ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO: RySG Membership Meeting 1 of 2
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 AST

TERRI AGNEW: Hello, and welcome to the RySG Membership Part 1. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in chat. We will read questions or comments aloud during the time set by the chair and moderator of the session. If you'd like to ask your 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. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note the 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 participants in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in the Zoom session 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 back over to the chair, Samantha Demetriou. Please begin.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much for that, Terri. Hello, everyone. This is Sam Demetriou, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I'd like to welcome you all to our first meeting of today. We have our membership meeting broken out into two parts for today at Tuesday, March 8, here at ICANN73. We'll have 90 minutes right now. We'll go through our agenda. We'll have a short break. We'll have our meeting with the Registrar Stakeholder Group for our joint Contracted Party House meeting, followed by our joint Contracted Party House meeting with the ICANN Board, and then the last session of the day, we'll have an hour for any overflow or wrap-up from this morning session as needed. We have 60 minutes to use during that time. If we need, there are a couple of things that we've pushed to that due to some scheduling conflicts. But if we don't use that full 60 minutes at the end of the day, we'll just wrap up early for today and reconvene after ICANN73 is over.

So before we kick off and dig into the agenda, I do just want to remind everyone about what Terri just said. We've gotten a note that everyone needs to be signed into the Zoom rooms here with their first and last name. So name and surname, please. Stakeholder group members, you guys are accustomed to doing this, right? We all put our full name as well as our affiliation next to our name for our regular meetings. So please make sure you've done that. And then anyone else who is not a stakeholder group member who is observing today and is with us to hear us go through our meeting, first of all, welcome. But please make sure that you do that as well to make the lives of the secretariats a little bit easier today. They have a big job and a lot of

balls in the air during an ICANN73 meeting week. So anything we can do to help support them and make things easier for them, we should be doing.

All right, I'd like to start off today with a couple of announcements from our colleagues over in the Global Domains Division staff at ICANN Org. And that is about a couple of things that we are waiting on and some work items that are in progress, that a lot of those touch on the items that we've been discussing as stakeholder group priorities for 2022. So that'll bring us into a conversation. This is something we've been talking about over the last few meetings, including the drop-in call last week. The second item on today's agenda is just to really close out the ongoing conversation about our 2022 priorities, make sure that we've addressed any concerns, make sure that everyone's on the same page and on board with those.

Then we'll kind of go into our regular agenda of policy work updates, and then during our Council update, we'll have some time to do a bit of a deeper dive into the work of the various small teams that are going on right now. We know that those are up and running, we have some people participating on them. But as a full group, we haven't had a lot of time to really dig into them, especially because a lot of them have really just started their work over the past couple weeks. So that's what we're going to use the time today to do. I think that'll pretty much bring us to the end of time.

So before I launch into the announcements, I'll just pause quickly and see if anyone has anything to add to the agenda or any other

comments about what we're going to talk through today. All right. It looks like we are good to go then. Oh, go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, sorry. I was reaching for my mute button. This is Sebastien Ducos. This is surely my personal capacity, but I followed the Registrar call yesterday, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and there was a gentleman out of Ukraine, a registrar, asking questions about renewals of domains for people that may not be able to do it right now. I know that a few registrars have made announcements. I'm not sure on our side. I'm working right now on a report that I'll have later today on who might be concerned, etc., which I'd love to share. And as an AOB at the end of the second session, I'd like to have five minutes for that. It'll be short. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks very much, Seb. And yeah, we can absolutely add that to the end, to the agenda for the wrap-up call later today. And you actually transitioned and segued me very nicely into one of these announcements with bringing that up, which is we've learned from Russ and the staff over at GDS that ICANN is right now preparing to send a communication out to all registries and registrars to invoke the waiver program that's related to expiring domain names. It's the same process that they've used in the past around Hurricane Maria, and then also, I think it was in April of 2020 around the COVID pandemic. Thank you, Andee. Andee Hill from GDS staff is here with us. She's confirming that that communication went out yesterday. So that's

been communicated out. Like we said, we'll set aside some time during the wrap-up call to just discuss that a bit further and here at Seb's report out from that. So I appreciate that. Andee, thanks for the confirmation on that. And there's the link if you guys want to go ahead and read more up on that topic.

All right. The other announcements that I wanted to kind of lead off with today are a couple of updates on the ongoing work, like I said, that we have in progress with ICANN Org. First off, the amendment text around using the Bulk Registration Data Access to integrate registrar level information into DAAR, we have heard from Russ that ICANN Org anticipates sharing a proposal back sometime the week of March 14. So that's the week that immediately follows this ICANN meeting we work. We're expecting to get a proposal back after our discussion with them, thinking now, it's three weeks ago at a drop-in call when we discussed the language and what we need out of that amendment. We're also expecting to get the amendment text related to the RDAP SLAs and the amendment to the Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement sometime next week. Karla sent an e-mail to that working group a little bit earlier. No, it wasn't early this week. It was at the end of last week, confirming that they're still working on it and they expect to get it to us after ICANN73.

Similarly, the Roles and Responsibilities team that's been working with ICANN on data processing terms, we had some conversations with Russ about getting a reply to some questions that we had raised over e-mail with them a few weeks ago at this point. I want to say it was in January. And we've talked to them about potentially getting

the group's back together, so CPH and ICANN shortly following ICANN73, this meeting to kind of talk about what the next steps are going to be in and what the path forward on that is going to look like.

So the shortened version of that kind of lengthy update is that we have a lot of work and a lot of updates that we're anticipating immediately following this ICANN meeting. So I'm just encouraging everyone to be prepared to dig into that because I think we're going to see a lot more movement on some things that we've been working on for a while.

Does anyone have any questions or any comments about any of those specific items before we transition into a wrap-up discussion about our priorities? All right. Then I think we can move on to this next item.

So as you know, we started this exercise a few weeks ago, in part prompted by the Board's question to the ICANN community for all of its meetings during the ICANN73 week. It's been asking community groups what our priorities are for this calendar year for 2022. So we started that discussion within our group and the registrars have also kind of been similarly engaging in their group. We're planning to talk about that with the Board today. But on recommendation of our ExCom members, we thought it would be good to kind of expand this discussion and also have our own kind of internal working priorities for this calendar year. So that when we're considering new things that come up as we meet week to week or every other week, there's some guiding principles to keep us on track as we work our way through the year.

So, we have pulled together some of those thoughts into a Google document. And really, this is just an opportunity to open the floor and see if there's anything from those priorities that we want to discuss anything that maybe is unresolved or concerns that people want to address, both with what we plan to talk about with the Board later today, and then also our own internal priorities.

While I give folks a minute to think about it, put their hands up, I'll just briefly recap what we plan to talk about with the Board later today. And those fall into three categories, which we're thinking about them in three groups. One is the priorities for our own stakeholder group actions in 2022. That revolves around continuing our work on DNS abuse mitigation, continuing to collaborate with other community groups, to identify new areas of work on the DNS abuse issue that can help meet their needs and help just address this problem overall.

The second category is the priorities for the Contracted Party House in working with ICANN in 2022, and those overlap with a lot of the announcements that we led the call with. So finalizing the language around the RDAP SLAs in that amendment, finalizing the amendment related to the BRDA specification, and then executing the actual amendment and going through all the steps that are needed to make that contractual amendment happen. Then also a reaching agreement on data processing terms and what the next steps are going to be for those terms between ICANN Org and the contracted parties.

Then finally, the last group is the priorities for the ICANN community, so community-wide work for 2022. That involves having the

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

community representatives group identify members of the IRP omnibus Standing Panel and really kind of getting that effort underway. It's taken some time to really get going, but making sure that the group of volunteers that has been convened on that starts their work is able to make some meaningful progress with the support of ICANN Org on that.

The second one is finalizing the Policy document for the Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team, publishing that for public comments sometime this year, keep that work kind of going and starting to wrap up. Then also making sure that ICANN Org completes the Operational Design Phase for the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures in a timely manner and engages with the community to ensure that all the milestones are met in order to avoid further delays in the launch of future gTLD rounds.

So that's kind of the overview of our priorities. When we are talking to the Board about them today, I would love it if other folks from this group from the Registrars as well, and we'll talk about that in our next meeting with the Registrars. But is there anyone from the Registry Stakeholder Group who feels particularly passionately about any of these and wants to introduce them or explain them to the Board? We definitely have the opportunity to do that. So it doesn't always have to just be myself or the other ExCom members in front of the Board speaking. So just know that that opportunity is open. We'd love it if other folks wanted to put their hands up and get involved in that conversation.

All right. Does anyone have any questions and/or is there anything that anyone wants to kind of refine or discuss about those priorities and how we're going to be engaging in that conversation with the Board later today? All right. You guys are a quiet bunch this morning, or morning for where I am. Sure, it's afternoon and evening other places in the world. All right, so that's fine.

You guys, the Registry Stakeholder Group members all have the link to the Google Doc. So feel free to give that one last look. Otherwise, I think we're in pretty good shape. I think we maybe have exhausted this topic. So with that then, I don't think there's any need to delay further. We can go ahead and dive into the updates and the policy work that's underway, starting with—let me just see if Dennis is with us today.

DENNIS TAN: I'm here.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yep. Dennis here. So we'll start off with Dennis with an update on how the IDN EPDP work is going.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Sam. Hello, everyone. Good morning, afternoon, evening, wherever you might be. So on IDN EPDP, the working group is working in a number of questions related to the application process for variant TLDs. Before I say anything for it, just to frame what the work is doing.

When the charter was being drafted, there was certain expectations that the SubPro IRT was going to be working, ongoing work, and therefore, the IDN EPDP will work in tandem with the IRT of the SubPro in order to finalize some of the items the SubPro started and the IDN EPDP will need to finalize. That's not the case, and therefore, the IDN EPDP, while it's working through certain assumptions that what SubPro recommendations are going to be adopted and at a certain point implemented, we are working with certain assumptions. So I just wanted to get out of the way.

Again, going back to the questions on the IDN EPDP is working now is the application. So what we're looking at here is several aspects of an application process for variants of TLD labels. First one, single characters that have been a long ask for community, especially those scripts where a single character isn't conveyed a meaning. For example, Han script which is using Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. Single category, single ideogram, it means that will work. So SubPro already recommended that those type of scripts could be allowed for single category IDNs but the IDN EPDP needs to answer and put some guardrails framework on how that can happen.

All the aspects that we're talking about the application window, in terms of how do TLD variant labels can be applied for that. Can they be applied for on a rolling basis, or they need to wait for a window in order to apply?

Application fees, what is going to be the pricing structure, if you will, for applying for variant labels? So on one hand, you have nominal

fees, on the other hand, you have full 100% application fees. Those are the options.

Last but not least, how do you memorialize these arrangements, meaning from a contract standpoint, agreements? Do we need independent single agreements for each one of the TLD labels that form a set? Or can there be any other type of arrangement in order to, again, effectuate the legal part of these relationship of variant labels? So those are all the questions that right now are implied with the IDN EPDP. We, the members of the Registries Stakeholder Group in the IDN EPDP are looking at the options and we're putting together our ideas in order to bring those options to the full membership and then seek guidance as to from a stakeholder group, what was going to be our position towards the work for working group. So there's that.

Just looking at the chat, Jeff—oh, okay. So yeah, he's going back to the question about the IRT. Yes. And Maxim is giving his opinion about the pros and cons of multiple, single RA. So those are the questions and the options that we are weighing in. Again, the small group of registry representatives in the working group will put something together for the full membership so that we can discuss as a stakeholder. I'll stop there. I'm happy to take any questions.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Dennis. Does anyone have any questions for Dennis? Or do any of the other members of the IDN EPDP have anything that they want to add or additional context to Dennis's update? All right. Thanks for that, Dennis. Just, again, to reiterate

something that Dennis said. The representatives on that IDN EPDP are going to be coming back to the full stakeholder group for input on some of these topics in the pretty near future. So we'll be on the lookout for that and we'll get ready to engage and provide some input to help guide those discussions in that EPDP.

All right. Next we have an update on the ongoing work of the Accuracy Scoping Team, and I believe Marc Anderson is going to lead that update.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi, Sam. Do you hear me okay?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yes, we can.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay, great. So yes, I'll read the Accuracy Scoping Team update on behalf of Sophie and myself. The Accuracy Scoping Team is continuing our work. We had our ICANN73 meeting yesterday, in fact. The focus of that meeting was to review the different options that had been submitted to date for how to potentially measure accuracy, which is one of the tasks given to the scoping team to consider ways in which accuracy can be measured, to try and get a barometer or current snapshot of what the current state of gTLD registration data accuracy is. Noting one of the things in our charge from the GNSO Council was

the fact that the IRS system which had previously been running has been shut down or hasn't been run since GDPR went into force.

So I thought that was a good discussion. It was great opportunity to review the options that have been submitted. It's great that the group and leadership was able to take it into account, the suggestions that we'd previously raised.

One of the things that we, the Registry representatives, had suggested is the possibility of doing a survey of registrars, asking registrars on a voluntary basis additional information that can help inform. Sophie in particular has been working on possible questions that we can propose, questions that can be done without the need for a data processing agreement, questions that would be around non-personal information or data that's an aggregate rather than specific and personal information that would require additional contracts or hurdles to jump through.

So that's how our meeting went. A lot of focus on getting through our first two tasks that we've been assigned, which are sort of foundational for the work of understanding the current situation when it comes to accuracy, which will help inform the rest of our work and any potential follow-on work that the Council may choose to undertake.

Lastly, I do want to share an update we got from sort of both Becky Burr and ICANN Org around the same time. At the start of the call yesterday, Becky shared with us that the Board in its workshop preceding the ICANN73 meeting asked ICANN Org to develop some

scenarios that they can take to the EDPP around understanding different scenarios whereby ICANN might get access to either full or partial gTLD registration data for the purposes of understanding or researching or reporting on the accuracy of gTLD registration data.

I think this was viewed as encouraging step. I think that we're looking forward to seeing what scenarios ICANN Org comes up with. Michael Palage in his capacity as chair, asked that the scoping team get the opportunity to review and potentially provide feedback on those scenarios before ICANN proceed to that outreach with EDPP, which I think is a great idea. And so this is encouraging and I think we're all looking forward to seeing those scenarios and providing input on them. So I think that's all I have. Sam, back over to you, if there are any questions or follow up.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Marc. Does anyone have any questions for Marc, or do any of the other members involved in the Accuracy Scoping Team have anything they want to add? Okay. I think that we're good on that. You're getting some kudos for the good update there, Marc. I think we'll all be interested to continue to see how this request progresses and how the work moves forward. So thank you for that.

Next, we're going to get an update on the Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team. And for that one, we're going to hand it over to Beth.

BETH BACON: Hi, folks. Just a quick update for IRT. We were making some really good progress there. It's been kind of a bit of a slow go, but it's been substantive work the whole way through. So we are hoping to come to a close pretty quickly. We went from a whole bunch of comments in our One Doc, as Dennis calls it, to really narrowing that down and cleaning things up to some focused issues. We also got some feedback from the Board's meeting, I guess it was a week and a half, maybe two weeks ago on Rec 12, which was an outstanding ask from them. So that was really great and we were able to move forward on that.

You should be seeing next week a timeline coming out. The public comment is currently targeted for Q3 of this year. I think that one of the larger developments with regards to the public comment process is that the IRT has discussed it and they're open to moving forward with that public comment without waiting for the output of the Roles and Responsibilities Team which is working on the DPA. Not saying that folks won't see the DPA but it's certainly a separate recommendation from the report, so they aren't required to be tied together and we don't want to hold up the public comment on the consensus policy to the extent we don't have to.

So that's the update there. It's again really good progress. I do want to give some shout outs to Dennis and his team on ICANN who have been really powering through and the attention to detail has been great, along with our other community partners on the IRT. So I think we've done we've done good work with a tough ask. So I look forward to public comment on that soon.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Beth. I'm sure everyone who's been involved in that IRT and been working on this for quite a while now is excited that you guys are getting close to the end of the road, that the finish line is in sight. I know a number of you guys have been actively involved. So I appreciate all the work there.

Does anyone have any questions for Beth or any other comments about the work of the IRT and how that's progressing? All right. I'm not seeing any. Then the last one we'll go to here is over to Donna Austin for an update on how the CSC Review Team is progressing.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hey, Sam, can you hear me okay?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yes. Coming through loud and clear, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, great. So the CSC Effectiveness Review is making some pretty good progress. We've had a couple of conversations with the CSC itself. And last week, we had a conversation with the PTI Board. This is part of our outreach to just get a sense of how things have been going and whether there's any concerns and things that we should be focused on.

The plan is that following the ICANN meeting—this meeting—we'll start to draft a report that will be published for public comment. And during the public comment process, we will conduct a webinar where there will be opportunity for community input. Or review the report, an opportunity for community input. Initial findings of the review, nothing surprising, the PTI continues solid performance. The CSC itself has been working really well for the last probably five years since it was set up. There are a few things that we've kind of honed in on with this review. And some of it, anyone that was around at the time that the CSC was set up, the idea was to make the job boring, for one of a better word, and non-controversial, and I think we've certainly achieved that objective. But the other thing we are concerned about is initially when the CSC was set up, there was a lot of work developed around governing documents and processes and things like that. So the CSC was relatively busy and doing interesting things. And now much of the work is made on a monthly basis and just review IANA's performance against the SLAs that are in their contract with ICANN, so that there is an element of repetition and boredom in that task. That means that in the future could be a little bit difficult to get people to sign up to be on the CSC.

So that's one of the things we're looking at to see if there's any way, any possibility that we could come up with recommendations to address that issue, such as the CSC only needs to meet every six weeks to go through that process or maybe there's some other things that we can factor in. So that's where we are. The CSC Review Team is a pretty small team. Jonathan and I represent from the Registry Stakeholder

Group. We have Brett Carr from the CSC, who is the liaison. And we have two members from the ccNSO. We've just had one replacement. But it's a small review team and we're making good progress. So thanks, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks very much for that, Donna. Thanks for the work you and Jonathan are doing to represent the stakeholder group on that review team. And to your point about the review team considering things like the cadence of the recurring CSC meetings, there's a note from Jeff in the chat that one thing that review team could be considering is whether quarterly would even work. Do you want to respond, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Just looking for something to eat. Just on that note, Jeff, I think one of the things that we are very conscious of is that important role that the CSC fulfills. I think if we went to quarterly meetings, I think we could potentially undermine the importance of the CSC. I'd also note that like everybody else in the pandemic setting, the CSC hasn't had the opportunity to meet face to face in the last two years. I think if we had a situation where they're meeting quarterly and as new people coming into the CSC, you wouldn't have the same kind of level of cohesion within the CSC. So that's what some of the other things that we're conscious of. I think the important thing is not to lose sight of the important role that the CSC fulfills, and ensuring that it is a cohesive

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Donna. Good points there. You're actually reminding me that one of our stakeholder groups, CSC representatives, his term is ending this year. So to Donna's point about the cadence of meetings, making sure people are continued to be involved in this important function, we are going to be seeking out a stakeholder group member to be appointed to the CSC starting later this year. So please just be on the lookout for that, if you are interested in it or if there's anyone from your respective Organizations who may be interested and willing to fill this role. Like Donna said, it is very important. We need to make sure it's staffed. So stay tuned for the call for volunteers on that one.

All right. So the last update or last item that we were going to cover during this portion of the agenda was an update on the other PDP that's actively underway, and that is on the Transfer Policy. However, due to scheduling being what it is, the Transfer Policy is actually having their meeting right now. So instead, we're going to push that update to the wrap-up session later today, again, last meeting slot of the day. Well, we'll circle back to that.

On the Transfer PDP, I will just note for folks that one of our reps from the stakeholder group, Barbara Knight has had to step back. She's still going to be an observer of that PDP. So she's not totally out of the game just yet but Rick Wilhelm has very graciously volunteered to step in to that role.

Actually, I'm just realizing we did not put an update from the IGO EPDP on here, but there's no reason that we can't. So if Chris Disspain is with us, if you want to give an update about that work, we definitely have time in the agenda, but no pressure to put you on the spot or anything.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm happy to. Can you hear me okay?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yes, we can.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, excellent. See, now I know my headset is working. Hi all. Very briefly, the first draft of the final report has gone out to the team. We are meeting on the 14th. That's our next meeting, which that's the call for redlines, call for red flags, call for I-can't-live-withs. Not currently expecting any but that doesn't mean there won't be any. And then it's the consensus call. And then if there are any minority reports, they would need to be in and the current goal is to complete it by our deadline, which is the 4th of April. So in fact, I'm hoping that our last meeting will be on the 28th of March and that we'll be able to file it with the GNSO on the 4th of April. As I said, it's looking okay right now, but that doesn't mean one will collapse in a heap between now and then. That's it. I'm happy to answer any questions.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Chris. I'm crossing my fingers for you that it certainly doesn't collapse in the heap between then and then. You guys are able to finish—

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I have all the things that it's possible to cross. So therefore, yes, me too.

SAM DEMETRIOU: For sure.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Anyone have any questions for Chris? All right. Then thanks for that. Okay. With that, I think we can turn the agenda over to our GNSO councilors. Kurt, Maxim, and Sebastien, whatever order you kind of want to take the next portion of the agenda in, it's up to you.

KURT PRITZ: There. Funny unmute button. I'll start off on behalf of Seb and Maxim. I was going to start by saying I hate following Donna because she's so competent and well spoken. But luckily, Chris stepped in and saved the day. Just kidding.

So our agenda for this meeting is this: the Council activities during the current ICANN meeting, which include a meeting with the GAC, a meeting with the Board, and an upcoming meeting with ALAC. The Council has spawned several small teams discussing important issues. I'm going to call on participants in those small teams to provide a status or update, and then give a preview of the upcoming meeting. The way this agenda is laid out, it's going to lead to some redundancies. We'll probably talk about the SSAD ODA. Several times we'll talk about the SubPro ODP several times. And so we'll just try to manage that the best we can and so on.

So first recap of the ICANN meeting activities to date. We met with the GAC. I need to minimize something here. So on the GAC's mind were the ODPs. First on the SSAD and the status we provided through Seb was that, well, I don't know exactly how to run this, but the GAC was brief that the small team was formed to answer the quick three questions of the Board. Clarifying questions were sent not to the Board but to ICANN on the content of the ODA, identifying inconsistencies and blanks between the recommendations in ODA and there was discussion of a pilot. We got some positive feedback on the idea of a pilot. Seb, do you have anything else that you want to add on the briefing to the GAC on the SSAD ODA?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No. You said at all. I think that—and Marc will appreciate—we need to be very careful about the fact that the small team has only started. We've met twice, spent most of their time deciding what we would be

tasked with, and looked at none of the substance. So what we're reporting on now is the result of information gathering. We've given everybody two weeks to basically reread the ODA, pick up any clarifying questions they may have, first thoughts on the Board's questions or ideas. But we have discussed none of this. So that's basically what we're reporting. We're working on it, we're part of it, but nothing has been discussed, nothing has been decided.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Seb. Jeff, brief the GAC on the SubPro ODP work and the GAC is focusing on their GAC advice from Helsinki. The GAC particularly wanted to know how the public interest aligns with the next round. In particular, the GAC seems to think that the ODP will confirm that the next round will serve the public interest or at least hope it will. That raised the concern in my mind that the purpose of the ODP is to gauge the cost and the rest of the program and not to identify cost benefit or public interest serving or anything like that. So I don't know if we're headed for a little bit of a train wreck there.

We also talked about pulling forward certain IRT tasks, and we're going to talk more about that later. I think Jeff will tell us to inform the GAC deliberations and they were okay with that. Jeff, do you have anything else to add about the briefing to the GAC, if you can separate the briefing to the GAC and the briefing to the Board and the other briefings you're giving?

JEFF NEUMAN: No, think I think you provide accurate update. The GAC seems interested in working with us if we do future work.

KURT PRITZ: Yes. Okay. The GAC wanted to discuss the small group work on abuse, and Mark Datysgeld and Paul McGrady lead that group. They primarily talked about how the Council could contribute to the DNS abuse discussion and take action without endless process, which they defined as the PDP. So to me, listening to that, I sort of took heart that they, the leadership of that group is not scaring it in that direction, but we might talk about that later in the meeting. And the first step that the DNS Abuse group has taken is to do outreach to other parts of the ICANN community. The GAC was happy to hear that and will respond to the DNS abuse questions.

The IGO Curative Protections work was brought up. A few jokes were made about how long the long-standing issue has been long standing, and that Chris is chairing and we just heard from him, so I think we're up to date there. Then the issue of accuracy came up. It was on the agenda but the GAC really had questions for the Board linked to access to registration data rather than accuracy. So that was kind of a brief comment.

And then on closed generics, we'll hear more about this later. But the Board has written to the GAC and the GNSO Council to work out a solution to the closed generics dilemma. So the Board has chosen to not make a decision about this but rather send it to the GAC and the

GNSO. This is another area where this presentation is sort of redundant. So we'll talk about that in a little bit.

Excuse my voice. There's a few slides here about the Board Council meeting that just occurred an hour ago. So beware of typos in these slides. Seb provided the small team scope and status and the Board response. Do you want to just take us through these bullets or disagree with them, if you think, Seb, or you want me to read them?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No. I'm happy also to go through, but I think a lot of people here were also on the Board call. So probably would have heard me saying what I don't need to repeat. One thing and as we're reiterating through in the same topics, it gives me an opportunity to remember something I forgot to say before. I think one thing interesting that came out of this call—and it will reappear on a number of topics from the Board but also from the Council—is to have more direct conversations, not wait for the other ICANN to have our formal meetings and to try to do this on a number of topics. It'll be relevant also on modifying consensus policy, it will be relevant on the SubPro ODP. It will be relevant on a number of topics, where the Board has said maybe we need to sit together and do these things. Trying to reproduce online, but we used to do in hallways at ICANN.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Seb. Are there any questions about this, this part of the Board Council meeting? As Seb said, many of you were on it. Amr?

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Kurt. Yeah. Just on the last bullet, this was something I was hoping to raise before I saw it on the slide. But regarding the proposed pilot that ICANN is hoping to undertake as opposed to launch a full-fledged SSAD, I think that last bullet speaks to what I wanted to say in a way. Just so that we're all on the same page, it would be helpful to understand what the purpose of the pilot would be. My understanding is that the pilot would be limited to some kind of ticketing system that would count on disclosure requests. I see Seb shaking his head. I'm glad I asked then because then he can correct my understanding.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Your understanding is not wrong and I think that it shared amongst some people. But let's be super clear, we have not discussed this. So it could be anything from, at some point, a conversation with the Board. I believe it was Herb suggesting almost running this on an Excel sheet, all the way to where Göran is suggesting of splitting the problem in two and having essentially a ticketing system. None of this has been discussed. All of this needs to be discussed before we—it's not like we've agreed or anything about any specific type of pilot. That's why I kept it very, very vague. It's a discussion to be had. It's absolutely a discussion to be had.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Seb. That's really helpful. I look forward to those discussions, especially on determining what the purpose of a potential pilot might

be. Because if we do proceed or if ICANN proceeds as Göran, for example, has suggested, then the pilot wouldn't necessarily be serving the same purpose that the EPDP team came up with in terms of the full blown SSAD. So the purpose of that pilot would be great. What kind of participation is required from contracted parties as well would be great and as well as what the perceived next steps might be. If we do run this pilot, what are the indicators that succeeded, what are the indicators that have failed, and what would it mean in terms of next steps in both scenarios. So I just want to bring that up really just to maybe flag what some of our councilors might suggest in terms of future discussions. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If I may again, also in terms of timeline that we've given, the small team is activated only for a short span of time. I said end of March, expecting some kind of a return to Council end of March. I don't know then that span of time we will have resolved everything. The result of our work might be yes, we want to pilot, but then the borders of that pilot still need to be discussed and agreed and send that off to somebody else to figure out. But yeah, absolutely. Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks. I think Göran made it clear that he was not supporting a pilot or thinking about a pilot that his job was to concentrate on the SSAD as designed by the EPDP team unless he was given other orders. There you go.

We next discussed the SubPro ODP. In late Friday night, the Board sent a letter to the GAC and the GNSO Council to collaborate on the issue—nice typing there—of closed generics. It's a fairly terse letter, but with the promise that ICANN or the Board would provide a framework intended to narrowly tailor the effort. So provide some sort of bumpers around that. Jeff, let's just talk about these first couple of bullets first. Does anybody have any ideas for a framework that would make this discussion fruitful? I'm sort of at a loss but Jeff is not. So go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I'm not going to help you make it more fruitful because I am pessimistic as well. One of the things that we had hoped and the GNSO Council leadership has said to the ICANN Board before they sent this letter, because they knew that this letter was coming, was that the Board should indicate what its views were on closed generics before any work were to begin so that it could set the stage for a very narrow area. Because if it's just as open as the Board letter is, like just meet and agree on closed generics, then it's not going to have a different result than SubPro. It just won't. But if the Board came to the group and said, "Okay. Look, we don't want to outlaw closed generics completely. We want a limited set of circumstances where closed generics will be allowed if they serve a public interest goal, for example. I'm just throwing that out there. That's what the GAC advice was, but it's just an example, right? If that were in the framework that comes to the group, then perhaps there is more of a chance of success because you won't have some of the issues that we had in SubPro,

which is that some people were saying everyone should be able to get a closed generic no matter what, and other people were saying, "No way no how closed generics should never be allowed." Period. If you can eliminate the extremes and then provide a narrow framework for a discussion where the Board indicates that it wants to allow closed generics in some way that would have set a better or would have enabled a group to have better success. But if it stays the way it is with some just vague—have a discussion, it's not going anywhere. So I'm hoping that this framework that ICANN Org is supposed to provide soon will narrow it down.

KURT PRITZ: Well, see, you did have ideas.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks.

KURT PRITZ: One interesting comment that was made by a GAC member, seemingly on behalf of the GAC, was that serving the public interest for the new gTLD program was a different level or a lower bar than serving the public interest for our closed generics. So there's varying degrees of serving the public interests, which will or might complicate the discussion or not.

Then Jeff can talk better to the next two bullets where we talk to the Board about pulling forward some work. Do you want to talk about that a little bit, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So aside from the closed generic issues, there are some issues that are distinct issues that may or may not have an impact on the ODP, but certainly is work that is outstanding and needs to be done. So, examples that Kurt has up on the slide are applicant support and appeals. There's also the registry service provider pre-evaluation program and a couple other topics where we know that further work needs to be done. We know that because the SubPro final report and the recommendations adopted said some further work needs to be done by an implementation team. So the discussion was how can we get started on some of this work? As Kurt indicates, Göran has sort of a lukewarm reaction to this. Göran basically thinks still that the ODP will, after a year, shorten the time to implementation and most of us kind of recognize that that can't be true. The reason it can't be true is because the earliest the Board can vote on the ODA is if everything is completed on time, it would be January, which would be almost two years after the delivery of the final report. So if that's the point in which you start implementation, there's no way that that would shorten the time it takes to do everything, write a guidebook, get vendors, build a system, do all that stuff. So I think Göran is still holding out some mistaken belief that the ODP is going to shorten timelines. But be that as it may, the rest of the Board, including the voting members of the Board, all believed that having discussions on

these topics are a good idea. They think that this is something we should encourage. In fact, Avri—she's the Board shepherd of this issue—had asked that hopefully by ICANN74, we could lay out the work that needs to be done, how it would be done, and be able to further this discussion. So the Council will be having a discussion on this tomorrow. So I guess I'll stop there. Thanks.

KURT PRITZ: Good stopping. Thanks, Jeff. The Board asked the Council. It's questions that they're asking everyone, but this all occurred in the last seven minutes of the call, what are your key priorities? Sam, go ahead, please.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Kurt. I don't mean to break up your flow. Per the last topic, I wanted to just note that we put that on the agenda for today's call for some interaction and to get to give the opportunity for our members to provide you guys as the councilors some feedback and direction on exactly what Jeff just laid out. So should we go through that now? Should we open the floor and get the feedback on that topic of the question of ongoing work that could be done in conjunction with the SubPro ODP? Or do you want to just wrap up the recap of the meetings and then we go back to that?

KURT PRITZ: Well, we could talk about that now.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay. Jeff opened this—I think it was on the last drop-in call, if I'm not mistaken. It may have been the biweekly that happened the week before that. But I think this is, especially in light of the fact that the Council is going to be discussing this in more detail tomorrow, we were really hoping that this call would be a good opportunity to hear back from members on what Jeff has teed up kind of that approach that's been laid out. So, folks, this is the opportunity to weigh in here and get in the queue and start to make your views known about this.

KURT PRITZ: I'm having trouble raising my screen, my hand. So put me in the queue, please.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay. Thanks, Kurt. Yeah. I can keep an eye on the queue for you at this point, too. I see Beth, and then we'll go back to Kurt.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Sam. Thanks, Kurt and Jeff, for all the info on this. The Council discussion was interesting. Hearing Göran's thoughts was also on process. I think he was kind of leaning into that process point to kind of send it to the Board. So how do we not rule on it? So I think maybe it's the friction there that is giving some people some questions and that we discuss this. I just wanted to flag folks that we did discuss this at some length at the drop-in call. So if you want to refer back to the

notes to see what people said, and then also in the recording, if you have any questions. Jeff wanted some depth.

I think one of the outcomes of that was a little more—and I understand Council is going to discuss this that, Jeff, he teed it up for them to chat about. So that'll be a good information gathering point. I think the only question I have is process-wise, how do we make sure that this doesn't set some sort of precedent where we send things to the Board and then we have to pull them back? I'm all for the collaboration and making this process smoother and understand that SubPro is not something we want to be dragging out and we want to be able to start implementing things. So I'm all for process for efficiency and speed. But yeah, the process question is there. And then also, I think that out of the drop-in call, we just flagged that it might be helpful just for the registries to discuss it and get a better picture for after the Council discusses of the discrete list of things that we think we can work on. You have the applicant support and appeals, I think, but if we could get the list, I think that would really help us shape our conversation and be able to figure out how that team might work, how the discussions might flow and integrate with the existing GNSO processes and things. So again, just kind of a recap of what we discussed on the drop-in call. I think it's still relevant if folks weren't able to meet that, and then just I think some things that would help us get our heads around that. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. So we're going to go to Kurt next, and then we've got a queue of Alan and Jeff.

KURT PRITZ: I think pragmatically to discuss—so I'm going to list these three issues. Applicant support, appeals, and one I left off which was the approval of backend service providers are sort of not only long lead time items but they'll actually inform the ODP that applicant support will come with a set of costs that need to be addressed somehow, and timing of registry backend service providers has to occur before the round starts. So there are certain pragmatic issues both with managing the project within a reasonable—reasonableness is long gone—by a reasonable timeframe. And also, making sure the ODP is competently accomplished. So I kind of lost my sentence there, but taking certain things forward makes a lot of sense. I understand best comment about process, and I think that needs to be worked out since the ODP is a brand new thing. We should think about how it overlaps and with IRT and other processes. That's all I got.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Kurt. Alan?

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much. To be perfectly honest, I think Beth said far more eloquently than I could ever hope to achieve. But what I will add to that is, I mean, I do think that the preservation of the process is kind of an important thing, especially when we're in a position where there

was a new process and the ODP is being inserted into this. I know we will talk about this, I definitely think we should get a list. I think we should have informal collaborations with ODP team. There can be that list that Beth has talked about. And I think that on our own steam, we could possibly do proprietary work, knowing what's coming down the line.

But my one fear is that, number one, I don't want to have to go back to the ODP and say, "Hey, these are things that we're changing." Therefore, the ODP I must consider them specifically. And that could add further delay. I think that was one of the points that Göran made today, that it could actually end up delaying the ODP even more if we were to do it that way, so that we could have those informal collaborations alongside concurrently with the ODP doing its work, do the work ourselves. And then once it gets to the Board, the Board will have the said questions and say, "Hey, we need more input of this." And instead of us starting the process at that point, we can say, "Here's work that we've been doing concurrently knowing these are coming along."

So I think we're being presented with the new beast that is the ODP, and I think we need to work a little bit more, I mean, informally, collaboratively alongside so that we can be prepared for what comes out of it as opposed to just reacting when it happens. I think preserving the process is super important. You're not setting a precedent that that has talked about.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that. Alan. Jeff, over to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. So after the drop-in call, I thought about this a lot more and the precedent. I want to just make the statement that I don't believe we're setting any bad or even any precedent here at all, and I think we are preserving the process and here's how so.

So number one, the final report recommendations itself said that further work needed to be done on these. And so that's the further work that we're talking about being done. It's not like a PDP was done, and then oops, all of a sudden we realize more work needs to be done. The specific tasks that we're working on are specifically what the final report recommendation said needed to be done. And it didn't say timeline of only after the Board approves it, right? It just said, "This work needs to be done by a future team." Now I called it an IRT team because, frankly, before the ODP, that was the only thing that existed.

Number two is I agree with Kurt on the costs on forming the ODP. So this whole issue came up initially because the ODP staff asked some questions about applicant support. It asked us those questions, because it doesn't know how to cost the Applicant Support Program because of those future details that need to be worked out. So if we work on an issue like applicant support, that was Org's way of saying, "Hey, guys, I don't know how much is this going to cost because there's so many important details that you guys need to work on."

The second indirect message by that question was, "And also, you guys said it to be an Implementation Review Team. But an Implementation Review Teams, ICANN staff controls the process. And is this really something you want ICANN staff controlling the process on?" So that's also another question that's behind it. I think that speaks for itself. I think with IRT's, we know that ICANN Org controls that as the final say.

With all of that, this is not going to set a bad precedent at all because of the specific factors. And if anyone tried to say in a future case that wasn't like this one at all, it would be easy to point to the fact that it was called for by the final recommendations. It was work that the Board wanted. It was work that ICANN Org had pointed out needed to be done for them to do the costing. So all of that, it is clear to me that this is really the right thing to do and the work needs to be done. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that context, Jeff. Over to Martin next.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Sam. Probably some repeats in here. I think first of all, we've got to accept that the concept of the ODP is a reasonable one. In practice, it's difficult to see the improvements played out because it's very early in the way that it's been delivered in the SSAD and now for the SubPro. I think it is up to us in the community to try and make this work. There's no point in us sort of saying the ODP doesn't work or we

got to wait right to the end. Because I think that we've got some valuable information that's being passed around now, which says we need some help.

There has been a push for work to be done in parallel so that we can actually support the activities and help produce, I think, a more robust product, the ODA, that the Board will then opine over towards the end of this year.

So one of the things I did like though, Alan, just mentioned the fact that it's got to keep the process in place, got to respect the process. I think that's very important. And I don't think that we're crossing the line in terms of that at all. But I think it's very important to make clear up front that anything that we suggested does fit into the equation of being supportive, finding out more detail that helps them to create the ODA product without actually undoing any of the agreements, the recommendations that are contained within the final report. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Martin. I think you raised a good point towards the end there about maybe knitting this into the Operational Design Phase process that maybe helps get at the concerns Alan had been raising, which I think both have to do with respecting processes. But the larger question of why do we feel so committed to respecting processes, and a big reason for that is transparency and predictability. So that other folks who are involved are able to follow the through line of where some work starts and where it ends up.

I'm almost wondering, as something for our stakeholder group members, something for our councilors to think about or consider is— Beth talked about knowing what these specific topic areas are. I'm wondering if there would be a way to integrate this into the ongoing ODP process. In a similar way as—so far, we've already seen I think it's been two rounds of ICANN Org sending questions back to the Council about the SubPro recommendations and the work there. I wonder if we could devise something similar where there is a lot of clarity about what the topic is, where it comes from, what questions need to be answered or what details need to be filled in, and it comes through a similar consultation process with the Council. Then that way, that opens the door for the Council to convene work parties or work groups or whatever we want to call them, and then provide the output of those in a way that is open, transparent for people to review, it allows us as a stakeholder group to direct and provide our input into whoever our representatives might be. I know that this is really fuzzy. I'm just thinking about this on the fly there. But maybe there's a way to leverage the ODP and work with it, as opposed to either working against it or trying to develop a parallel. Trying to all put this—sorry. I'm really losing the thread here. But put this all together to get at the goal of getting work done in parallel while still respecting the processes that are in front of us.

So apologies if that's super inarticulate. I'm just trying to pull the different views together here and give you guys something to go off of. Beth?

BETH BACON:

I just want to give you a plus one on that. Listening to Jeff and Martin and Alan, I think everyone is saying the same thing or a similar thing in that, let's think about this and make it predictable. I think predictability and efficiency are our bywords if you look back at our registry priorities right now. Making sure that we give very clear guidance, which is something I think ICANN finds actionable that's good for us. It provides efficient movement if we can make sure that we have a predictable process, and we have guardrails around what we think is appropriate here, and then we can discuss those. I think that's the way to—at least, it's structure internal discussion around this and move forward there. I think that having those guardrails, I think, is what you're thinking about is helpful. If we can be efficient and provide good input, that's actionable, then I think that's the best way around for everyone. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Beth. Maxim and then Donna.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I will speak from the operational and I'd say bureaucratic perspective. Before the ODP was introduced, there were no ODP and things worked somehow. Board was informed, I hope so. At least I think it was informed about the potential issues of implementation, etc., because obviously we have signs that it worked like the past round where things were invented on the fly, etc. Effectively, looking from the outside of ICANN, since we do not have very much transparency in the ODP process, maybe it's for the good, I don't know. But it's simple. If

the bureaucratic or operation process consumes times and efforts and doesn't go further, maybe it's a feature of design, maybe something else. It's not very important because you're looking from outside. And since you're not going to be provided enough info to properly understand what's going on, our suggestions might be like poking in the sky with the finger and saying something, "We think it might be this, we think it might be that." Even the process of fine tuning of something in the middle of the process is a bad idea usually.

Unfortunately, since we cannot use any interactions which are not positive, because they're not going to be accepted, we might ask either for more transparency so we can help or to step back and use the previous process. Because all items which were, let's say, used for advertisement of the ODP process like assessment for the Board, etc., it worked somehow, potentially by very same people doing the process. So maybe it's unnecessary complexity added without additional value in the output. It was a pilot, I remind you. It wasn't an approved process which was going to be working for sure. And pilots are like this. If it's not working, you just stop using it. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Maxim. I'm not sure there's a lot of room or ability to stop the ODP that's currently in process. I think that's why looking at ways to leverage the ODP and use the time that the ODP is being done to also accomplish other work and other goals, as Jeff and others have laid out, I think, that's maybe a more constructive way to approach this. Just a thought on that. I see Jeff and then Donna. And then we got to

do a time check because we've got about 13 minutes left for this meeting. Donna, over to you and then over to Jeff.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam. I think one of the things that concerns me about adding additional processes or going back to the GNSO and seeking clarification or whatever is that I don't have a lot of experience with the EPDP and SSAD, but I was certainly part of the SubPro Working Group for five years. That's a lot of time and effort that the community put into a number of distinct issues surrounding SubPro and the next round. I guess my concern is that when we start introducing additional processes that weren't foreseen at the time that we were having a policy discussion, it opens up another opportunity to revisit what the discussion that happened during the PDP and the outcome. So you're creating more opportunities to relitigate something that was probably done to death during the policy development process.

I guess I'm concerned about the complexity that new processes actually add to a reasonably complex process anyway, that is the PDP. And at the end of the day, what's the benefit? Besides the fact that we're adding 12 months or two years, and the outcome isn't going to be all that different from if you'd gone into what we understand is the process of an IRT and not everything out there. I guess my concern is about layers of complexity and is there any tangible benefit in doing that. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Donna. I was about to turn to Jeff but he just lowered his hand. So I will—

JEFF NEUMAN: No, no. Sorry. I just had to switch devices. I apologize.

SAM DEMETRIOU: No problem. Go ahead, Jeff, whenever you're ready.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I hear what Donna's saying and I understand that about adding complexity and tangible outcomes. So obviously, I think that's what I fear about the closed generic issue. And that's why I hope the framework is set up. But for things like applicant support, there are very narrowly tailored areas that the SubPro final recommendations tasked a future group to do. For that, it's not about relitigating anything that SubPro did, it's about doing the work that the final recommendations actually called for. I agree with you that it's always a concern about relitigating issues. But I don't see that as an issue when it comes to work specifically called for by SubPro on the standing SPIRT team. These are all things that if you went to the final recommendations, you could actually draft a charter from those recommendations itself. I hope that helps closed generics, though. I'm just as worried as you are about how that'll just be relitigating everything. But with the other distinct items, I don't believe that it's as big of an issue. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Jeff. I think it is really noteworthy that there is a distinction in the subject matter and the topic areas here. And it gets to a point that Keith has raised in chat, which is the distinction and the differentiation between items that are policy and items that our implementation is pretty critical to the way we do our work, to the way we structure our engagement, to the way the GNSO Council oversees the policy development process. To go back to a suggestion Beth had raised, I think it is going to be really important to understand exactly what topics are up for discussion here. Thank you guys for giving the preview that you did. The applicants, for one, appeals—the last one, I'm forgetting off the top of my head—the RSP, the registry services provider evaluation process. I think it's going to just be something that we probably need to give some more consideration as the individual topics are considered here. I think the SubPro—sorry, I just got distracted by outside. I think the closed generic topic, you're right, it is a unique beast. And it'll be interesting to see how Council and the GAC discuss how to engage in that one. Jeff, one more time?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. On the policy and implementation issue, I think it's a little bit of a distraction. And the reason I think it's a distraction is that ICANN Org asked us a question in Question set two about whether we believed that all of the elements that the SubPro final report indicated for applicant support. They asked us whether we were concerned that any of it involves policy rather than just implementation. Now, we can

get dragged into that fight and just spend the next year arguing with them, "No, it's implementation," and then they come back and say, "No, it's policy." Or we can say without agreeing that this is not implementation, we will take on this work in this small group. So if that's what everybody's worried about, fine. But I just think that we could be a lot more efficient and productive if we not spend another year arguing with Org that this is actually policy. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Point taken there, Jeff. I think the concern that folks—admittedly, the folks who aren't as close to this and aren't as steeped in the specifics, I think the concern is that this could lead to an opening for matters that are policy, to be litigated or debated or worked on outside of the understood processes, and that's what we're trying to guard against. But I take your point about the specific topics and where they fall in that spectrum. I understand what you're getting at them.

We have five minutes left in today's call. We ended up using up most of the time. At this point, I'm going to bring us back together and maybe adjust a little bit on the fly how we approach the wrap-up call later on today. Like we said, we're going to have an update from the Transfer PDP. Also during the wrap-up, if our councilors are available and willing at that point, I think it would be helpful to push off our deep dive and our discussion about the small teams that the council has going on right now. So the ones that are listed out here on the screen in front of you. We've gotten the updates about what these small teams have been working on. What I'd like to do is set aside some time

this afternoon for any input that stakeholder group members want to provide or any questions that our councilors and the folks who are working on the small teams, any input that you'd like from our members or things that people need to be thinking about in the future. So we can come back to you at another biweekly call or drop-in call and things like that. Just basically stuff we need to be thinking about and how we can best support those councilors and the people who are working on those small teams.

We'll do those. We'll do our public comment update. And we'll just do a recap of anything that folks want to cover from our discussion with the Board that's going to be taking place in between. Does that sound good? Councilors, are you available for that last meeting time slot to go through the small teams? Does that work for your schedules?

KURT PRITZ: Yes.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay, excellent. All right. We'll update the agenda so that you guys have it in front of you when we get into that call. Now, I will just pause here and see if there's any other business, anything else anyone wants to raise before we take a short break and then reconvene with the Registrars in a half hour or so. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:
May I just flag for a moment that there are some open public comments and documents for folks to look at. I just want to make sure we say that while we have 77 people on. Guys, way to go. Also, there's one active one, the request for input on the SOI from Karen. So for the Registry members on the call, please go ahead and make some comments and edits and reach out to me if you have any questions or concerns. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:
Thanks very much, Beth. All right. Anything else folks want to get in queue on or air out in the waning three minutes before we break? All right. Then with that, I'm going to wrap us up for this first portion of our meeting. See, hopefully, most of you, if not all of you, at the next call that's coming up in 32 minutes with the Registrars, so the joint CPH call. Then we'll meet with the Board after that, and then we'll reconvene for the wrap-up and the carryover session later on today. Thank you all for your time. Thanks for the good discussion so far. We'll be talking to you. Enjoy ICANN73.

SUE SCHULER:
Thanks, Sam. We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]