the councilors are able to make it with the dates and things, and socialized a bit more, because it's obviously a great program and if it is such a great program then socializing it and getting it more widely known about helps us maintain it or expand it. So that was just my suggestion. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, again, apologies for not flagging this earlier, completely slipped under my radar. But yeah, therefore I propose to have this list of people that we could refer to every time when we have to look at something like that. But again, this program is not to learn about the ccNSO, let's say.

We need to send someone who is very knowledgeable about ccNSO, otherwise other communities may get the wrong information about the ccNSO. So, it's not for someone who is just becoming, just joined for example the working group, it really needs to be someone who can present the ccNSO. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I hate to go down this rabbit hole, but they did have a call today for I believe they were calling them facilitators and that's kind of what they're looking for, is people who can come in a couple days early because this event is held two days before the meeting gets underway, to help David and ICANN Staff lead the new class through the ropes with basically guest lectures and not so much formal lectures, but this is how ccNSO works, this is how GNSO works, et cetera. So that

EN

experience role could well be fulfilled by somebody who comes in as a facilitator to help them.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, fair enough, Biyi?

BIYI OLADIPO: I was actually part of that meeting today also and when the call was made I volunteered to come in as one of the facilitators. However, my suggestion would be because the program itself is not just about knowing what the different SOs and ACs do, it's about getting people up to speed and getting into leadership position within the community, I would suggest that we can have an array of people who are very experienced in maybe if we have two slots, so you have one person who is very experienced, you have one person who is not so experienced. If you have that kind of balance, I think it will help people to come up to speed very quickly.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you Biyi. Any suggestions? Anyone from councilors?

AJAY DATA: Ajay Data for the record. I guess what Biyi said is quite right. In today's sessions when I heard it's about leadership development, more from that perspective, they are looking for people who would like to be the future leaders or who would like to sharpen their skills of

leadership by communicating across communities and learning from experience, all that stuff. Another program which is not yet announced is sharing skills, that probably is a different discussion altogether.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yep, thank you. Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Although I was not considering this, given the explanations that I've heard that it would be preferable to have someone with vast experience in what is the ccNSO and how to present it, and given the experience that I've had of two years in NomCom doing precisely that, I would throw my nomination there for the consideration of others.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yep, thank you very much. Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Just a question, Katrina. This balance of a person very well versed in the community and a relative newcomer I think is a very, very good idea, but in terms of the well versed, I know you went there last time, and I'm thinking that maybe it would be a good idea for the Chair to go.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, it's not something to do twice, I wouldn't feel well, knowing that it takes a seat from someone who really needs it, who really would benefit from it, especially when we talk about future. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Perhaps the way forward here is to contact the relevant parties that actually organize this event, I'm thinking of David, the external guy who runs it, as well as the ICANN staff involved, and get a better sense from them as to what they feel they would like to have in terms of new and experienced.

KATRINA SATAKI: This is up to us to decide, this is nothing that we should ask from the ICANN Org. So, let's go that way. So currently, I explained especially in my email blasting, that for ccNSO it will be beneficial that Barbara takes one of the seats, actually we haven't spoken to Barbara, maybe she can't make it? But at least propose this to her. Because again, this is something that has to be taken into account. So how do you feel about that? You support, yeah, okay, I see, well at least I do not see any objections.

                         Then we have also Pablo who volunteered, so he could provide this in depth knowledge and help Barbara with those areas where maybe she does not have such deep knowledge yet. This would be this balance, at least that's how I would feel that, so maybe we could follow this the same pattern like one experienced councilor so it would mean at least probably one year on the Council and then someone from the

ICANN ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

community where we see some potential growth, potential Involvement, leadership role.

Because especially if we decide to have this introduced, term limits for councilors, we will need people from the community who will be willing to join the Council. So does that look okay? So Pablo is the one who supports Barbara and expands his network. Okay, any objections? No? Thank you. Thank you, Pablo, so you can make it? You're available to that, okay.

So, we will reach out to Barbara and ask if she's available, if she's not, we'll be back to this discussion, but we'll have to do it really quickly because it would be a waste to lose a seat on the program. So, that that was Any Other Business, is there any other business? Anything you'd like to raise? Something from the meeting? Yes, Young-Eum.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Just to say that last night was one of the most wonderful events.

KATRINA SATAKI: We are coming to that. Demi, please?

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just a short reminder that the ATRT3 will have all the input from the public consultation until the beginning of February. I suppose we will try to set up a face-to-face meeting in the beginning of February, then it's important that this, of course, all the decisions are more or less

fluid until now except the strong examination of ATRT2, that Bernie did very very, strong work on that. But anyway, any input to the group will be very welcome until the beginning of February when we will try to reach some kind of consensus on that. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much, and it's very important that we do not miss the public consultation periods as well, that we submit our comments to support optimization of everything that we're doing. So, any other business?

I assume that we all are in agreement that we're going to have a workshop in Cancun. We will follow the same methods that we use to come up with interesting topics. So, that is definitely something that we will be working on.

And then if there is not any other business, I'll move to the agenda item number 22. Those are thank you and welcomes. So the season, so the ccNSO Council first want to thank CIRA, the ccTLD manager of .ca for its warm welcome, assistance during the week, and organizing a great ccTLD event. Thanks a lot for Canada Night.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, thank you very much. It was great to see so many of our colleagues and our friends out on the dance floor shaking it up like I haven't seen before. So, thank you all for joining us there.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I saw some surprises myself. Okay next one., the ccNSO Council also wants to thank Jian Zhang, the outgoing NomCom appointee for all her contributions and support. Thank you very much. This is probably a very good reason to ensure this rotation of councilors. If you want to get this folder, then yeah, let newcomers, new blood join the Council. We also would like to welcome Marie-Noemie to the Council. She takes her seat right at the end of this meeting.

And finally, the Council on behalf of the ccNSO thanks Cherine Chalaby for his years of service as Chair of the ICANN Board of Directors. With that, again, I would like to thank you all for being here for your active contribution during the ccNSO Council workshop during ccNSO members meeting days. Thank you for your leadership, thank you for your advice and support. See you on the call on December 19th. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019