ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO: CPH Membership Meeting
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 – 12:30 to 14:00 AST

DEVAN REED: Hello and welcome to the CPH Membership meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this meeting, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to ask your question or make your 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. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or 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 multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name—for example, a first name and last name of surname. You may be removed from this session if you did not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Sam Demetriou.

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.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thank you for that, Devan. Hi, everyone. This is Sam Demetriou. I'm the Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. She should have said handing it over to both me and Ashley Heinemann, who's the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. So welcome to our joint meeting of the Contracted Party House.

We have a couple of items to discuss today. We're going to maybe start just getting prepared for our session with the ICANN Board, which is coming up right after this session concludes. And then we will also spend some time talking about the possibility of a GDS Summit taking place later this year in 2022, and then one other topic that I'm going to actually have Ashley tee up for us.

So, Ashley, whenever you're ready, I'll hand the mic over to you for any other opening remarks you want to make.

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Hey. Ashley here, Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. My hopes for today's call, in addition to prepping for the Board session, was to talk about not only just the GDS Summit and the prospects of having one, which hopefully are good or this year at some point, but to talk about what subjects we would want to discuss at a summit. And that was pretty much why we had put the RA … Actually, not the RA—we wanted to talk about the RRA amendment process and how that could be a subject of conversation for the GDS Summit.

And we didn't want to get into particulars here but just articulate why we think that's a good subject to talk collectively on as part of a GDS

Summit. And we're hoping that you all would also, as registries, have some ideas for what would be good topics for us to discuss as well and that we could present them here and just brainstorm on what we think would be a good idea so we're prepared under the assumption that we could potentially have a GDS Summit in the fall.

So, apologies. It sounds like our wires got a bit crossed in terms of what we wanted to discuss today.

But let me ask you, Sam. Does that make sense or do I need to clarify a little more here?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thank you for that, Ashley. I think that does that make sense. I think, yeah, it was just a little bit lost in translation. I think we thought you guys wanted to begin discussing substantively the registry/registrar amendment process. And I think that's how that ended up on the agenda for today

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Just to be clear, we specifically did not want to talk about substance today since this is an open meeting. So it was more just a teeing up of "This is an issue that we as the registrars would like to discuss," just articulating the value of this because I think this is something that's not sexy. It's not something that probably jumps off the page for registries until it becomes an issue for a registry that needs to amend the RRA. So we wanted to save the substantive conversation for later since we were a little concerned around a public discussion on it at this stage.

So, anyway, I will stop there. I see Brian has his hand up.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Ashley. And sorry if I wasn't clear on [if] this is when you wanted ideas as far as what we could talk about a GDS Summit. But something that we discussed in the Registry and Registrar and the CPH Abuse Working Gorup was that, of course, generally speaking, we're aligned on DNS abuse mitigation practices, but there's areas of frictions and areas of when is it a registry's responsibility to action something versus a registrar's. Working on a potential roadmap—that's something that we tabled until we were back face-to-face because I think it's a conversation that lends itself much more to that face-to-face engagement.

So it think, if there's a GDS Summit, that's something I would be very interested in: that abuse mitigation roadmap between registries and registrars, what pain points there might be, and how we help address those.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay. Thanks for that, Brian.

All right. Let's then, since we started down this path, just go ahead and rework our agenda a little bit and open the floor for any other thoughts or ideas for what folks want to cover during a GDS Summit.

While you guys have some time to think about that, maybe what I can do is I can buy you a little time and give everyone an update about what

the status of a possible GDS Summit. We've been talking to the folks over at ICANN staff in the Global Domains Division—sorry; Global Domains and Services is what they're called now—about the possibility of having a GDS Summit sometime in the calendar year 2022. We hadn't had one since 2019. It's been a while since we've gotten together for one of these due to shift to remote meetings with the COVID pandemic. The nature and the structure of the GDS Summit doesn't lend itself especially well to a remote setting. It's really all about getting the opportunity to be face-to-face with our colleagues and spend some time to talk about specific issues that contracted parties are dealing with and have similarly open discussions.

So over the course of the last two years, we've not had a dedicated summit. We have talked to ICANN staff about having one this year. It is not going to happen in the first half. So it's not going to happen between now and ICANN74, but staff is looking at the possibility of having it sometime in the fall, after the ICANN75 meeting, which, as anyone who has looked the calendar knows, is a little early in the calendar this year. That meeting is in the middle part of September. So the GDS Summit they're looking into potentially having in the middle of October, late October, or early-to-mid-November—sometime in there, getting outside of the holidays and all the year-end craziness that takes place.

So, with that, let's spend some time throwing around some ideas about what folks would like to cover at a potential summit. If and when we get the go-ahead that we're going to have one, we'll pull together a

planning team, the way we have in past years, to refine these topics and make sure that they're timely and make that everyone is on board.

But we've got a nice queue, so we might as well get this ball rolling and have some ideas thrown out there so we can capture those and use those to guide those discussions once we get the greenlight that this is going to happen. So, Michele, then Beth, then James.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Sam. I suppose [inaudible] looking at topics for GDS; I think registry backend migrations, because they're an absolute pain the proverbials. And I think that entire process could probably be handled better in terms of communications and [inaudible] to some of the issues we've run into is that, with all the mergers, acquisitions, and God knows what else, plus staff changes, notifications are going to all sorts of weird places. The timing is a total mess.

Another one would be semi-related, which is with respect to registrar onboarding. Again, a lot of this comes down to contacts and duplication. And why, for the love of God, in 2022 do I have to go off and find a printer to print out a contract and sign stuff in blood? We have the technology. We're meant to be a technology industry.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Michele. Over to Beth.

BETH BACON: Hi, folks. This is a little bit more of a registry-focused item, but I don't think it's bad that we have some registry and registrar items where we can talk to ICANN at GDDs.

Internally in the registries we talked a little bit about the process in Section 7.5 of the RAA on assignment and just maybe hammering that out a little bit, making it a more predictable. So that's maybe something we could discuss. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. James?

JAMES GALVIN: Hey. Thanks, Sam. Good morning, everyone. And +1 to Michele's and Beth's suggested topics.

I've been discussions with the team, including some folks over at Verisign—Pat and Keith—and we've been discussing how to address and handle seized or repossessed domain names, especially when it's the service of a court order of fulfillment of a law enforcement investigation. And it's easy to imagine that, as we continue to focus on DNS abuse, the number of seized domains will proliferate.

The problem is there's no standard way of doing it. Sometimes the seizure happens at the registry, sometimes the registrar. Sometimes the billing may auto-renew from now until Doomsday. And even long after the law enforcement of court incident is resolved, the domain name is still in limbo.

So I would like to talk as an industry about exploring some standardized ways that we can handle seized domain names. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, James. It's looking like there's some +1s for that in the chat as well and a suggestion from Owen to maybe even expand to include non-seized domain names suspended for abuse.

So I think one thing we can maybe also think about is whether it makes sense to have almost a track related to all things that touch on DNS abuse and DNS abuse mitigation and divide that into some of these subtopic areas so it brings in the topic Brian proposed and it brings in the topic Jim just proposed here. We've sort of done that in some past summits. We've broken out the individual topics into overarching subjects. So I think that may be something we want to think about also for this one.

JAMES GALVIN: I completely agree, Sam. The more we look at this, the more complicated it gets. It needs a lot of coordination. And, yeah, I think it's going to be a focus.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Awesome. Thanks, Jim.

All right. Other thoughts? Other ideas or topics for a summit?

Alan?

ALAN WOODS: Hey, all. So, obviously, we're already covering the fact that registries and registrars should talk about the abuse management specifically, but if ICANN is there, I think that is the perfect first opportunity for us to be able to sit down with ICANN and have the beginnings of that conversation with them on DNS abuse and discuss the events of the past two years and where we're going for there and just talk to them about what we can do to help them and vice-versa in order to move this along.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks, Alan.

All right. Any other ideas or thoughts?

Jothan?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Hi. I put this in the chat, but it's been a while since my fellow Tech Ops folks have had an opportunity to meet and we, typically, at these GDD or GDS Summits, have a half day or a full day where we can go and discuss. And there's quite a lot on the agenda coming out of the policy development processes that would give us an opportunity to review them together. And that's always been great for our industry. So we'd appreciate that if we could. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jothan. Michelle, then Donna.

MICHELLE NEYLON: Thanks. There are grace period restrictions at the moment. I know why they're in place. It's to do with domain tasting. That was a problem—I don't know—10, 12, 14 years ago. These days, it's causing a massive pain for some of us when it come to handling abuse and fraud and all of the things why there are grace periods were meant to exist for in the first place. And it really does need to be opened up again as a conversation.

I think it also it feeds back into the entire reason why, for the love of God, aren't some of these policies reopened and reviewed because they're just kind of done and then forgotten about. And we're dealing with the pain for years. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks, Michele. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam. So it seems that the list is focused on operational issues, but I wonder, from an industry perspective, whether there's interest in talking about new technology and impact on the industry or something along those lines. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Donna. Something a little forward-looking, I think, could be useful.

All right. So I think that, so far, we've got some good ideas here that we can dig into further. Obviously, again, we've got some time before the summit is hopefully aiming—fingers crossed—to be taking place. So like I said, we'll have more time to drill down on some of these and refine these and review them with the membership and the team that wants to get together to plan the summit once we get into that time of the year. So probably around, leading into, and then post-ICANN74 we'll be able to work on this. And we'll keep the lines of communication open as there's definitely a backlog of things that we're going to need to talk about, as it will be almost three years by the time we do finally get together.

All right. So thanks for all that. And like we said, we're going to move the RRA amendment process. We'll put that one of the list, too, as that was mentioning an illustrative example of things that we can discuss at the GDS Summit, not something we're discussing here today. And, again, apologies for just a slight blunder in agenda preparation on our part. Thanks for bearing with us, folks. There's a lot of planning flying around leading into an ICANN meeting.

All right. Anything else folks wanted to discuss around the GDS Summit before we transfer over and start getting ready for our discussion with the Board?

Catherine, I see your hand. Go ahead.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: I just wanted to add to that, on the RAA process thing, just to give it a little bit of color, the registrars appointed me in charge of said group. And it's really fun. But basically, I just want to float the premise behind that, being that—this is not meant to be a bad thing—a given registry only cares about the RAA amendment process when they need to use it. And so we saw Donuts, GoDaddy, and now PIR all going through this process. And we think there's ways we can improve it—improve the consistency, improve the consistency—and kind of sync on what kind of changes might require more or less attention from the registrars.

So it's just to set that up of what we're thinking would be a valuable conversation between the groups, knowing that it's hard to get a group of people who it's not relevant to to discuss changes to a process that they're not currently involved in. So we just want to hopefully have that conversation and make some good progress. So that's it. That's all I got. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Catherine. And I know that this is something that's been outstanding for a while. We know it's been a concern. And I think we'll definitely be able to get some folks together to provide you guys with hopefully some useful and good input when the time comes for that.

Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam. I appreciate that there's uncertainty about whether we can have a face-to-face summit, but it seems that this is a reasonable list of things at top of mind for folks. And if we can't have a face-to-face meeting, is there some other way that we can engage in the—I don't know—six months with the registrars to have some initial discussions on the topics that have been identified? It seems that, if there is no opportunity for a face-to-face meeting, then can we find another opportunity to have these conversations?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Donna. That's really practical and useful input for us to be keeping in mind. There's definitely a part of me—and I'm sure some of you guys can relate to this—of wanting to put all my eggs in the basket of hopeful return to face-to-face engagement. But that's a really good point to keep in mind: six months from now could look very different than this moment in time. I think it probably makes sense at some point.

And this we can do over e-mail and we can do this in follow-up meetings between our respective stakeholder groups: figure out which of these is the highest priority and which of these does lend themselves to a dedicated call or maybe a three-hour block of time—that would be good fodder for remote engagement—and figure out if that's the way we want to tackle them and if there's enough urgency around those specific issue that we want to be having those conversations even in the absence of a face-to-face meeting.

Or, similarly, since we are possibly six or seven months out from the ability to have a face-to-face on these topics, if there's any we want to advance, if we want to have these conversations early or at least start the conversations early, I think the ExComm of the registries—I'm sure the ExComm of the registrars feels the same way—is more than happy to facilitate additional calls and meetings outside of our regular cadence, our regular biweeklies on our part, or other opportunities to interact. We can set up dedicated times to talk about these things. All you guys need to ask, and we'll get working on it for you.

Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: As the list of topics for a potential GDS Summit have grown very, very quickly—and that's based on only a small cross-section of both memberships' participation—might I suggest that we put out to both members of this to see if there are other topics people want added and then maybe do some kind of priority voting-type thing or something? There's a couple of topics I think you could probably move forward with because they're not that contentious in that we all probably agree that we'd like to see a change and it's a really question of how we change it. And then there's other ones where probably we would have to get on the same page, which is where you have that longer, protracted face-to-face [inaudible]. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Michele. Good suggestion there. I think we'll dust off our old friend, the Google Document, and start getting the … I say that because there's not a day in my life that goes by that we're not working on some Google Document related to stakeholder group business. So we'll get maybe one of those with this list as a starting point. And then folks who have proposed the topics can do in and maybe provide some more detail. We can set aside a dedicated amount of time for people to put in additional topics. And from there, we can work on the best way to rank them and understand the priority order in which we want to address them.

All right. And Andee is keeping track of an ongoing list as well. And Carlos is confirming that's very similar to what we've done in the past. Even for the face-to-face summits, where we've had 50 topics to fit into a ten-topic bag, we've had to go through this ranking process and figure out how to best use our time. So we can definitely move that process up so that we are able to sort out what to talk about before the meeting and what to do talk about during the meeting and which ones merit being addressed and then hopefully make the most of the time that we have available to use in 2022, leading up to and hopefully inclusive of a face-to-face summit.

All right. Thank you, all, for this. I'm getting a lot of great energy here. I'm sure you guys are all eager to get together if we can and work through some of the stuff. So we will make sure to do that.

And before we move off of this topic, Martin has asked a great question in the chat. If there's any topics that GDS staff would like to propose,

Andee has replied that they'll put these into the list as well and allow us as the CPH the opportunity to vote on them.

Andee and other GDS staff members, are there any that you want to really flag in advance, or would you rather wait and feed it into this process?

All right. I'm not going to put Andee on the spot. We'll let them submit those comments in the due course of us refining and developing more topics.

And, yeah, Michele, I'm with you. If I say GDD, please know I mean GDS. Please know that I want to be saying the most up-to-date one, and it's just because I've forgotten.

All right. Thanks, all. So I think, like I said, we're in pretty good shape for this one. I think we are maybe ready to close out this part of the meeting and move over into preparing for our session with the Board. And then we can also have some time for any other business that comes up.

Any questions before we make that transition?

All right. So as you guys know, we have our meeting with the Board coming up immediately following this session. Sue has here the questions that the Board has posed to us, along with the questions that we have posed back. So some of these are sub-questions to some of their topics that we'd like to get the Board's input on.

On the first one, Ashley, maybe it makes sense … I can turn it over to you, just because I've been really going and people are probably sick of

my voice, if you want to run through the list of Registrar Stakeholder Group priorities for 2022, and then I can walk through the Registry Stakeholder Group ones. And there's obviously some overlap there, so we can figure out the best way to run through them with the Board and if other folks aside from the Chairs want to be in charge of teeing these up or explaining them or what-have-you.

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Oh, gosh. So they're not written down here. Yowzers. Let me pull up what we talked about. Bear with me for a second.

So there are a number of things that we can talk about. And I think, from a registrar perspective, we can talk about what we clearly think are our objectives, which I think, for the most part, is the Transfer Policy Working Group.

I would say also that, from our perspective, it's completing some of the existing work that is out there right now, including the IRT for EPDP Phase 1 and also, figuring out what we're doing with the SSAD and, lastly, getting some focus around the conversation [in the] Accuracy Scoping Team. I think what we've been seeing as we progress with this particular initiative is that it seems to be struggling with its mandate, which is to define, first and foremost, which accuracy is in the context of this conversation.

So I will stop there, and I invite my colleagues in the Registrar Stakeholder Group to follow up with any further priorities they have and would like to raise in the context of this conversation.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Anyone else from the registrars want to elaborate or chime in?

Okay. All right. So I can give a quick overview of our stakeholder group priorities as well. So, Ashley and friends in the registrar group, you guys will see that there is definitely overlap, especially when it comes to this topic of wrapping up work that is underway and that has been in progress for a while now.

So, as we were thinking of this and what we want to flag for the Board, understanding it's obviously a public session—there's going to be other folks from other parts of the community listening in—we broke it out into three topic areas. The first topic area is work that we as a stakeholder group are leading and that we're engaging on. And that involves continuing to advance the work we've been doing on DNS abuse and looking at DNS abuse mitigation within our stakeholder group's working group. That means continuing to collaborate with the other ICANN community groups, identifying new places where we can work together—places where we can focus our energy so that we are addressing other community needs as well.

Then the second category is priorities for the Contracted Party House as a whole engaging with ICANN staff over the course of this year. And that's where I think we have a lot of overlap. So one is finishing the RDAP amendment to the RA and the RAA. For us, that will also involve the BRDA amendment and getting that worked out. So it's reaching agreement amongst all of us on the actual language and then hopefully, before the end of this year, at least starting, if not completing, the

actual amendment process and then also reaching some resolution, whether that's agreement on actual terms or at least a path forward, on data processing agreements between contracted parties and ICANN.

And then the last category are things that we see as priorities for the ICANN community—so for wide-reaching work that the community is engaged in for 2022. That is getting panelists identified and selected for the IRP standing panel. So there's a Community Representatives Group who is working on that. The call for volunteers went out quite a while ago. There's been folks ready, willing, and eager to get engaged on this work, but it has really just been spun up again in this new year. So getting that done is a priority this year.

There's moving forward with the Registration Data Policy IRT—so this is one, I think, that you guys mentioned also—and, at the very least, getting the policy document out for public comment this year so that that work can start to wrap up.

And then the last one is just making sure that the Subsequent Procedures ODP proceeds in a timely manner, meets all of its deadlines and milestones, and that we're able to avoid further delays in overall timeline of launching future gTLD rounds.

So it's kind of a lot of priorities, but I think breaking them up that way is hopefully useful for the Board to parse out their thinking on that.

Does anyone from the Registry Stakeholder Group—oh, sorry. Before I ask that, Ashley, I see your hand. Go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: I just have a question in terms of how you want to tackle this with the Board on the call. Do you want us to do it individually as registries and registrars, or do it collectively?

SAM DEMETRIOU: I think that's a really good question since obviously there is a little bit of overlap here. I'm open to whatever you feel like doing. Maybe there's two options. So one is either we just run through it the way we ran through it now—registrars and then registries—or what we could do is we could do registrar-specific, registry-specific, the CPH ones, since there's commonalities there, and then … We follow this three-category breakdown and just do it that way. I'm happy to tackle it however you're most comfortable, Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Perhaps, in light of this coming up so quickly and not really having time to prepare to parse things in a cohesive way, we do it individually and we just note this is also a priority for the other group and supplement where necessary if it's different. How about that?

SAM DEMETRIOU: That sounds great. Works for me.

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Okay.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Registry Stakeholder Group members, is there anyone in our group that would like to speak to any of these priorities specifically? Anyone that you'd maybe want to dig into a little further with the Board, or anything that someone other than me wants to tee up for the Board? I'm happy to do it. I certainly don't mind walking through the list. But I do want to give other folks the opportunity to be out there, to be in front of the Board. It doesn't have to be The Sam Show.

I see Beth and Alan.

BETH BACON: Well, I would like tickets to The Sam Show and [inaudible]. I'm happy to talk to whatever you'd like. Since we've been working on DPA things, I'm happy to do that.

I also was just wondering, if the registrars go first, or whomever, and then the registries go, and we say, "We are aligned on these certain issues"—and I assume that, Ashley and Sam, you'll [inaudible] those things—are we going to elaborate on each issue or give a little blurb on each issue individually? Or are we just going to say the list and then say, "What do you want to talk about?" to the Board? So maybe that helps figure out who needs to be on tap for answering questions maybe.

SAM DEMETRIOU: That's a good point, Beth: how much detail do we want to go into detail up front versus having people be point persons if there's follow-up questions from the Board about any of the specific items.

And I see Donna also had put her proverbial hand up in the chat for that she would be happy to tackle any follow-up questions or additional context regarding the standing panel. Thank you for that, Donna. Donna is one of representatives on that group, so she's well-suited to tackle those questions.

Maybe we do a little bit of both, instead of running through the list fast, the way I kind of just did, which I don't think is always the easiest to follow because I've been told I speak to fast, mostly by the translators. We give a short (maybe a sentence or two) overview of each topic, what we're thinking about, etc., and then pause and give the opportunity for the Board to ask questions and have folks be on tap as the point person for those specific items.

So, Beth, like you said, you could be the point person on DPA-related stuff. Donna can be the point person on the IRP, etc. Ashley is making some notes in the chat. Roger is the point person for the transfer PDP.

And I think, if we go through them one by one and allow some time for the back-and-forth, once we get to where there is any overlap or repetition, we can just note, "Yeah, this is also a priority for us. We just want to _1, that," etc.—craft the presentation on the fly.

All right, Alan?

ALAN WOODS: I was just going to jump in there and say [inaudible] the DNS abuse stuff. I'm more than happy to be a point person with Brian—I'm going to throw him onto the pile there as well—obviously, as the Co-Chairs on

the registry side. And if Reg and Luc have any inputs on their questions that they put up or their response, I think there's easy pickings there. Thanks, Brian.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. That sounds great.

Okay. Beth?

BETH BACON: Just because they're along the same lines and I didn't see anyone put up a hand and I don't want you to have to speak for, like, the fifth hour in a row for another hour, I can also roll in, I guess, the EPDP IRT along with DPA answers as well, although if there's someone else on here who wants to take it, there are lost of people who have been involved.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. Actually, you reminded me of a logistical detail that is probably important to communicate to the full group. The meeting will be using the Zoom webinar format/setting or whatever we want to call that. We're learning as we do more and more of these remote meeting [that] this is always the case for Board meetings with the community groups at these ICANN public meetings. So when you log in, it will log into a webinar format. Upfront, we will be able to promote people to panelists right off the get-go. Some of the folks who have put their hands up to volunteer to run point of these, we'll promote you guys automatically right when you log in as panelists.

But everyone will have the ability to raise their hands. And once your hands is raised and you're called on to speak, you'll be able to be unmuted. So it will hopefully still have the same kind of ability to interact and the same functionality as your standard Zoom meeting room, which is what we're in right now. The drawback is that not everyone can see the full participant list, which is something I kind of hate. But I think it's a decent compromise based on how the Meetings Team wants to run these things.

Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Just to make sure I'm following this conversation, I got the point that we have point people to respond to questions and we're identifying those people now, but are you and I going to be going through the overarching list as the intros to these conversations first? Is that still the plan?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yeah. Thanks, Ashley. I think that probably makes sense just for the sake of flow and so that we're not losing too much time transferring over to other people. So we'll give the short overview, quick statement about why it's important to us and why it's a priority for our respective groups or the CPH as a whole, and then pause, see if there's any response from the Board, and, as that comes in, we'll tap the point people for that.

So as I say that, unless anyone, again, feels really strongly that they want to introduce a topic, I'm more than happy to cede the mic at that point. But I think, generally speaking, we can follow that structure.

Ashley, you want to get back in?

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: No. Old hand. My bad.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. So I think we have a pretty good plan in place for how to go through Topic #1, which is the prioritization topic. And, yeah, I think we'll be able to manage that relatively seamlessly. I'm hoping there's some good engagement from the Board. I hope they have good follow-up questions or comments or +1s, etc.

All right. Item #2 here is: What, if any, suggestions do we have to enhanced ICANN's effectiveness and efficiency with regards to the process of implementation after the adoption of a PDP or review team recommendations? So it's just general thoughts about how to improve this process.

One of the things that the ExComms talked about was the importance of developing at least target timelines for implementation work, understanding that, in the real world, sometimes timelines need to be adjusted. And this is a theme that we've talked about—our Registry Stakeholder Group members and, I'm sure, the registrars as well—in a lot of different contexts: instead of just having all processes be open-

ended and this kind of understanding that things should take as long as they need to, at least starting with a target timeline can be really helpful in focusing people on the work. That lets you develop a workplan that you can try to work through and it sets milestones that you can try to be reaching, again understanding that sometimes you need some flexibility to adjust as the work goes on but at least, as a starting point, setting a standard time period for implementation. Maybe that's twelve months. Maybe it's eighteen months. Six months is probably fast. Two years is probably too long. But something in that range is maybe one area.

And then we also thought that it would be good at this point to get the Board's thoughts about how the operational design phase can positively contribute to the efficiency of the implementation process and maybe what the Board has learned from the ODP that's been done, the ODP that's currently underway, and what its goals are for this, broadly speaking, in the future.

Does anyone else have any thoughts about improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation process that we can make sure to touch on and discuss with the Board?

Theo?

THEO GEURTS: Thanks, Sam. I'm actually struggling with that concept a little bit. I mean, everybody is driving to get these things done in the most efficient manner as possible, except the reality is, of course—that is what we all

observe—that things are going extremely slowly for tons of different reasons. So I don't understand, or at least I'm not grasping, what kind of answer you expect from the Board here. It's of course very nice when you have a timeline—a dot on the horizon, so to speak. That is definitely helping, but I don't see how you will get a really coherent answer from the Board here. But maybe I'm wrong. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Theo. I'll be honest. I don't really ever expect clear commitments or clear … Yes, you're right. That's a great answer. We're going to exactly that from the Board in these settings. I think it's more about opening the doors for some conversations. So that's a good point to raise: what are the goals of some of these interactions?

So I have a bit of a queue here. So Kieron and then Beth.

KEIRON TOBIN: Thank you. I'm all for putting in timeline, but I think also that ICANN also needs to take responsibility. If we do implement these timelines and it fails to do, then maybe as a non-profit organization, it also should take a leaf out of its own book and potentially donate some of its money to a certain charity or something or [elected] charities and respect that, if they don't hit this timeline, there are consequences for them as well. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Keiron. I like that. That's novel and also a very good-spirited suggestion there.

Beth?

BETH BACON: [I kind of want to follow that.] That's such a nice out-of-the-box comment.

So I think also maybe not something that we actively volunteer but that we can say … When we were developing these questions for the Board, we did discuss that we can acknowledge that we have work to do before this process. This is all post-ICANN-Board-action. There's also a pretty big delay leading up to that sometimes. So I think we could talk about how the GNSO … GNSO is willing to also recognize we have efficiency problems. We will work on those things. We're dedicated to making our communications more actionable and tight and targeted. We're maybe making PDPs more manageable in size and scope and that sort of thing because the last few have just been kind of unwieldy.

So I think it might be nice if we could say a flavor of saying, "Yes, we understand that there's stuff on this end, but also, before that, we acknowledge that "efficiency" is the word of the day. And we're working on it."

BETH BACON: Yeah. Good points there, Beth. I think this is a theme that's especially come up in the context of review teams but I think probably also applies

to PDPs as well, which is making sure that the recommendations are implementable as a starting point. So I think you're right. Acknowledging that there's work for the community as well when it comes into this larger process is, I think, very fair.

Roger?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Sam. Just thinking about that and what Beth mentioned there, I wonder if it's something … Obviously, PDP 3.0 changed the idea and tried to make PDPs more narrow in scope and tried to speed them along. But I'm wondering if maybe the final report maybe lies out that implementation. I mean, ICANN staff is involved throughout the whole thing. The GNSO[/]Board should be aware. Is there a way that their final report can lay out a path that goes out with the final report that says, "And this is the expected"… I mean, hopefully, before a final report is accepted, even [if] it's sent to the public, the Board knows if they have an ODP to do or ODA to do or not. You would think they've been involved enough that they would know, "Okay, we have to interject here," or they say, "No, there's not enough here that we need to interject." I don't know if that's an idea.

Again, PDP 3.0 focused the PDP. Maybe we can add on to that in-process implementation phase, which is not just an IRT anymore but everything else. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Roger. And you actually jogged my memory a little bit. I want to attribute this correctly because it was a really good thought. I'm almost positive it was Pam Little who, when we were starting to discuss this topic, suggested, very similarly—there's been a PDP 3.0 process to try to improve the way PDPs are done—looking at something similar for the … Because the policy implementation guidelines (it's not exactly the acronym or the title) … But there is a document out there (a handbook) for the implementation work that happens. So this might be a good time to be thinking about doing a 2.0 version of that work, especially in light of the direction of an ODP which we understand may be used sometimes but will not be used all the time, and having that on the horizon for future work to try to improve the implementation process overall.

I also thought you raised a really good point about flagging issues early. So we now have a process in place where both the Board and ICANN staff have liaisons in, I think, every policy development process working group that's going on. So maybe more work between—I think this is maybe at the council level, right—the GNSO Council and those liaison to give them guidelines of when to intervene and how to intervene but raise things that could prevent implementation challenges early or just flagging them early when the PDP working group still has time to respond to adjust to that on the fly, I think, could also be a really good topic to explore, possibility to explore, in this vein.

All right. I didn't mean to keep Michele waiting, so, Michele, over to you.

MICHELE NEYLON: I keep me waiting, so that's perfectly fine. I might have missed this, so apologies if they started doing this. But one of the things that have been discussed as part of the PDP 3.0 discussion at council when it was on it a couple years back was the idea of ICANN providing costings on PDPs, both in terms of staffing them and the cost of any research, legal fees, and then obviously implementing them. And I get the impression—as I say, I [ask for] forgiveness if I have; I apologize—that they haven't really done much about that. Am I wrong?

SAM DEMETRIOU: I am not aware of any work that's been done with respect to that, Michele, but I'll obviously invite anyone else to weigh in if you know something I don't know.

Okay. Seb?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just quickly, no, it's not being done. There is some effort being put in all the work that Berry is doing. I know that Berry is trying … So part of the costing would be to evaluate how much staff time is spent which is trackable but not entirely under his remit and [visibility]. Evaluating external costs is a bit easier, etc. But it's about him having that information in order to be able to do it. I know that it's an effort that he's trying to pull in, but it's not straightforward. It's not just something that ICANN has ready from him to digest and spread/ventilate into the different projects [inaudible].

So, yes, it's still there as a task to be done but not available today.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Sebastien. That's good to know.

All right. Any other thoughts about what we'd like to bring up to the Board here? I think we've had some really great contributions to this discussion right here so far. So I'm hoping that the folks who've put their hands up to propose some good ideas are willing to do so once we get to the next meeting and we walk through these with the Board.

But also, by that same coin, I'm hoping that they are also open to giving their kinds of thoughts and sharing their feedback about what they're hearing from other groups, what they're thinking about, and making this more of an open back-and-forth dialogue as opposed to just one side sharing some views and the other side sharing some views, etc.

All right. So I think that brings us through the second topic from the Board pretty thoroughly.

The last topic, the one that we had posed as a question for the Board for this meeting (and it's sort of a little bit been overtaken by events; not entirely but somewhat) … When we had to submit these questions, there's a deadline. It's like three of four weeks before the meeting takes place. It was when the European Commission study on DNS abuse had just been published. So we thought it would be useful and interesting, at the very least, to hear from the Board if they have any thoughts about it, including thoughts about if and how it should feed into community work on DNS abuse and what we're doing here in the ICANN

community. So I think that's the spin, if you will, or the lens through which we're going to pose this to the ICANN Board.

Now, we thought about this and we proposed this before we had heard follow-up and having conversations with GDS staff and conversations with Goran and before we had heard ICANN announce/confirm/say—whatever verb you want to use there—that they are not planning to issue a formal response to this study. So I expect that that will be something Goran repeats during this discussion.

But is it still worth getting the Board's thoughts on the content or some of the ways that it characterizes the ICANN community? I think, at this point, we have some flexibility. We can talk about this if we want to. We don't have to. If we'd rather say, "We understand that ICANN isn't planning to respond, and that's enough for us. Let's just move on," I think we have an open door here. We can just choose to do with this what we'd like.

So I'd like to get your thoughts.

Ashley first. Go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Well, it's on the agenda, so I think it would even be weirder if we just said, "We don't need to talk about this now." So I think we just let it go as it goes. I think we don't need to escalate it any further than necessary. I think it's just recognizing that it's there. If they have anything they want to share with us, great. Otherwise, I think we stick with how we last discussed it. And [on] the CPH DNS Abuse Working

Group, [“]Yeah, this was an interesting study. They had a lot of interesting information in there. We are concerned with their definition in that we believe it’s overly broad. We’re also concerned that this kind of put to the side all the good work that we’ve been doing. And there’s a lot of missing context in what they’ve articulated. And regardless of all of this, we intend to continue our DNS-abuse-related work and we intend to do that with ICANN.[”] And then full- stop.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Ashley. I think that’s a really great suggestion of how to cover this topic.

Anyone else have any thoughts about that?

Okay. All right. So I think we are in pretty good shape here.

I did see an intervention in chat from Keith which is just a reminder. And I think this is a good reminder to have in place for this meeting and for any other meetings that we engage in at ICANN73 and ICANN-other-numbers-that-follow-73, which is, in the event that you are speaking, and you’re speaking in a personal capacity or on behalf of your company or if it’s on behalf of the stakeholder groups of the CPH as a whole, please just make sure to be clear about that. This is an opportunity for the CPH to interact with the Board. I think, generally speaking, us as the ExComm are speaking on behalf of our stakeholder groups. We’re speaking on behalf of the CPH.

But as I [said] earlier on this call, I have really tried to encourage other people to feel free to interact, feel free to raise their hand and

contribute to the discussion. If you are taking a position that is not understood to be a registry or registrar or CPH position, please just note that for the Board just for clarity—for clarity for everyone who's listening, clarity for the Board members, clarity for any follow-up that there might be—because I think it's just important for us to be keeping that in mind as we have these kinds of engagements.

All right. Well, we're just about at half-past the hour. We have, I think, 30 minutes left. The meeting with the Board starts one hour from now. I think this probably a good time to stop and open the floor and see if there's any other business. If there is, we can spend some time talking about it now. If there's not, we can give folks a little bit of an extended break before we reconvene for the meeting with the Board.

Keiron?

KEIRON TOBIN: Hello. Thank you. I'm just sure if everyone had the time to read what ICANN put out just in regard to Ukraine. One of the things that I want to just clarify there is the initial sum of a million dollars that they kind of assisted with. How is that exactly going to work? Obviously, they want registrars and registries essentially to help those. Are they planning on reimbursing us? Or is the one million going direct to the cause? I'm a little bit confused as to how that's operating. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that question, Keiron. As you were asking it, I was trying to scroll through our participant tab to see if we have any folks from ICANN

staff who can clarify that for us. If we do, great. Please pop your hand up. If there's not, then we'll take that offline and we'll get that question over and we'll hopefully get you an answer—fingers crossed—before the end of this week, as soon as we're able to get that.

Anyone from GS? Going once, going twice—oh, there's Russ. Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Hi, everyone. I'm sorry, I don't have an answer for that at the moment, other than what's been published already. I know we're looking at all the options. I think Sally Costerton's team is leading that effort to look at the options of how we get that money and into the community where it's needed most.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks for that, Russ. Then we will definitely follow up with you later on and give you guys a chance to get an answer on that. So I appreciate it.

Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: It was actually just on that topic. Somebody asked something similar, I think, during the Q&A thing with the execs yesterday. So my understanding from that was that there were two parts to it. One was that we're being given free reign to renew domains without being paid. And the thing about the one million … My impression with that is that

it's more towards infrastructure in countries, not for registries and registrars. It's more towards helping to keep the Internet running there. And I think they did make some vague reference about people asking for funding for projects. I think that's what they said. I'm sure somebody above Russ's paygrade has a wonderful answer.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Russ, is there anyone above your paygrade? I thought you were the boss.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I'm the top until there's more. No.

Thanks, Michele. Yeah, there's two different things going on here. There's one, which was the Board resolution to authorize Org to spend up to a million dollars on funding Internet-access-type and relief-type efforts. Then there was a separate action by us, the Org, to invoke a specification or a cause in the registrar agreement that allows for, I wouldn't say, free reign but I think trying to reduce the friction. You can think of it as similar to the security waiver request or ERSR. We're trying to do something that reduces the friction that prevents registrars from doing the right thing in the cases of registrants who are unable to review their domains.

So I think there's a number of things both registries and registrars can do there, and it'll take some cooperation on your parts. But we're here to be helpful where we can and just trying to reduce the friction that an ICANN rule that might be causing you from doing the right thing.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks for that, Russ. Keiron, did you want to get in with a follow-up?

KEIRON TOBIN: Yeah. I just would also like to note that obviously ICANN's whole stance is that they don't want to get involved in any political stuff. So by actually reimbursing registries and registrars in terms of that, if registries or registrars decided to donate through a charity themselves or to the Ukrainian cause, they should do it, but I don't think ICANN should [need] any permission in terms of allowing it to be seen by giving it by them because I think that could cause issues, especially within Russia and places like that. Thank you.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, Keiron.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thank for the questions. Russ, thanks for the answers. And we'll follow up on some of the … Sorry. I don't why I'm laughing at that. I just really honestly had a brain pause and it made it sound weird. Thank you. I appreciate that. We have a couple of additional details that we'll follow up on following this meeting. All right. Thanks, team.

Any other items that we want to cover while we're here together before we adjourn, take a little break, and then meet back up for the meeting with the ICANN Board?

All right. I'm not seeing any hands. So before we fully wrap, let me just run through the list of names for the priority discussions. We have Alan and Brian on tap for DNS abuse stuff. We have Beth on tap for the DPA data processing terms between ICANN and CPH stuff and also possibly any IRT-related things. But I think also Sarah Wyld was maybe voluntold to be able to speak to the IRT. Roger is on tap for anything related to transfer policy PDP.

Who am I missing?

ASHLEY HEINEMANN: Sarah also SSAD and Sarah also for the Accuracy Scoping Team.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Perfect. All right. Beth is saying that she and Sarah can rock-paper-scissors for it. All right. Perfect.

So I think we're in pretty good shape. We'll meet with the ICANN Board. We'll go through all these topics.

Anything else before we close it up?

All right. Thanks so much, team. Good discussion today. And also look for, over e-mail—we'll probably push this for after this meeting week-invitations to contribute on topics for GDS—GDS-style topics that we want to tackle before the actual summit at the end of the year. Look for opportunities to provide input on that. We'll hopefully hear from you more and we'll get some stuff planned so we can have these interactions.

All right. Thanks very much. See you guys in 45 minutes or so.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]