
ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO Council Working Session (1 of 2)
Sunday, September 18, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 KUL

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hello, and welcome to the GNSO Council working session, one of two. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. If you'd like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace, and then mute your microphone when you're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is neither official nor authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's stakeholder model we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name, or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I'll hand the floor over to Philippe Fouquart. Philippe, over to you.

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.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. This is Philippe here, good to hear you, and good morning, everyone. Good morning to councilors and to observers as well. Welcome to our Sunday working session of the GNSO Council. For those of you who would remember the old days of the Sunday sessions that we used to have, this is no longer focused on the ongoing PDPs, which for those of you who would want to learn more, we had a session during prep week and there's a briefing, so we're not going to repeat this. This session is essentially focused on the bilaterals that we will have over the course of the week. We have the agenda on the screen now, thank you. We will talk about the evolution of the multistakeholder model and the associated project with Giovanni, thank you, as well as a session with the candidates for the GNSO chair for this AGM, Sebastien, who is with us remotely. That's the plan for this morning and we'll come on to the second part later on.

With this, I think I can hand over to Giovanni for the first presentation. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Philippe. Thank you for having us this morning, Sunday morning. Tough start. We are going to speak about enhancing the effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model. It's an update on this project that ICANN Org is supporting

and currently running. This section is going to be divided in two parts, and for the second part it's going to be a Jamboard interactive exercise. We wish we could have had something more interactive, but there are all these pandemic rules, social distancing and much more, so we'll do it on Jamboard. Thank in advance for participating. Feel free to pose any question in the chat, and we will pause at the end of the first part to collect any question input you may have.

Without any further, I would like to live the floor to my colleague Negar, who is participating remotely, and she will introduce us to the update on enhancing the effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder project. Thank you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Giovanni. Hello everyone, my name is Negar Farzinnia. I'm a member of the Implementation Operations Team at ICANN Org. I wanted to provide you a brief update on the status of the Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model project. We'll go over where we stand today with this project. We'll talk about collecting some data regarding consensus-based decision making. We'll discuss some next steps.

The second part of the presentation is deciding the future of the project and what we're going to tackle next. With that, let's go to the next slide, please. One more. Thank you very much.

As you're all well aware, the multistakeholder model being at the core of ICANN's operating model is in fact one of ICANN's five strategic objectives, and together with my colleagues in the implementation operations function of ICANN Org we manage the project to enhance the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model to help contributed to ICANN Org achieving its strategic objective.

There are some key steps that ICANN Org is taking to continue to advance this project, and those are to evaluate a number of the projects that have been identified when the work plan was finalized in October 2020, and we are working through the findings of the evaluation to determine the impact the projects may have had on the multistakeholder model. We are also investigating and looking to evaluate other projects that were not really in existence when we first finalized the work plan back in October of 2020.

Given how critical the community's involvement and input is to the success of these evaluation efforts, we are having these engagement sessions like the one we are currently having today, to really help get your input to resolve the six issues that were identified as those most hindering the effectiveness of our multistakeholder model. Next slide, please.

As a reminder, there were a total of 20 different projects that were included in the work plan released in October of 2020, of which we ended up selecting four projects for evaluation. These projects were ones that have been fully implemented and involved the whole community. The four projects, as you can see on the screen, are about improving communications between ICANN Org and the community, consensus playbook, fellowship program, and ICANN Learn. The remaining projects that are currently not fully implemented will be evaluated as needed once their implementation has been fully completed. As I noted earlier, there are also a number of projects that were initiated after the publication of the work plan of the MSM project that we are looking to evaluate, because we think they're important enough and can help make our multistakeholder model more effective. Some of them are listed here on this page. We have a whole list of details associated with all of these new projects on a dedicated Wiki page for MSM, the link to which we will share with you shortly in the chat. It's obviously publicly available for all to see and look through. Let's go to the next slide, please.

Where are we at and what are our next steps? ICANN Org has completed the design of the evaluation methodology, and again, this methodology has been posted to the Wiki space and it is this methodology that we're applying to the four projects that we're currently evaluating. Our goal is to share the findings from the

evaluation of these projects with you once the evaluation has been completed. Of course, we are having a number of engagements sessions during ICANN75 at which we are hoping to gather some data from you regarding one of these projects that we're trying to evaluate, which is actually the next section we are going to get into. If you can move on to the next slide, please.

Of the four projects that we just looked at, one of these projects pertains to consensus playbook and addressing issues surrounding consensus-based decision making. While the MSM project was being conducted, if you recall, the community had differing views about how consensus is applied to a given project and raised concerns about all the voices being heard equally when making decisions. One project that was deemed as possibly helping alleviate these issues was the release of the consensus playbook. I won't get into details of what that's about because I'm sure you're all fully aware of what the document is about and how it was released, but what we are looking to do now is to ask you a series of questions, polls if you will, to really better understand how you have applied consensus-based decision making to your work and what your perception of the process is. At this point I would ask if only GNSO members please participate in the polls as we are engaging with this constituency, and we would like to get the GNSO members' input into these polls. Of course, after the engagement sessions are over, we will share the polls and the

content of the presentation with our policy colleagues to hand over to you, so that those members that have not had a chance to participate in the polls and in the exercises that will come in the next session will have a chance to contribute and provide their input as well.

If you could please move over to the next slide, this is our first poll. The question we are putting to you, and if you can please initiate the first question for everyone to respond to, the question is, “Do you know the basic principles for making decisions on a consensus basis?” We’ll give you a couple of seconds to respond and then we’ll be displaying the results for everyone to see.

Yvette, if you have some responses, let’s go ahead and show what the results are of this first question. Wonderful. Wouldn’t expect anything less, honestly, from GNSO. Let’s move on to the next question and next slide. Are you aware of the existence of consensus playbook? I surmise that I think I know what the results of this poll are going to look like, but let’s see. Let’s see what we’ve got, Yvette. Wonderful. Thank you very much. Yes, this is along the lines of what I was expecting. Great news. Let’s move on to the next slide and question, the question being, “Have you used or referenced the consensus playbook in ICANN work?” This can be about a policy development process, review, any cross-community working groups, any work groups that you have participated in, in general the work that your constituency does.

Yvette let's see how we did. Interesting. This is really good to know. Let's move on to the next question and kick off the poll, please, to find out, did consensus-based decision making contribute to the project success? Again, the project could be any type of work that you've been involved with within the ICANN ecosystem. Let's wrap it up and see the results. These are very valuable data points. Next question please. Do you think you achieved better consensus of goals and objectives as a result of either using or learning from the consensus playbook? Yvette let's see what answers we have. Quite interesting, majority saying no. Let's move on to the next question. Did goals and objectives become clearer as a result of consensus-based decision making? Let's see what everyone has to say. This is really good. It's good for a multistakeholder model. Moving on to question number seven. Did you reach better mutual understanding as a result of using consensus-based decision making? Let's hear what your experience has been. Yvette let's see what colleagues have to say. Great. Moving on to question number eight. Did differing positions successfully converge? We're of course hoping the answer is yes, but if it's no then we know we need to change something. Let's see what everyone has to say. Quite interesting, clearly some work ahead for everyone involved. With that, last but not least, let's move on to the last question that we have. Was there good communication and context when converging different positions? Let's see what we get, Yvette, please.

Fantastic. Thank you very much for participating. Let's go to the next slide, please. We are done with polls and questions at this point, but I do want to talk about next steps. One more slide forward if you don't mind. Thank you.

We are running these sets of questions, the same exact questions, across all the constituencies that we are meeting with in person at ICANN75. For those that we haven't had a chance to speak to directly or those that have not been able to participate in these exercises we are going to be emailing out the poll questions and the next exercise that Giovanni is going to help us run, so that everyone will get a chance to participate. We are looking to collect all the information from across the community, collate the data, analyze the results, share our findings with the community and really discuss and agree on what changes we may need to make as a result of our findings, so that we can help improve our decision making, our inclusion of everyone in that consensus based decision making, and really making sure that all the voices are heard.

With that, let me hand the presentation over to Giovanni. I see we have a hand raised. I guess this is a good point to pause for questions. Thomas, go ahead please.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks so much. I can't resist the temptation of commenting on the questions for a bit. First of all, thank you so much for doing this. I found it difficult to answer some of the questions only having a binary choice, because there have been projects or PDPs where views have converged, at least to a certain extent, but there have been other PDPs where that didn't take place. I think that not being able to reach a common view on a certain topic does not speak to the success or failure of this multistakeholder model. I think it's perfectly okay to violently disagree on certain subjects. What's important is that everyone gets heard and that no stone remains unturned when it comes to exploring opportunities for consensus.

I've seen PDPs where in the PDP working group there have been different groups, basically some of which hated the recommendations, some of which loved them. Then the consensus call was made, certain recommendations came through, and then when it came to Council there was a unanimous decision in Council to vote up the recommendation. Even the ones that didn't like the recommendations have afterwards said that they were happy with the way the process went. I think that's really important in this. Certainly, the gold standard, I would say, is that you reach a consensus position where everyone is equally unhappy and can live with the results, but that's not always true. Therefore, I think that the results need

to be taken with a grain of salt because they might not be truly reflecting the variety of things that we've seen over the years.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you very much for that input. Point well taken regarding the binary responses. This is definitely something that we can work on and help break down a bit more so that we get a more nuanced awareness of the issue areas that may need to be addressed. Mark, go ahead please.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much for your time, for your presentation, business constituency. I was the lead drafter for the BC for every comment on this project back in 2019, so I will speak a bit from experience. I am not entirely sure that this is the way that we were envisioning this project panning out, in the sense that yes, we should be acting better as a community to reach consensus, but the question is that the playbook basically describes good consensus building for any environment. I don't think that it's particularly geared for ICANN, it described good business practices, describes good communication practices. I think what we were envisioning with this project would be for Org and for the different stakeholders to engage more with the community and with the contributors in a way that the process became clearer and more structured, and what has happened is not exactly that.

Now we have a hub, this page on the Wiki, but during the past three years there has been a bit of radio silence. When we speak about reform of the MSM model, I think that one of the things that we talk about is exactly that. How do we give input to ICANN, and we know it doesn't fall into a black hole and reappear three years later? There haven't been really many updates on this for the past three years or change. This is not the fault of the team in any way, shape, or form. I appreciate your work, but the question is how we avoid that. How do we make sure that we have a communication channel? How do we make sure that this progress is being made? That is the kind of question that I think the original project sought to address.

There are gaps, they're evident, and we need to start addressing them. Be effective about it. Know what's going on within ICANN Org and within the community, and both communicating with each other. The consensus playbook is very much appreciated, I'm just unsure if this would be the top deliverable that the contributors to the original project were looking for. Still, thank you very much. It is an advancement for the community, but I leave this comment and it can be a comment by itself, or you may answer if you think it's possible. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you very much Mark. I appreciate your input and comments. Yes, definitely as a general point, the goal of these next steps are really to continue engaging more and more with the community and the different constituencies to really try to determine and surmise whether the issues that were deemed as hindering the effectiveness of the MSM back in 2020 are still existing, or if some of the work that we are doing is helping to address it.

Certainly, not every project that we're evaluating is going to hit every mark or every issue area. Communication has actually been one of those projects that we are trying to assess and evaluate and find ways around improving lines of communication between the Org and community. In fact, it was the first of the four projects from a few slides ago that I presented today that we are looking at. The work to enhance the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model is going to be never-ending. There will forever be improvements that can be made, and that should be the case because the needs of the community and the ICANN ecosystem are changing over time, all the time.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the MSM and the changes that we need to make is really going to happen one project at a time, which we are hoping to start chipping away at with the evaluations that we've started now. One of the things with the consensus issue that has arisen over time is that not everyone

applies it the same across the organization or across the community as a whole. They have different understandings of what needs to happen to really reach consensus effectively.

I do appreciate your input. We are going to continue working on it with you and everyone else and hoping to continue to engage on this topic.

Giovanni, I know we have one more hand up, but I'm also aware of the time and the fact that we still have some portions of the presentation left. Perhaps if you could ask the questions to be emailed out to us and we are happy to answer them afterward, and meanwhile see if Giovanni, you would like to continue with the presentation.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Yes, thank you Negar, and thanks a lot to Mark and Thomas for your initial input. This is really the kind of input we are looking for. Indeed, there has been a sort of radio silence on this project, and we have taken over the project. We have continued to work on the project over the past months and we will make sure that the Wiki page, as it is now, will continue to be regularly updated. As Negar said, those engagement sessions are the first sessions that we are planning to have, and we'll continue to reach out to the different communities in the future. If we can go quite fast to the Jamboard, there is a last exercise that we have planned for you.

It's a Treasure Island exercise. For those who get the treasure, there are some stickers. It's MSM Treasure Island Champion, that you can put on your badge, if you like of course.

Those you see on Treasure Island are some of the projects and initiatives that were listed on the Enhancing the Effectiveness of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model paper in 2019/2020 and some of those that we have uploaded on the Wiki space, as they are also contributing to the multistakeholder model, but were not included in the initial paper. What we'd like to ask you as we are about to start the evaluation process of more projects, is to place some of the stickers. Again, in pre-pandemic times we would have had some more interactive, in-the-room session about this, but we're asking you to do it on this Jamboard and to move those stickers from the Treasure Island, which means that under some stickers there is a treasure, to the important/less important categories. That will help us to understand where we should focus our evaluation in the coming months.

I'd like to start this Jamboard, and again, under one or more stickers there is a treasure. For those who get it, just raise your hand and I'll give you this MSM Treasure Island Champion sticker. Isn't it a nice thing to do on Sunday morning? Yes. Let's start this Jamboard. I hope your familiar with Jamboard. Again, this is an input for us. Thank you. Who got the treasure? There was an X under the treasure. Anybody in the room get a treasure? Raise

your hand. Somebody remote? We have two treasures, good. I'm going to have two stickers.

Who is putting back things? Don't move our map. That was really fun. See, there was only one treasure, because we are saving costs. It's optimization. Thank you so much for participating. This is really to give us a sense where we should go in the coming months. Again, we commit to update this Wiki space on a regular basis, and we commit also to engage with you. Stop playing with the map please. We commit to engage with you on a regular basis. Thank you for having us this morning. Somebody doesn't like strategic [inaudible] process. They put it back on the island. We'll treasure what we have received as input. Again, thank you so much. Thank you, Philippe, for having us. This is just the start of a process. Thank you so much to Yvette and Negar who participated remotely and supported the session, and also Nathalie and Ariel for supporting the session remotely and here. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Giovanni and thanks Yvette, thanks Negar for helping us with this. I think this was useful I just want to mention that, I'm not sure who said that, but the other reason why we considered this for this session is that you have only one meeting this week with a GNSO constituency, so we thought that was relevant in this

context. Thanks again. Also, for this being entertaining, which doesn't harm. With this, we'll now move on, mindful of time, to the second item on our agenda. It's the preparation for our bilateral meetings that we're going to have this week, just to make sure that everyone is on track on the topics that we'll be reviewing with the GAC, the Board and ALAC. I think the topic leads should be aware of those items. We're not going to go through the details of those, but we will go quickly through the list. I just also would like to mention that for the topic leads we shared a few notes for you to have a look at, to channel to those discussions.

For the meeting with the GAC, we have four topics, the first of which may be renamed actually. We used to refer to the SSAD Light, now called the WHOIS Disclosure System, at least for the moment, considering the discussion that we had yesterday. I think Sebastien, you'll be leading us through this. On item number two we will review the current status of the subsequent grounds of new gTLDs work status, both on the closed generics and the GGP on Applicant Support. I think I will handle that with Jeff's help, I think, for the GGP. Obviously, I should have mentioned that. Would any Councilor like to chime in? Not only today, during the session it would be opportune to do so. I would like to mention that our GAC colleagues would like to discuss a bit of the substance relative especially to the first item, which seems

to be somewhat premature at this point, but I'll leave it to you as to whether you'd like to do this in your own capacity.

I see Jeff, you have your hand up. By the way, if you would like to take the floor, please use the Zoom room. I know you did, Jeff. Yes, have the floor, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. I'd like to actually draw everyone's attention, especially the topic leads, to the questions from the GAC. They just sent it to us yesterday and I think Nathalie and I both posted it around the same time. Although we're not engaging in substantive discussions, if anyone has thoughts on these questions, I think they should make them known in some way to the topic leads. Do you want to go over who the leads are for these? How are we going to get some feedback? I think the session is tomorrow, right?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Jeff. Yes, this particular session is tomorrow. I think the Board is on Tuesday and ALAC is on Wednesday. We have 10 minutes. It's going to be difficult to go through the detail of the notes, but indeed, if you would spot anything that you'd like to review, please say so later today. I'm thinking aloud, I'm sorry, but I'm sure we could take some comments on this particular

item now if you'd spot anything you'd like to discuss. While you're reading this, maybe I'll go to Paul, who's next. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. I just had a process question on the GGP. We voted for that, but have we done any kickoff work on that? If not, when are we going to start doing that? I don't recall seeing any kind of participation request or anything like that go out at this point.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Paul. The call for interest was sent just hours after Council approved the motion, so that's on the way. I think we're working on the process, so your respective SGs and Cs should have received that as well as the SOs I see should have received that call. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes, thank you. I don't mean to dwell on this too much because I know we have a short amount of time. If people are interested, they need to contact work within their own structure to express that. We're not doing our own Council structure of the standing selection committee or anything like that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: No, it's directly through the SGs and Cs and SO/ACs. Thanks, Paul. Anything else? Thanks, Jeff. I'll mention the topic leads just in case you wouldn't remember as we move along. I think we can move on to the next item.

I'd like us to have a look at the other items that we had with the GAC if we could go back one slide. Yes, thank you. The other items are DNS abuse. We would rely on the co-chairs for this, Mark, and Paul for the WHOIS Disclosure System. Is it the agenda for the GAC meeting? The first was SSAD Light, now we're already with the Board, thank you. The third is indeed DNS abuse, so contacts, as I said, are Mark and Paul. Accuracy, we would rely on Olga to lead us through that discussion. These are the four topics that we have for our meeting with the GAC. Again, please have a look at the notes that we shared on the list.

Moving on, I think we can go to the bilateral with the board. We have three items. The usual generic question on the link that we may see between our own activities and the strategic priorities of the Board. I think everyone would chime in on this. I'll be leading the discussion. The second is on the PDP Improvement Tracker, and leadership will lead this as it relates to the first item, as well. The third point is on the WHOIS disclosure system and Sebastien is the topic lead on this. This is for the meeting with the Board.

The third bilateral meeting that we will have is, as I said, on Wednesday. It's with ALAC and I believe Justine will be moderating the session. Thank you, Justine. We have two topics. The first is on DNS abuse. Likewise, we'll rely on Mark and then Paul, and given it's on Wednesday it's going to be the new Council who would be sitting for this particular meeting. The second topic is on the SSAD ODP and our potential comments that we may have on the process itself and what we put together to provide our feedback to the ODP team. Lessons learned, as it were. I think Sebastien will be leading this. These are the two topics that we have for the meeting with ALAC.

Again, if you have comments, if Councilors have comments on the notes, please say so on the Google Doc that we shared.

Jeff, you have your hand up. Is it a new one?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yes. This is both for the GAC and the ALAC sessions. The questions ask what the Council's view is on the ODPs, not what my view is as a liaison, so the only thing I can do is talk about what the process way. Only you all as Councilors and provide your thoughts and opinions. I look at that, even though I'm the "topic lead" at least for the GAC, and I think maybe for the ALAC on that one, though I'm not 100 percent sure, I can't do anything other than just point to facts of what happened. If there are thoughts,

either you can tell me and I can present them, or you could just speak up yourselves, but I think it would be good to get some thoughts from Councilors either way.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. Good point, especially not only on the process, but on the ability or the experience that Councilors may have on whether it is easy to channel those inputs to that particular ODP. Feel free to chime in at that point. I believe, to your question Jeff, I believe you're expected, at least on the process, even on the second, during the ALAC discussion. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Philippe. Confirming that in terms of the second general action the lead for the SSAD ODP was identified as Sebastien and the lead for the SubPro ODP would be Jeff. I think the way it's been designed is we're going to focus more time on the DNS abuse, topic one. For that I would sincerely hope that the other members of the small team would also be present to participate in discussion and not just rely on the co-chairs, because the co-chairs will be doing the presentation. I think if there were any discussion that arises for the ODP out of the GNSO GAC meeting you can probably replicate that for the GNSO ALAC meeting. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Justine. Good point. This is for the agendas that we have for the three bilateral meetings this week. Thank you. We'll now move on to the third and last agenda item for this part one, and that's our Q&A session to the candidate, Sebastien, who's with us remotely. I think we're five minutes late, but we started I think five minutes late anyway, so we can run over a bit. Sebastien, are you with us? Just checking. Do you want to say a word before we start?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, I am. I'm here, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Good morning to you from Kuala Lumpur.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good very early morning from Europe. I didn't mean to do this dramatic set-up here, but it's very dark outside.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: You certainly succeeded. Do you want to say a word before start?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just simply that I shared my candidate statement last week. I did a similar session with the non-contracted parties 10 days ago. I've

lost track of time. I'm happy to give the spiel, but I think that given the amount of time that we have possibly the easiest way to go through this is to answer questions and open conversation. Whichever way you feel is more appropriate, given the early hour for a lot of people around, if people are ready to interact or not.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Sebastien. Let's just start then. Any questions people would like to ask? Not only Councilors for that matter, to Sebastien as candidate? Sounds like a done deal. Before we adjourn, do you want to say a word about the priorities that you see for next year? I'm sure you've got a quite a few. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, there are quite a few. Maybe then I will take this time to say a few words. Most of you I've worked with at some point or another in a small team or in other groups. I was actually going through the list and there are still people three years later, because I have not been present at any of these meetings, that I haven't really met. I am, in my day job and normal responsibilities, very much a backend registry operator. I don't operate any registry directly, but I do work with a lot of clients in the domain, a lot of brands, some more generic TLDs. I have a long history of gTLDs. I hope in the last three years my participation in the GNSO is also able to demonstrate my capacity to go beyond that and work on topics

that are not topics of primary concern to the registry stakeholder group or the CPH in general.

I'm very attached to our model, to our bottom-up approach, to consensus building, to all these things. Finding out, understanding and being able to put myself in other people's shoes and understand where they're coming from in order to better resolve problems is what I like to do best. All these are things that are near and dear to me, and I would definitely use those tools to work over the next year.

The second thing I want to say is also that, indeed, I have only one year to serve on Council, so I'm raising my hand only for the next year, which is exciting and challenging and all these things, but at the same time means also that I'm not intending to change and revolutionize anything in a year. I have no time for it, so whilst there are a number of topics that I'd like to see advance and move, I'm very conscious of the fact that we can't tackle everything all at once.

If you scroll down a bit, indeed I've put the priorities I see them. It's a bit further down, just to make sure that I'm not missing anything. I don't have the document in front of me. It's further down. Big priorities in terms of the key pieces that are running the transfer in the IDN PDPs, they seem to be— If you can scroll down a bit, thank you. They are indeed running right now their course.

I don't think there is any major reason to worry about them. If I trust the tracker they should be finished or finishing by the time I leave this Chair. We're good. If you could scroll down, please to the next topic. No, still not, but it doesn't matter.

I probably made something, but I'll catch up afterwards. We have a number of projects. We mentioned the WHOIS Disclosure System, or the DNS request system as I heard the preferred title yesterday. We have obviously the SubPro EDP. Currently this is one project that I haven't heavily participated in, but is very near and dear to my day job and I would like to see progress in the next year. There are a number of reviews that we're going to have to go through. There are a number of reviews that we will make sure are moving along but won't actually start, or certainly not bring any result before I'm gone, but we will definitely help that process. Sorry, I'm drawing a bit of a blank. It would have been helpful to have that list in front of my eyes, but no worries.

I see comments in the chat. I'm not very good, you'll discover that if you haven't heard me on the mic, but I'm not very good at following the chat at the same time as talking. If somebody wants to add something— Thank you very much, that's a good point. We will need to go and find a new chair for the Registration Data Accuracy, and I strongly encourage, particularly those to whom this topic is dear and important, not that it's not to me—

Sorry, I don't have any other open mics, so I hope I'm not the one causing this. I do encourage for those that [inaudible] this topic to go in your community and try to find somebody to go and replace Michael. It's a different topic, it's a different position. It's a different position that we need somebody neutral for, so it makes it all very, very difficult and cover, but this is something that we will need to work on also.

I will apparently chair the closed generic discussion, also, with the GAC. We had one seat that was the Chair [inaudible], which makes me, if you choose to elect me on Wednesday, which is also a topic that I've touched through a few clients that fell either way of it, so it's a very interesting topic for me, too.

Sorry, that's about it. I see some questions in the chat. If somebody wants to voice them, that would be super helpful, but otherwise I think we're at time, so maybe I'll give the mic back to Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Sebastien. I think that there were any, they were more like comments than questions. If I got that wrong, misinterpreted them, please say so and raise your hand in the Zoom room. Any questions you would have for Sebastien? I see people saying no, so it's all clear. I'm sorry? Yes, Desiree, thank you. Where are you? Yes, you're online. Desiree, can you hear us?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes, I can, thank you Philippe. Good morning. Just a quick comment and a question for Sebastien. Thank you for standing, I think it's a really good thing that you're putting forward your election statement. A bit of a question for you. If you could think you could be any animal for 24 hours or a flower, what would that animal be that you'd pick?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: At 3:00 in the morning I'll be a warm animal of sorts. I know it's probably not flattering, but a bear, I think. I guess depending on where you live in the world, they're looked at very differently, from a teddy bear to a dangerous animal. There is something, I don't know why I'm choosing this, you're catching me at 3:00 in the morning. It's a bit weird. There is something about both— I don't know. I don't know why I answer this. I'm very careful in civil society to make sure that I hear people around me and make sure that I understand wills and intentions or whatever. I don't usually walk in imposing myself just for the sake of it, but I do have strong opinions and I do have strong feelings about a lot of things. I do tend to want to see them in the end. This is not to say, again, that I'm not listening to people and I'm not ready to hear and take things onboard, et cetera, but there is, let's say, both sides of the metal here, if I was to say metal, both sides of the coin. Those

who've worked more closely with me will attest that I try to be civil, and I try to be understanding, but it doesn't mean that I'm just there to listen to everybody else and wait for things to happen. I hope that helps.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you Sebastien. Thanks, Desiree, for the question. I think you have to be a bit of a night owl to be a Councilor, for that matter, living in Europe, or anywhere for that matter, given the rotor of meetings and to be Chair. I can testify to that. Thank you. Thanks, Sebastien, all the best for Wednesday. I don't think you need that anyway. With this, I think it concludes the first part of our meeting. We will reconvene for part two at, what is it? Is it 1:00? It's half past, thank you, so at 10:30 local time. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's first session. You may stop the recording. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]