
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and CSG
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 - 12:30 to 14:00 AST

WENDY PROFIT: At this point, I'd like to turn it over to my colleague Aaron Jimenez to read the opening welcome script and housekeeping items. Aaron, go right ahead.

Recording in progress.

AARON JIMENEZ: Hello. My name is Aaron Jimenez. Welcome to the joint session with the ICANN Board and the Commercial Stakeholders Group. Please note this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for this session will include six U.N. languages: Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, and English. Click on the "interpretation" icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during the session.

For our panelists, please state your name for the record and the language you will speak. If you are speaking a language other than English, before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu.

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.

Also, please be sure to mute all audible notifications and speak clearly and slowly for our interpreters.

This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the CSG. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience. However, all participants may make comments in the chat. Please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select "Respond to all panelists and attendees." This will allow everyone to read your comment.

To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency and participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask you that you sign into Zoom sessions using our full name. For example, first name and last name or surname. To rename your sign-in name for this Webinar, you will need to first exit the Zoom room. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand it over to ICANN Board Chair Maarten Botterman.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, Aaron, for that. And welcome everyone to this public session between the ICANN Board and the Commercial Stakeholder Group.

Mason, everybody, really welcome and look forward to an open discussion about subjects that we all care about, and we've exchanged a couple of subjects. So we've been preparing for that.

But let that not withhold us from doing a good open discussion on things that relate to this and benefit from that.

So over time, you've seen also that with this interaction, we've become more and more informal, is may be the best way of saying it, but also exploring how with respect to the bottom-up multistakeholder model we can best facilitate and work with the community on getting things done together and really look forward to your input on that. That is closely related to the questions the Board asked to you in a positive meeting as well to reflect upon, which are the questions of what are your key priorities and how can we work best on achieving those together and how can we improve ICANN's effectiveness and efficiency with regard to the process of implementation after adoption of a PDP or review recommendations.

You've asked us to start with that and we'll do that. And then after that, look forward to go into the three questions you've been posing to us and whatever else is needed.

With that, Mason, as the current lead in the Commercial Stakeholder Group and leader of the business community, please.

MASON COLE:

Thank you very much, Maarten. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone.

My name is Mason Cole. I'm chair of the BC. It is the BC's turn to chair the CSG for this meeting and for the June meeting as well. So it's a pleasure to kick off this discussion with the Board.

So I want to say thank you, Maarten and Board colleagues, for making time for the CSG as always. I believe we have 90 minutes together, Maarten, so we should have time for a fruitful discussion.

So, yes, Maarten, we deferred to the Board in terms of tackling the Board's questions first. Indeed, what are the CSG priorities and then a discussion on increasing efficiency.

So if I may, I'd like to turn to my colleague Tim Smith, the CSG lead for the business constituency to --

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please allow me to -- I made one little mistake. I am fortunate because we have got a board of 20 people. And on this session, Matthew will be helping to do the support from our side for this.

Matthew? Sorry.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Maarten, that's absolutely perfectly all right. I just wanted to add my welcome to everybody and over to you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Matthew.

So Maarten, Matthew, with your permission, I would like to turn this over to Tim Smith, the CSG representative from the BC, who is going to introduce the topic of CSG priorities for 2022.

Tim, over to you.

TIM SMITH: Thanks very much, Mason. And thanks Matthew and Maarten as well.

As you know, the Commercial Stakeholders Group is made up of the intellectual property constituency, the Internet service providers and connectivity providers constituency, and the constituency that I represent, business constituency.

So while we all have our own individual priorities, we have gathered together as CSG to identify three areas that we feel we can focus on and collaborate with others beyond the CSG in a productive and positive manner.

So I won't go into all of the details because, of course, issues do emerge and change from time to time, but we have three basic themes that, I think, capture the work that we want to do over the coming months, and I'll include a couple of examples along with them.

But to start off, I guess, the three themes or priorities would be having coordinated action with GNSO. Another would be improving access to registration data. And the other would be helping to successfully mitigate DNS abuse.

So, again, these are emerging things. But just as examples having coordinated action with GNSO, we're feeling the completion and implementation of data protection agreement to enable data sharing would be one of the areas that we would look at within GNSO.

For improving access to registration, we want to look at the feasibility of developing a code of conduct, perhaps drafting a code of conduct, as an example and, of course, accuracy scoping would be another area that we would look at.

And then helping to successfully mitigate DNS abuse. We would look to adopt common standards to address abuse, including infringement and content abuse. And also supporting contracted parties' voluntary efforts to address abuse. And, of course, there are frameworks and matters that the contracted parties have worked on.

So that -- those would be a bit of an overview of the three buckets that we're looking at and would welcome any questions regarding that.

Sorry for speaking so fast.

MASON COLE: Maarten, would you like to manage the queue for this, or do you prefer to?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Actually, I hope to leave that to Matthew.

MASON COLE: Please. That will be fine.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Any questions or comments from Board colleagues or others?

GÖRAN MARBY: I have put a quick question in chat. I don't know if this is the time to talk about it.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Göran, you want to elaborate, please do.

GÖRAN MARBY: You made a reference that the agreement with enhance the ability for data sharing. I would be very interested to hear the theory behind that.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Brian, please.

BRIAN KING: This is Brian King for the record. Thanks for the question, Göran.

I didn't put this point together, so someone please correct me if I got this wrong, but, Göran, in response to your question, one way that the data processing agreement, let's call it, would help is if ICANN and the contracted parties were clear that, for one example, ICANN could process WHOIS data that may contain personal data in response to a complaint that the data was inaccurate. So that's one way that that data processing agreement between ICANN and the contracted parties could help with that.

Thanks.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. We can take this in another situation. And I think Becky will go write on it now.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Becky, please.

GÖRAN MARBY: Who happens to be a lawyer as well, and not an armchair lawyer as I am.

BECKY BURR: Oh, you're an armchair lawyer. Okay.

Good morning or afternoon, almost, everybody from Washington, and thanks for having us here.

So I think obviously the question of the data protection agreement is a really important question. There are, as I'm sure you have heard, a few outstanding issues, but I think we have renewed energy and commitment to nailing those down once -- as soon as ICANN73 is over to really looking to put a press on finishing these issues up.

With respect to that last question regarding ICANN's legitimate interest in accessing data, I think there are a couple of things going on. The first is I believe that ICANN does consider that it has a legitimate and proportionate interest to access data in response to a complaint about inaccuracy. I believe that ICANN has exercised that interest and has gained access in connection with various compliance issues. Contracted parties, registrars in particular, do have responsibilities with respect to accuracy.

They are largely, but not exclusively, procedural. In fact, they are required to undertake an investigation in response to complaints about inaccuracy.

The one place where we have concerns about ICANN's ability to access data for accuracy has to do with the proactive kind of work that ICANN was undertaking prior to the effective date of GDPR with the accuracy reporting system. We do think that that was an incredibly valuable tool that we would like to see able to continue with work. And in particular, that's important in the context of the accuracy scoping work that is undertaken.

Right now we are in a situation where we do not have agreement among the various stakeholders with respect to the -- either the nature or the volume of the problem. In other words, what kinds of inaccuracies are there across the dataset and how common are those inaccuracies across the dataset. And we really do need to have a sort of shared understanding about the size and nature of the problem going forward. That is why the Board has asked ICANN org to create a set of very specific scenarios that we can go to the -- or that org can go to the European Data Protection Board with and say under the following circumstances, do we have a legitimate and proportionate interest in access, proactively, bulk data? And the scenarios are intended to make it as easy as possible and as granular as possible in order to get useful

responses from the European Data Protection Board. And so that is something that the Board did discuss this weekend and ICANN org has agreed to take on. And I think that it will help us get a good baseline.

I just want it make one final distinction because somebody's going to say, well, if you have a legitimate and proportionate interest in accessing data when you get a complaint in order to investigate a complaint about inaccuracy, why are you unsure about that in the context of bulk proactive access to data? And I just don't want to spend the next -- the rest of the session talking about GDPR but suffice it to say that the nature of the processing and the kind of analysis that Data Protection Authorities would bring to two very different kinds of processing: one in response to a specific complaint and, on the other hand, proactive analysis of a dataset and processing of data where that has not been flagged as being inaccurate. Those are very different processes under GDPR, and that is why the bulk access issue, for purposes such as the accuracy reporting system, are unable to proceed at this point.

GÖRAN MARBY: May I add something?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, please do, Göran. Yep.

GÖRAN MARBY: Sometimes we sort of zero out in the fringes of discussion. I mean, we are actually trying -- the Board is trying to shortcut this and make it go faster, because one of the problems is, of course, as you know, that it's not up to ICANN. Even if we came up that we think we have a legitimate purpose, the contracted parties do actually have to agree. And if some of them disagrees, we're going to end up in court because then we will go to court ask tell them we think this is right, and then the court will actually decide.

And as you can understand, in the current circumstance, when it comes to privacy, that's going to be a very long process, which I imagine could even end up in the European Court of Justice.

There are, indeed, (indiscernible) writings that the role of the Data Protection Board is to give us advice about this. So instead of 1500 individual data owners making their own judgment of what is right or wrong, we get from the Data Protection Authorities the ability to say this is right or wrong.

So it's a shortcut rather than something else, because we can debate endlessly about certain things in the ICANN community,

but in the end, it's the Data Protection Board who makes that decision. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Göran.

Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yes, thank you. Lori Schulman for the record.

I have a follow-up question to this comment, Becky, and to Göran as well. We're excited that there's motion being taken on this and that to the extent we can find answers, hopefully we get them, but I'm a bit cynical. Because my understanding of the feedback from the European Data Protection Board from maybe even as long ago as two years now, is that ICANN set hypotheticals without having an actual framework. The Board expressed some concern about providing legal advice rather than on opining on a program that was either about to be launched or launched.

And my concern is we would go through this effort, and the Data Protection Board itself might look at this, again, as sort of coming for legal advice rather than asking for advice on a program that

we have fashioned and believe implementable about are now seeking the assurances we need.

So do we have any indications that this kind of communication would be welcome and acted upon to the degree of comfort that ICANN would need for its risk management?

GÖRAN MARBY:

May I comment before Becky? In reality, there are two alternatives. Either we go through the Data Protection Board, or we do it in court. That's the only one to get legal clearance of this, and I think you agree with me on that. ICANN cannot sort of -- ICANN cannot be the interpreter of the law, (indiscernible), because if I was a contracted party, and I'm not taking them in any way saying they should do something, but that it will be, because there are fees involved in this one. So that's one.

And the other thing is the real holdup has been that the Europe -- the Data Protection Board asked us to go through one single Data Protection Board -- data protection for it and that was the one in Belgium. And if you remember, the Belgium said to us in a meeting with them they don't think that they should make this assessment; it should go together through with the European Commission. And, unfortunately, so far the European Commission has not helped us to proceed those questions. So it's

a little bit stuck. And I'm not -- there are so many things going on, but that is actually where we got stuck.

Remember, we have received advice from the Data Protection Board. That was what saved the WHOIS in the first place. So I know there are many who at the time said to us we will never get any advice at all. But we did get advice that actually saved the WHOIS, had the permission to have the WHOIS as long as we did not disclose data. And I wonder if we should reread what the Data Protection Board actually said there.

So we have been successful. We were actually among the first ones in the world who got it right from the Data Protection Board. I hope that answers your question.

The question is I need your help to convince the European Commission to help us with this.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Göran.

And I think we probably need to move on to the other question.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Lori, you are correct that we need to have -- in order to get answers from the European Data Protection Authority in this regard, we need to articulate the circumstances under which the data would be processed, what data, who's processing it, for what purpose, where et cetera. That's what the scenarios are intended to keep out and undertake. So I think that's clear.

And then also somebody mentioned risk, which I assume is a reference to data protection agreements. And I just want to point out in this regard that there are a couple of ways of doing this.

One, we very much hope to resolve the negotiations with the contracted parties regarding roles and responsibilities in a holistic way. But the other -- an additional approach is with respect to this particular data processing, processing for purposes of research and analysis related to accuracy, it's entirely possible to enter into a narrowly tailored data protection agreement with the contracted parties that just focuses on this process itself. So we're well aware of those issues and looking at the most efficient way to resolve them.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Becky.

I just wanted to offer Jim Galvin. Jim, if you want to come in because I know you did. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, thanks, Matthew. And thanks to Tim and your list of priority topics. I didn't want to let your observation about mitigating DNS abuse as a priority topic go by without at least acknowledging that it certainly is a shared issue obviously in the community and with the Board and wanted to assure you of that.

We're obviously going to have more discussion about this later, so I just wanted to acknowledge that at this point. I don't want to take over the priority discussion yet so we will get into more details later. But we do appreciate the significance of it and certainly enjoy the community's continued discussion and wanted you to know that, yes, it is a priority of the Board. And we can get into some details later in all of the good work that is going on as well as where we need to go. So thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Jim.

So, Mason, should we go to the second question from the Board?

MASON COLE: Ready if you are, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Absolutely.

MASON COLE: Okay. Kicking that off from our side is Brian King.

BRIAN KING: Brian King for the record. Sorry, Mason, I was typing my support for Göran in the chat, which I like to do every opportunity I get. Remind me where you wanted me to cover this, Mason?

MASON COLE: So we're talking about increasing effectiveness within ICANN following establishment of policy and proceeding toward implementation.

So I think the IPC had some ideas to lead that off. You and Susan wanted to take on that subject.

BRIAN KING: Yes, please. This is Brian for the record again. I would like to defer to Susan to kick us off, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Brian. This is Susan Payne for the record.

Thanks very much for this question. We do really appreciate this and appreciate the opportunity to make some suggestions.

And we do have a number of thoughts on this. They are suggestions. None of them are intended as a criticism, so please don't hear them as such.

Oh, sorry, I'm being told to speak slower.

And we do recognize that we don't have all the answers by any means. Some of our suggestions may be unworkable or may even be things that already happen and that we're just not aware of because we don't necessarily know what happens internally within Org and the Board.

But, you know, with all of those caveats, one of the -- we feel that the process of, where possible, shortening the timing between a review team recommendation or a PDP recommendation, the adoption of that and the commencement of the implementation work itself will itself drive efficiency.

This is -- this is not a criticism of the ODP, which has obviously been sort of inserted into that interim period but not all outputs go through a PDP. So we are thinking in particular this sort of latter set.

Essentially, the longer the time there is between recommendation adoption and actual implementation commencing, the greater the loss of the institutional memory. So we have staff members leaving, community members changing jobs, all of our memories, particularly those of us who are that bit older, get, you know, less clear. And so we feel that this leads then to a longer ramp-up for the implementation review team. There's greater risk of re-litigation. There's just general forgetfulness about how the working group came to a particular position. And so we do feel that where at all possible we do need to strive for shortening that time period.

That's obviously, you know, not always easy to do. And I think this is one of these areas where we all have a part to play. The community needs to all consider whether new work efforts really need to happen now so that we can start trying to reduce the pipeline or the backlog and finish what we've started where possible.

We need, I think, to look at whether there are any unnecessary work stages and one area that I personally thought maybe -- may allow for a bit of a shortening of time period is do we really need a staff report on the PDP output? The PDPs are generally drafted with a summary. Undoubtedly the Board members will read the whole report. Do we really need an effort that is assigned to staff to kind of draft their own summary instead of just the full report being sent immediately to the Board and, therefore, cutting out maybe a month or so, and some work.

And then, you know, can we all stick to timelines or at least the anticipated timelines in the PDP manual, including that of the Board review. And maybe we need a triage exercise, if you like, of sort of does it need an ODP, yes or no. If it's no, can it be fast tracked to a Board decision so it's more in line with the PDP manual timing?

In terms of sort of new work, we feel that there's a need particularly on related work efforts to think about not starting off a new PDP until the efforts on previous work have been completed and implemented.

Obviously, it's not always practical with something like the first EPDP. There are conditional efforts. And so you can't really say that you can't start phase 2 because phase 1 isn't finished. But we

think that there are some where that is the case. And one example would be RPMs where we do feel that there's -- that there's an argument not to start phase 2 until we've implemented phase 1. The same community members are going to -- would be the ones who would be working, and we're already stretched. There are expert policy staff who could perhaps assist the IRT in the implementation of phase 1, if they're not working on the phase 2 policy efforts.

There's an open comment period at the moment on the UDRP status report. Well, maybe we need to pause that rather than be diverting effort on to something that perhaps shouldn't be started yet.

Moving on to ATRT3, the recommendations on that, there are a number of them that relate to review cadence and prioritization. And we do feel they need to be taken forward as soon as possible.

It's now coming on for two years since that review team submitted its report to the Board.

And I know that this group had many reservations about the ATRT3 outputs. But, you know, in the sort of disagree-and-commit context, you know, these are the recommendations we have. The Board has adopted them. And therefore -- rather,

accepted them and, therefore, they need to go forward. Many of them go to directly addressing and managing workload so they're a priority.

We feel that where policies have already been fully vetted and an IRT has already happened, then they should be implemented. Something like PPSAI is a prime example.

Similarly, if we've got an IRT that's been commenced and it hasn't been completed, then let's identify what the barriers are to finishing that work and remove them. You know, an example being phase 1 of the EPDP and the data protection agreement that we've already been talking about.

As I already mentioned, you know, we do think that a suggestion is there a way to redeploy some of the policy staff who have particular expertise so that they -- rather than working on a new policy effort like the RPMs, one could actually be assisting on the implementation of the work that they've got very key knowledge of. They obviously have really strong project management skills and they're also very aware of the arguments and community positions on the particular work efforts. So they would be really beneficial for the implementation effort.

And then, finally -- you'll be pleased to hear -- there are sort of hundreds of pages of reports and dashboards. And perhaps there's a way to provide more clear and readable infographics that could maybe explain progress to the community on maybe a quarterly or a semiannually basis so that we all have a mutual understanding of where things stand and may be focusing on kind of top three to five priorities, so we all stay focused.

But I think there's undoubtedly work that's going on. And notwithstanding efforts of things like prep week, I don't think the community fully appreciates what is happening and how far things have got to and where progress is being made or where there are logjams.

Thanks. And sorry for the length.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks all right, Susan. Thank you very much. That's quite a list. I tried to take note, but I think I exhausted my pen in doing so. But thank you very much.

Any comments from Board members on Susan's -- suggestions from Susan and the CSG? Any immediate feedback?

Not seeing any. Susan, thank you. Very good input.

I think probably in the interest of time, we probably need to move to the other questions, Mason.

MASON COLE: Yeah, Matthew, thank you. We're on Item 2 of the agenda now, I believe, where we would like to raise the agenda of DNS abuse. I'm sure this comes as no surprise for the Board. This has been an issue for the CSG for some time now. And I believe Lori is going to kick off the discussion. Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yes. Thank you. Lori Schulman for the record. I have the three questions regarding our most favorite subject, except over GDPR is maybe DNS abuse.

And I feel like I can't ignore Becky's question. And I think it's a good lead into the three questions you see here in terms of the IPC asking for a summary of the outcomes from the Board's DNS abuse workshop at ICANN72, which we thought was excellent, by the way; current focus of Board's small group on DNS abuse; and how will the Board utilize the E.U.'s recent report on DNS abuse, which leads to are we asking ICANN to regulate content? The answer is no, we are not asking ICANN to regulate content per se. But we are asking ICANN to be a leader in helping solve a problem that has been around for -- since the inception of the Internet

which is incorporated into ICANN's bylaws by reference, into the RAA and the RA by reference. In terms of when we see instances of abuse, when they're called to attention by contracted parties who can aid or assist in some way in mitigating that abuse, and most of the time that is unfortunately a suspension or at minimum notification to an owner that their site is the site of illegal or suspected illegal activity, that there's some action taken. And that action is consistent and consistent with the law.

So I'm going to end the question there. And we can go bullet by bullet. Or you're welcome to address the question in its entirety.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Lori.

I'm going to turn it over to Jim, and I think Sarah is going to jump in on this one as well.

So, Jim, over to you.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. Thank you, Matthew.

Perhaps I'll take your question in a slightly different order and just observe that with respect to the Board's small group on DNS

abuse, you know, the Board does have a caucus. And as Matthew just introduced, both Sarah and I, we are co-chairs of that caucus.

And, you know, we certainly want to acknowledge that DNS abuse is clearly an issue of concern. It is a concern for the Board. It is recognized by this caucus that, you know, has been running for some time prior to my tenure joining the Board. Sarah has come forward, and so I have joined her in this work and the Board's consideration of this topic.

I think that one of the most interesting concerns with this problem space is having a shared understanding of exactly what DNS abuse is. I think we can all understand that it is a complex topic. And there is no one thing that's going to solve the problem. We all have a role to play. That's the community at-large. The Board has a role in trying to move these things forward. The community has a role in what it does. And, you know, there are just others that are not really part of this conversation that we have here that also have their role.

We certainly want to acknowledge and appreciate the work done by the Technical Study Group in its report about DNS threats. We think that's informative and a contribution to this space as we examine what we think and what we see as DNS abuse.

We also recognize there are a lot of experts and have different opinions about how one defines it. So it was good to get that technical basis of what is DNS abuse from the Technical Study Group and its work.

We do certainly want to point out that ICANN Org has been responsive to that, even prior to that report already. There certainly is a lot of data and statistics that they make available generally, beginning with DAAR, DNSTICR, and those efforts that they are putting out there in making available to the community and looking at this from a technical point of view. What are the facts? What is the data that's out there?

We do want to -- one of the primary focuses of the DNS caucus is to consider the question of how to define DNS abuse and what we can do to help the community to come to some agreement, to coalesce around that activity so that we can all share in what we believe the problem space is that we're trying to solve and what can be done there. You know, what are the gaps in what we're not doing today that we can move forward with.

Let me just end with one brief comment about the BC DNS abuse report. It's really not for the Board to utilize the DNS abuse report, similar to the DNSTICR -- I'm sorry, the Technical Study Group's

report. There are other reports and other groups that have done their own studies.

These are important in understanding the general space, so the Board is aware of them. But it really is for the community to take these kinds of things on board and to look at those and consider what it wants to do in that space and do with those recommendations and other thoughts and proposals in that report, just as the community would take on board the other studies that have been out there.

They should inform how we want to look at DNS abuse and what we want our definition to be and, thus, inform what input actions we might take.

So let me pause there and offer to my co-chair, Sarah, if she wants to add anything to that and perhaps even correct anything I might have misstated. So thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Jim.

Sarah?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks, Matthew.

GÖRAN MARBY: Can I --

SARAH DEUTSCH: Oh, do you want to go ahead, Göran?

GÖRAN MARBY: Of course not, Sarah. Please, you first.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Then I'm going to pass the baton you because I know you want to share something. But thank you, Jim. I think that was a really good summary. I would just note that the DNS Abuse Caucus isn't really small group. It actually comprises most of the board members because people are really interested in it. It's obviously a Board priority. And I would also add that part of the goal of the group is not just developing a shared understanding of, you know, the breadth of DNS abuse and what we understand to be the definition, but we're going to be trying to figure out which of these activities fall inside ICANN's remit and then try to identify specific activities and possible steps both for the org, the

community, and the Board. Because like Jim said, we all have a specific role to play in fighting DNS abuse.

And on the EC report on DNS abuse, I would just note it's a very important development, and at least in my experience working on policy and legal issues throughout my career, usually when you see a study, it can be a precursor to legislation or regulation. So it is something to take seriously. But we need to keep in mind that not all solutions are going to sit inside ICANN. There's still a, you know, role for the contracted parties to play -- for example, for issues that fall outside of ICANN's remit -- to address things, and there may be things that the CSG parties do as well outside of ICANN.

So we're going to be focusing on what's inside the remit here. And we really look forward to hearing your views on this and working with you.

So with that, I want to turn it over to Göran to share some information.

GÖRAN MARBY:

I just want to share with you that one of the things ICANN has been doing since COVID was we introduced something called the DNSTICR. The DNSTICR traces, to some extent, bad behaviors

when it comes to domain names. We reported that back. We decided -- There will be coming up more information about this very soon, but we have decided to also add names in relationship to the conflict in Ukraine. So we are now looking for abusive domains -- I hope I'm using the wrong word here -- hang on a second so I get the right wording here. So we are looking for certain types of domains -- domains to make sure they're correct, and then if we don't think they're correct, we report them, as we did to the contracted parties. It was very successful in the fight for COVID, and we're going to do this also here.

There is a -- there is a -- there is a paper coming out about this in a couple of weeks. Sorry, couple of days. Everything is happening in real time right now. I'm getting info as we speak.

But can I also bring back -- I've got to make one comment and if you excuse me now, I am going to do something that is -- that is - - might not seem to be that fruitful. I'm going to do it anyway.

So if you utilize the same sort of science that the -- that the one who did the study (indiscernible) question, but if you draw out the line a little bit, not look at one specific point in time. So what we did which is more or less the same, because it's the same as the DAAR. So we sort of looked at the DNS abuse for new g's and

legacy g's for a longer time to see how this is happening, and especially with introduction of GDPR.

So I'm going to show this as my background picture. And I don't know if you could see that, but from the time the GDPR actually came in -- and we can share this with you, of course -- we have seen some spike but also declines. And you can also see that the amount of -- if you actually look from the relative perspective, if you look at the amount of abuse, it's fairly low compared to the aggregated one.

And I'm showing this not too much to convince anyone, but I think that we all agree that fighting DNS abuse is a very important part. But I also think that we should be very careful about what we are looking at and when we are looking at it. And you know that you can -- This is done more or less with the same science as the European Commission study as well.

There is problems with DNS abuse, and there are -- the effects of the bad actors are, of course, there. And I think the community are doing a good job of starting to having discussions about this.

And I just want to mention that sometimes when we sort of go off ray of discussing this in such a way that it's -- we can't -- we will not find a solution to it. I would love to share you this, and I didn't

want to sort of throw it at you, but it's an interesting perspective of this chart.

It's taken out of DAAR data. We just prolonged it back to the date that GDPR was introduced so we could follow it for a longer period of time. Because of course if you look at something -- if you go into this data and you look at one particular time, you will have different results. So it's based on the DAAR charts.

I just want to put that out there as well. And if you're interested we can, of course, share this graph and some other material with you very soon.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Göran. Anyone -- Jim, please.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, thanks, Matthew. And I guess if Göran -- we should let Göran come back on for a little bit with his background and put it there. I wanted to highlight a couple of things, other things to call out in that chart or maybe these are things to look for people when you get a chance to see that chart again. Göran will make that available.

You know that DNS abuse, these threats and these reports of DNS abuse, there's clearly a downswing in the chart even after GDPR came into effect. At least that's in the data and the facts that DAAR has available. And I just think it's important to call that out. Let's take note of that.

There are a lot of, you know, mixed reports. There are a lot of mixed stories, you know, out there in general. And, you know, it's important to take advantage of all the facts as we can get them, as we can see them.

And I noticed in the chat a question about whose data is there? John Crain can certainly correct me if I don't get this right here, but it is -- it is, as Göran said, from the DAAR data. So it is about reported by third parties, and. The DAAR methodology and its data sources is all quite well documented and easy to find on the website and go see if folks want to dig into that.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Jim.

Any follow-up questions? Please, Brian.

BRIAN KING: Yeah, thank you. This is Brian for the record.

What -- Göran, you said the point of sharing that was not to imply that there's not a problem or -- I just didn't get what the point was. What's the takeaway you want us to have from sharing that?

GÖRAN MARBY: It's not to you, Brian, but sometimes in this conversation, when -- I think you should, as a part of ICANN, care about DNS abuse data. And I think that we all should care about it. We should all care about having the definitions.

I also think by looking at how this has evolved we can have conversations like why does it actually go down? Is it because of actions taken by ICANN? Is it because people -- which is a theory that many have said, that one of the things that's happened over the last couple of years is that many users have moved to platforms instead, and bad actors always goes where the users are, and maybe that is the reason for it.

I think there's definitely questions you can ask about the reputational feeds that we are using, how they acknowledge things.

One thing that we have talked about is that just the lack of access to WHOIS data, WHOIS data, how that data -- how does -- for research and other ones, how does it affect the actual quality of the data we're all using.

I think there's a lot of questions we can ask if we just started with the same facts. And we often seem -- and maybe I'm the cause of those, but we often end up in the fringes of our discussion, this is bad, this is good. But I think there is a time for us to sort of recognize that -- because we get reports about, you know, this is so bad, and we have to do something about it. And I just think to myself that's very interesting, and I'm looking forward to the conversation. But if we can agree on what -- like Jim said, what is the problem? What is causal? What is effect? And how can we improve or data?

We know in this case; ICANN org and OCTO is very independent in their science. We don't tell them the outcome of the science. We don't ask them for recommendations from it. We just ask them for the science for others to use.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yes, thank you. I want to go back to this issue about data, because I do find it concerning that there is this -- what I will call data wars, I have been calling data wars in presentations for lack of a better term. And since this is the first time I have seen this TICS I don't know too much to say about this except this. With other indicators like DAAR that ICANN has put out into the community, there are community concerns about how the data is read, whether it's readable, whether the data is conveyed in a way that's actionable, which I think is really important when you're talking about data no matter where it comes from, that the data is actionable. And I think to your point, whatever this data source is and assuming the objectivity of it, it's great to see that incidence of abuse is down but that doesn't mean abuse is done and that certainly doesn't mean that harms aren't still being caused at a very concerning rate, particularly when you look at specific industries. And the pharmaceutical industry comes to mind where there's been studies done that say as many as 95% of websites out there may not be in compliance with rules regarding the sales of online drugs.

I bring all this up because I think it is important to note, and we agree DNS abuse is a problem, but I want to be very careful, too, that when we're displaying numbers and talking about statistics that we're not skewing the problem in either direction, saying,

look, it's going down so things are good and let's keep rolling the way we are or, in the opposite, when industry studies come out that show spikes in certain types of abusive behaviors that somehow that's defining the entire problem. It's not.

And to use words that our friends in the registrar community like to use, we want to find the sweet spot, right? And we know that there are tens of thousands of websites, if not hundreds of thousands, engaged in all kinds of abusive activities, and we want to target the ones that are targetable, that we can find good, fair solutions for, and that can mitigate the most harm.

And so whether it's a voluntary definition or a definition suggested by a government, we do understand it's a problem. And in that sense, Göran, you and I think agree wholly.

But what I would really like to stop is sort of this here's my study, here's your study, here's my study, it's your study. Can the community agree it's a problem? Period.

GÖRAN MARBY:

I think that the community -- at least everybody I speaks to, thinks the effect of any type of abuse is important. And there are -- I mean, the data -- I will send it to you. You will say that there are domains out there.

I think the biggest problem is to define what Jim talked about. What is in ICANN's technical capabilities to do something about and what is in our mission to do something about. And where -- because you don't want ICANN to be the go-to place for issues that might not be something that we could or should do, because this is something that we belongs in courts, this belongs to law enforcement and other ones to do.

So I think that -- I think that, you know, maybe -- my hope is always that we progress the (indiscernible) with DNS abuse. You know that we -- Now, we wouldn't have done things like DAAR, we wouldn't have done things like the health indicator, we wouldn't have done the DNSTICR which was a fairly big leap for ICANN to do, to actually go and identify things if we didn't think the bad actors should be gone after.

You also know that I've said many times especially and the Board have said there are things we could do better. But let's not -- but sometimes we go, as I said, to the fringes of discussion.

LORI SCHULMAN: (Indiscernible).

MATTHEW SHEARS: Is that for follow up?

LORI SCHULMAN: Oh, I'm sorry, Matthew. Yeah. I should have raised my hand.

I'm just saying without really looking at this chart, I wouldn't also want it to indicate that there's a problem that's being solved, because we're not there. That's my only point.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Lori.

I see Jim and then Sarah. And then, Mason, I'm just conscious of time. I didn't know if you wanted to move time or if anybody else from the CSG wanted to come in on this. Just checking.

MASON COLE: Let's finish the queue, Matthew, and then we'll move on.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Jim and then Sarah.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Matthew and Mason.

And thank you, Lori. I think that you bring up a number of very important issues and I just want to highlight a couple of things,

because I really do agree with you. I think that we are -- we do find ourselves, unfortunately, stuck in these data wars, and we shouldn't be stuck in the data wars. It's not really about the data because we all know the joke about statistics, right? So let's not be in that place.

I -- I firmly am coming from a position, and I think I speak for many, and certainly I would hope most on this call, that DNS abuse is a problem. We're not trying to walk away from that.

There is an issue in understanding, you know, what is our shared agreement of our responsibility in that broad problem space? So having and creating some kind of shared agreement about what is it we're going to take some responsibility for, what is it that's within ICANN's remit, if you will. And there are a number of different characterizations of that that are under discussion. And those discussions need to continue. That's the discussion going on in the community now. We do need for that to continue. That's an important part of where the caucus is and what it's up to.

But as Sarah said, which I didn't say in my intro in the beginning, but she added on to, and I want to highlight here again, too, that's just a starting point, you know. I mean, the caucus is going to be looking at that question specifically, and we are obviously very

conscious of all the discussions going on in the community in this respect. We do want to find a way to bring all of us to some shared agreement about that problem space so that we can begin to explore more explicitly what's within ICANN's remit and what is, you know, one ring outside of that of the things that we can seek to influence versus the things which we really just have no responsibility for and there's nothing that we can do. So we need a place to start with that.

Another comment that you talked about is action and taking action. And I want to call out one important distinction there and respond to a comment that you made, Lori, about DAAR and all of these reports are not necessarily actionable, but they are an indication. They are leading indicators that there is something that's happening, which we all know.

The DNSTICR work actually is intended to be actionable in the sense that it provides evidence. It was doing that for COVID. It will do that going forward in the new work it's taking on with respect to the crisis that we are all experiencing and seeing. And that is where ICANN org is going to take the DNSTICR work. But being actionable -- a report is not automatically actionable. And I think that's an issue, too. That's a space that the community is exploring a lot and trying to understand and what all of that means. And so that's a part of this problem space that we need

to keep in mind: The distinction between DAAR and DNSTICR and whether or not it's actionable. And actionable also doesn't have a piece of this puzzle on the part of contracted parties because there is an opportunity for them always to evaluate whether or not something, you know, fits within a cause that they're willing to acknowledge. And all of this comes back into do we have an agreement on a shared understanding of our problem space.

So thank you very much.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Over to you, Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, I just want to say briefly, because I know we're running out of time, that I do think that if the data does show abuses going down, then -- and it's -- ICANN and all of us should take credit for making a difference because I do think sunlight is a good disinfectant, and it may be the DNSTICR and some of the work that's being done by DAAR and even the EC report may change behaviors in this regard. So if we can get it to go down, that's great. But at the same time I think we all recognize that even small amounts of DNS abuse are extremely harmful to consumers, et cetera. So there's more work for us to do. The problem hasn't gone away. And our abuse caucus will be looking

at solutions, and we should all take credit for anything we can do together to make it better.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Could I make a small comment? Sorry for being unconventional even for me to do this. But -- and I don't want to -- we don't know why it's gone down, to be honest. I think it's a -- I think there are many reasons for that. And I think it would be very interesting, together with you, and more people who understands much more than I do, the reason for it because that's a learning process. Have the users moved away in the platforms? Is that where fraud and fraudulent behavior happens nowadays?

There are things to be learned from this one. But I just want to make sure that we solve the right issue at the right time, and of course within ICANN's mission and our technical capabilities as well.

So I hope that this -- I want to contribute to a positive discussion and not end anything. But if anyone asks me why it goes down, we know some of the spikes -- we believe there are some of the spikes which could be related directly to some registrars doing promos. That's one of the things we're actually looking into. And that could be something that we can all look into from a policy

perspective. But, you know, I'm just -- we are just providing to provide so many facts.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay.

GÖRAN MARBY: And when it comes to -- just when it comes to -- I am receiving a lot of questions. We are not going to have an opinion about the European Commission study. That's up to the community, not to us. I think it's a very interesting input into the community discussion, but I'm really curious about what the European Commission thinks about it, about some of the suggestions in the study. And maybe you can ask them about that.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Göran.

Mason, we have two sets of questions left. Is there any preference in which order we take them? We have 30 minutes. Hopefully that will be enough --

MASON COLE: I hope so. Do you prefer to take one or the other, Matthew?

MATTHEW SHEARS: It's up to you.

MASON COLE: Let's just stay in order then.

The next item is governmental engagement. I know that this was a subject of a Webinar, I don't know, a couple months ago maybe where ICANN talked about governmental engagement and where the community could be involved.

But the CSG is interested in whether or not there's a bit of an update to that situation after the Webinar and in light of what's happening at the governmental level and whether or not ICANN Org is looking for additional community support in terms of its engagement with governments.

So it's a bit of a wide question, but I hope we can at least start down that path and then maybe narrow the discussion over the next few minutes, if that's doable.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, thanks. I noted that the question is kind of in three parts, different discussions in different spaces.

Maarten, did you want to kick this off?

Sarah, I see your hand is still up. Is that an old hand, I'm guessing?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, sorry.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No problem.

Yeah, government engagement is something that ICANN has been doing constantly and actually Göran has a whole unit and a good group of people focusing on that. And then he also reports on that regularly, and at least you know with which governments he engages. And that is next to, of course, the engagement we have via the GAC as well.

Importantly, it is about educating governments and not about informing governments. What we do see at times is that governments try to go out and find information and we've seen situations where governments refer to deferring opinions from ICANN members as the ICANN opinion. So we have to be careful in our communications there.

So I think that is all of the elements to take into account. And you also know that we now will have -- I think it's on Thursday -- a plenary session on government-related policies and legislation that are relevant for us to be aware of and understand how it impacts -- understand how it impacts our ability to do our mission.

So that is a way where we try to ensure that the community understands what's going on and the Org can also benefit from the input from the community from their perspective as well. I hope that helps.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Maarten. I don't know if any other Board members want to jump in on this.

In terms of the question about issue identification, I was wondering how there are others.

There are a number of things that -- and you raised them in the sense of happening at different levels, ITU and elsewhere. Certainly one of the things that would be helpful is playing that kind of information role. So in terms of joining national delegations, different ITU meetings, the WTSA, WTC, plenipotentiary may well be you have members who participate

in those processes. Bringing your expertise from those groups, telling us what's going on in those groups, keeping people informed, I think that's all part of that engagement and information sharing and building awareness of what's going on. So I think those are -- and those would apply whether at the ITU or the U.N. So I think that the kind of support that the community can provide and helping the community become more aware of what's going on in these various fora. So that's one suggestion.

I don't know if any other Board members have any other thoughts on this particular...

GÖRAN MARBY: May I?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Please.

GÖRAN MARBY: Knowledge is the best way for defense. And so that's why we're having this -- we're having this session with the whole community -- it's 90 minutes -- about not what only -- because we often get focused and talk about GDPR and other areas, too. But there are many different foras where you see legislative process that have the direct impact on your ability to make policies within ICANN.

I mean, GDPR was the first one, but many others is happening. And also in the U.N. system, in the ITU system, which is part of the U.N., we see it on the Hill in the U.S.

And so our first intention is actually just starting to share. We also did seminars about legislation in Canada. We have written a paper and given information what happened in China, what happened in Russia, what happens in other countries. And we are going to continue to do that.

But we sort of -- and I think this is a very essential question because something has happened as well, and this is that the legislatures now thinking that ICANN is so important, so they actually directly engage in the ICANN community. They sit at the table, which I think -- I don't know how fair or unfair it is but it definitely changes the dynamics of a multistakeholder model bottom-up process where you have legislators sitting in a room and they might or might not agree with what we do or even the multistakeholder model itself.

So, and by the way, you know that we many times provided you with the opportunity to engage with legislative resources that we provided. I remember when I gave all the email addresses to all the data protection authorities in Europe to you guys.

The fact of the matter is that actually that ICANN as an institution and all of us who supports the multistakeholder model has to have conversations about what this actually means because if we always go down in the discussions about we'd like this and this, you might like one of them. We actually lose sight of the fact that because of government engagement and how they do it, we might lose the ability to make policies in ICANN.

And I happen to believe strongly still -- and I will for -- until someone says no, that's wrong and convinced me of that, that I believe in the multistakeholder model. I believe in the bottom-up process because I think that with all the challenges it has, I think all the discussions we have, I think our model has proven to be really, really, really good when it comes to sustaining the security and stability of the Internet and helping, what is it now, 4 1/2 or 5 million users to be able to go online. We did this job. We did this together.

And just because some things -- some people don't think it's a good thing, we could lose a part of it. And I think that's very, very, very bad.

So a part of this, to answer your question, is really to get everybody to understand that we are probably more challenged now than we have been in a very long time when it comes to

geopolitics. And we as ICANN, we debate, we argue, we don't like, we unfortunately don't meet so we can have (indiscernible) and make up.

But right now, we are really worried about this. And they are sitting in our rooms. They are sitting and listening to our calls. They are participating in the conversation. And some of them are taking very careful note of the things they don't like. They go home and sort of product litigation to mitigate that.

That is really the conversations we want to have. But we start by talking about the more general stuff on the legislation we receive.

And I also want to speak on behalf of the multistakeholder model in ICANN. But I feel very passionate about that, as you know. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Any other Board members want to come in? Lori, please.

LORI SCHULMAN: I feel it's worth noting here on many levels, one in terms of the role of government and government relations. And those of us in the CSG represent businesses, right? And businesses is not

always running to regulation, to be regulated or to impose regulation.

I think regulation is typically the last resort, and it's the last resort when the multistakeholder fails unfortunately. And I'm not saying it's failing now. I'm not going to opine today on where I think we are. I think in some policies, we have been terrific. And I think on other policies, we have needed a lot of help. But I feel - and, again, I don't speak for the entire CSG. In this case, I'm probably speaking more in my role of representing a trade association where we try to find voluntary solutions, where we work with industries, where we have all actors on the side of a problem sitting in a conference room trying to sort stuff out. I do want to say, and I do want to support that is what we're trying to do here.

But with all that being said, we cannot ignore, and we don't ignore governmental functions. And I do think that when reports such as the DNS abuse study are issued by governments, on behalf of governments, they may have a greater weight than reports that are not. I don't know. Again, we can debate it; but that is how I tend to look at these types of things when you talk about government engagement.

So to your point, educating, lobbying, trying to create atmospheres where there's an exchange, and I think in that space, ICANN has done very well.

And I think there are governments that are more proactive. U.S. government, notably the agencies all meet together and interact -- many of the agencies meet together and interact before ICANN meetings so there's consistency in policy messaging.

The E.U. has its high-level meeting where it invites the public to observe. And there's a lot of avenues. Other governments are learning by these examples, doing more. And I think that's where we have the greatest impact in terms of multistakeholderism, to encourage as much public input as to government discussions as is possible.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Lori, I just want to say how much I think you are absolutely spot on. We have faced over the past 20 years quite an interesting run on the issue of the multistakeholder model through the WSIS process. And that WSIS 2025 process is already starting. It's well under way. We're going to have to come back again together as society, business, trade associations, the technical community to again defend that model, which is what we've done in the past. And I think that will be another calling over the next couple of

years that will only increase in need in terms of those who are talking and espousing the multistakeholder model.

Anyone else? Not seeing anyone. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If anything, just pointing out that, of course, the focus was now mainly on -- in back of our minds GDPR and interaction with the E.U. But let's not forget we face a whole world of new regulations and different impacts as well. Personal data is one aspect that's differently treated in the States as in Europe, as in China for that matter.

If anyone can help us to facilitate this to be truly global, it's the Org. And if we can benefit from that by pointing at things and sharing information with Göran and his team, I think that would be most welcome. It's not for no reason that this is one of the main -- one of the five areas in the strategic plan, geopolitical developments. It's not something we control but it does affect how we can execute on our mission.

So really appreciate the interest. As Göran said, please share info and that will help.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten.

Mason, back to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Matthew. I think we're down to our last agenda item.

So we wanted to raise the issue of work prioritization, perhaps predictably. And for that Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen is going to lead it off with the ISPCP.

Wolf.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBLEN: Yes. Hello, everybody. Can you hear me? Okay.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBLEN: Thank you.

So last, but not least, some comments and questions regarding the ICANN work prioritization. That is an ongoing work for the time being and covering a lot of work in the communities.

So from the point of the Commercial Stakeholder Group, we had a -- last week in the prep session, or the week before that, a meeting obviously with Board members, which we are doing every ICANN meeting with Board members related to the GNSO on the question of solving the backlog of the recommendations and implementation work. We are aware of that.

And we are also aware of the prioritization work led by the planning department. And where we are contributing to that, we are politely nominating representatives from the CSG to the pilot, which is going to be started.

And in the past, we had several times made clear that we have -- we have priorities and we put forward, for example, the holistic review that's being seen as kind of an overarching priority.

And in all these respects. So we come to that question. We do like to know how you see, the Board is seeing, the current status of Org's and Board's outlook on ICANN's prioritization here. What is your -- what is your opinion?

And last, not least, to be a little bit more specific, for example, we had raised also one example which we see is also of priority, which is a question of the auction proceeds, what is going on with that.

So the auction proceeds, for example, the final report, it was delivered in 2020, and we are well aware that ICANN is not using the funds itself. There is concern that the funds generating by the 2012 round for new TLDs is not being used at all, and mechanisms for distribution of the funds are governed by the final report and further Board action on that report. And when is the Board scheduled take action on that? That is a specific question with regard to prioritization.

So we would like to know from you are you just waiting for the outcome of the ongoing prioritization work within the community, or do you have specific input to that? Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Wolf-Ulrich, I'll start and just talk about prioritization a little bit, and then others will follow, I'm sure.

Yes, as you say, we are looking forward to -- to the process and the outcomes of the pilot that will start within the next weeks. The

Board will be observing that process through the budgeting and prioritization of community reviews caucus.

We are keen to see that work progress smoothly and to come up with a prioritized -- agreed and prioritized list of items that can be implemented. And we're also keen to see how this process will work because the learnings from it will, as you know, go into the broader prioritization framework, the first iteration of which was published a couple of days ago.

So we are fully supportive of this process. We believe it's a critical first step to understanding how this prioritization -- overall prioritization will function going forward. And we see it as a very useful way of addressing some of the challenges that we have talked about in the community about moving things forward, getting them prioritized, and getting them implemented.

We hope that this will be a productive and smooth process and that good progress can be made.

With regards to other things, so we, as you know, have our own board operational priorities, and Leon may want to talk to those. We've just been through over -- during our last workshop and the workshop before that our own prioritization process for the Board in terms of our work. And, you know, we've -- we believe that this

is an essential way of managing the workload within the Board, managing the workload across the community, and bringing the right resources to bear to implement the work going forward.

With regards to the specific question around the holistic review, I think you know that the pilot for the holistic review is going to be one of those work items that will be reviewed and hopefully prioritized within the process, the pilot process that's going to occur over the next month or so.

Any -- I think that's more or less where we are.

Avri, please.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah, thank you. Avri speaking.

Just to add one thing on the holistic review, is, yes, we are, indeed, waiting for the prioritization, but in some sense we have a strong expectation that it will be prioritized, and that's why we started working with the shepherds of -- from ATRT3 on trying to get the terms of reference in place. So assuming, betting on that it is prioritized at the top of the list and when the work then starts on the actual planning and moving forward with that, that that will be as close to ready as we can get it. Had hoped that that

would start before 73. It looks like it will start right after 73. But basically, that that's sort of an anticipating that this will actually hit the top of the priority list and, therefore, try and be ready to go on it as quickly as possible.

So that was a small piece that was done to try and help that along.

Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Yeah. If I may just emphasize that before -- before Leon. We are - - the Board is absolutely keen to move forward as fast as possible on the work that needs to be done, and that's an indication of trying to find ways to work in parallel, to move things forward, and to take small steps, important steps in terms of moving the work forward.

Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Matthew. I just want to make it clear that we have also another set of priorities which are the Board operational priorities which are not exactly the same as these priorities, and we report to them on a regular basis to the community. We are intending to

provide an update on this set of operational priorities hopefully later this month or early on the next month.

And to give you an example, these are based on the five blocks in which we have divided our different tasks. We have a shepherd for each of the operational priorities, and the shepherd works along with some executives from org and other staff to carry out whatever is needed to be done in this -- or his or her assigned operational priority.

So again, this is a different kind of priority. This is intended to help the Board increase its performance and to help us do things better in an internal way. It is not towards the community. It sometimes could, of course, overlap with some topics that may be of importance to the community as well, but it is more intended to be internal to the Board. So that is the other kind of priorities that we establish as a board.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Leon.

Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Leon, and thank you, Avri. And coming back to you, Avri.

So that is good to hear from your side that you've got a feeling with regards to some items, some issues which may be prioritized. So, in your case, holistic review, and then you started with that -- with that theme on the terms of reference, which is a good thing. I welcome that very much. And I do hope other board members also got this feeling as regards to other -- to other issues that may come up as priority issues. So that would be helpful, because that is also one point to me. It appears to me that could be improve the effectiveness of the overall procedure, you know. If you got engaged in this way and take a step, and then take a lead on that, to some extent helping us, guiding us, giving the communities guidance, which is a task for the Board, and in that sense that we don't lose time with specific prioritized issues.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

Mason, we have a -- there's a question about auction proceeds. Should we cover that one quickly? Danko, I'm not sure if you wanted to cover that.

MASON COLE: Yeah, I see the question. I think that's fine. We have five minutes.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Very good, thank you.

So, well, auction proceeds are very much in our focus, but as you know, we are discussing prioritization all the time, and sometimes to prioritize something means that you cannot do everything at once. And even while we're discussing prioritization, the work is going on.

So we -- The Board also post the blog about auction proceeds in December, and we are of course in communication with org. And we expect a proposal during the next month.

Sarah Deutsch and myself, we are liaisons to the auction proceeds work group, and we are in communication with them, and of course we are also leading Board caucus on the auction proceeds.

So as you probably remember, the work group proposed two models how the auction proceeds work, and we organized. So this is something that org is evaluating right now, and we are expecting, as I said, a proposal next month.

One of the possibilities, we'll see what is needed, will be that we will need an ODP, but this is not something that has been decided on. I don't really know if it is needed or not. But anyway, it's as I said very much in our thoughts, and we will soon do something about it.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Happy to answer any additional questions.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Any other board members want to jump in in the last minute?

All right, Mason. Any follow up on your side?

MASON COLE: I think that's it for issues that we'd like to discuss, Matthew. So if I may, I'll just take a moment to say thank you to the Board. And

on behalf of the CSG, we really appreciate this interaction. We used all of our 90 minutes and it was fruitful. And we very much appreciate the Board's time, and we look forward to next time.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Hopefully in person.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, hopefully in person. I know it's always a pleasure.

Thank you so much, everybody. Great questions, great discussion. Much appreciated. I think this session is a wrap.

Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, all. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Next time in person. Yay.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]