MONTREAL – GNSO - CPH Meeting
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

GRAEME BUNTON: Hello registries. Welcome! We've been sitting in here all day. For registries' edification, there are three boxes of Timbits running around the room. Timbits are donut holes, or they're basically just a tiny donut. They're very Canadian. You should feel free to indulge as much as you like. Any health consequences are your own problem.

What's our agenda today? Some join TechOps stuff, some RDAP stuff, and then prepping for the Board meeting. Does anybody have any bits and pieces before we start? Thank you for joining us. It's always nice to see you guys. Enjoy our time with our registry—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you guys get an update from GDD about the Summit in 2021 being in LA? Did you guys hear that?

GRAEME BUNTON: Yes, we did hear that the summit in 2021 is likely to be in LA.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's the only tidbit [inaudible].

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.

GRAEME BUNTON: Right. Okay. Let's do it. Let's get this party started. And I will just pass it right over to Mark for a TechOps update.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, he won't.

GRAEME BUNTON: Well, he's got a mouthful of Timbits. It's perfect as it should be.

MARC ANDERSON: That was your evil plan.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. Marc, was it good? What flavor?

MARC ANDERSON: Well played, Graeme. Thank you. Apologies, everybody. I forgot I was up first. For TechOps, we had an all-day session on Sunday. We covered a couple of interesting things. The first thing is what we did differently this time around is we sort of combined our TechOps meeting with a RDAP working group, formally the RDAP pilot group. There's a lot of overlap in membership between the RDAP pilot membership and the TechOps group. And so recognizing that, we invited the RDAP working group to sort of have its own session within TechOps. So I thought that went really well. I'm looking forward to getting feedback from everybody else if they share our views on that.

The other thing that we did that was a little bit new this time around is the second half of our TechOps session featured a joint session between the TechOps group and the IETF REGEXT or Registry Extensions Working Group. That was chaired by Jim Galvin who co-chairs the IETF REGEXT group.

This is something we had originally talked about at the GGD Summit meeting of the TechOps group, so it's something we've been kicking around for a while and we're finally able to implement it at this meeting.

So I got a lot of good feedback on that. I think a lot of people got a lot out of that, especially people that hadn't previously had exposure to the IETF. So we were able to pull in some new discussions that we hadn't had before and move forward some of the specifications that we've been talking about within the TechOps group.

So I think that was sort of the main updates for us from the TechOps group. I'm happy to take any questions.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Marc. Anything from around the room on TechOps?

MARC ANDERSON: I'll just say the donuts were excellent. Thank you.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

EN

GRAEME BUNTON: They're a Timbit, dammit. That was easy. We're going to blast through this agenda at this rate. Next up, RDAP working group update with Rick. Rick, where are you sitting?

RICK WILHELM: Sure, thanks. I don't have a Timbit, so we can start straight away. Since we last met together RDAP, of course, has gone live in August, it was a requirement to go live in August for the registries and the registrars, and also, as Mac had mentioned, the RDAP pilot working group dropped that adjective of pilot and is now just … The group is no longer referred to as the RDAP pilot working group, it's now just referred to as the RDAP working group.

So, we're still meeting weekly, and right now there's not a lot going on in the working group itself, but we are ready for when the EPDP Implementation Review Team gets ready with phase one recommendations such that we can need to start going about and making changes to the profile to reflect the policy changes that come out of EPDP Phase 1. And then subsequent to that we would expect to have to make another round of separate changes related to EPDP Phase 2, whatever they might be, but that's what that is—a separate matter.

This week, as Marc mentioned, the RDAP working group met. The main issue that we're working on right now—and we established a very formal consensus call regarding this one—is we're working with ICANN on getting clarity around the fact that it's the working group's position that the authoritative force for the registrars' RDAP URLs is the IANA

ICANN ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

registrar IDs file. This is a place on the IANA website where all of the registrar names and girds are published. And its' been augmented with the implementation of RDAP to include all the registrars' RDAP URLs.

And the issue that we have going with ICANN staff right now is just clarity on the fact that the registrar IDs file is the authoritative source of this and not a system called the MOSAPI (MOS API), which is a system that the registries have access to, but there's some operational issues with that system being the source of the authoritative source and some confusion about what the data might be. So we're making a formal request to ICANN to make sure there's clarity on that. That was probably our biggest action item out of the meeting related to RDAP working group.

I think that that's probably about it for the working group. I can certainly take any questions, and as always a call for any additional registrars to come and participate along with the registries. If there are any additional registries, please do come show up at the RDAP working group meetings. We meet on a weekly basis now. We've got a good crowd that shows up, but always looking for new technical folks to participate in that. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Rick. I'm not seeing a queue forming. Oh, there we go, Michele. Thank you.

MICHELLE NEYLON:	Yeah. Thanks, Rick. Just from the RDAP thing, I saw some people asking on that group about maintaining some form of "WHOIS" and some of us pushed back. Do we know where ICANN Org is on that? Because ultimately they're the ones, if they are supportive of that we're going to have to push back against them, whereas if it's just a matter of pushing back against some third party it's probably easier?
RICK WILHELM:	Good question, Michele. That would actually be part of the RDAP RA/RAA amendment process as opposed to the RDAP profile process. So just to pull the two topics apart for clarity, just for clarity on that. And the topic of RDAP; I don't see the RA and RA amendment as a topic on here. Graeme, how do you want to talk about? RA … WHOIS sunset is part of the discussions for the RA amendment. And, to date, those discussions, or negotiations, are just kicking off as from the letter from Goran that went out, the contractual notice that went out a couple of weeks ago. Graeme, you want to talk a little bit more about that?
GRAEME BUNTON:	I feel like you know just as much as I do.
RICK WILHELM:	Okay. So that negotiation period has kicked off and the topic of WHOIS sunset is one of the topics that's going to be talked about in there. But, as you know right now, it's a requirement to have them both running is my understanding. Does that help? Go ahead.

EN

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Yes and no, because I think the issue what I saw raised there was that people were asking for some kind of interface or layer basically to make the RDAP output easier for the little lambs to interpret, and that they were trying to force that obligation on us whereas I think I and others would argue that the RDAP stuff is available. If you want to write some kind of parse or whatever to make it more easy for people to read you could do so. There's already mobile apps.

RICK WILHELM: Right. That's a related issue. That's there related to the obligation, the current obligation that contracted parties have to provide a web based WHOIS and how that will or will not carry over post the RDAP amendment.

Right now, based on my understanding of ICANN's position—and others that are involved in this can check me—it's my understanding that ICANN's current position is that they want this thing, that web-based interface, to continue. And the contracted party house does not yet have a formalized response to that because the negotiation is just kicking off.

Within the RDAP working group there's been extensive discussions related to the technical point that you raise and there's been a fair bit, a number of technical people that agree with that position regarding the fact that the technology that RDAP provides sort of obviates the

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

need for the continued requirement of that kind of a web-based WHOIS equivalent. Does that help, Graeme? Does that sound consistent with your understanding?

GRAEME BUNTON: Yep.

RICK WILHELM: And Jeff is here also.

[JEFF NEUMAN]:   Yeah, thanks, Rick. And, yeah, Michele, this is one of the items that we were talking about before as being one of the thornier ones that will come up during those negotiations. And, Rick, I don't know how we do this, but because the negotiation period has now formally kicked off, we should try to nip the discussions of this from the technical list and move them off simply because what we all kind of talked about yesterday with ICANN was to make sure that all negotiations go through whoever the appointed points of contact are.

I know it's a good discussion and techies probably want to talk about it, and it's pretty cool, and if it ever does become a requirement, then we'll figure it out at that point, but to the extent we can kind of stop those conversations on the technology lists on that list and move it, that would be great.

EN

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, I understand your point, Jeff. Right now, to be fair, ICANN staff have not been participating in the RDAP working group really since the pilot ended. They've very much withdrawn and are not attending … For example, Francisco, neither Francisco or Gustavo have been on calls really since the pilot ended. I'm not sure. We'd have to chat with Sue about who's still on the mailing list. And then the technical teams have been discussing this topic of late staff has not been chiming in on this topic.

Those perspectives notwithstanding I'm entirely agreeing that we're not going to be … That within the RDP working group we're not going to be negotiating with ICANN regarding this thing. So I'm entirely in sync with that point and also this state of direction from Donna within the Registry Stakeholder Group about centralizing negotiation conversations which is also echoed by Graeme for what it's worth. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: My echoes are worth a lot. Thank you, Rick. Anybody else have questions on RDAP working group or the RDAP RA/RAA amendment bits while we're all in the room? Go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Regarding this particular topic of the web-based interface to WHOIS and the possibility of carrying that over in to the future, I would encourage those of you that are not familiar with this topic to seek out somebody that is, get educated, because this is going to be an

important point. Michele's been involved in some of those discussions on the mailing thread. There's been others in the [MARDAP] working group. Jeff is obviously familiar with it. Other folks. So it is an important point because it does have operational impacts to what's going on at both registries and registrars. So it would be good. It's not just a technical topic. It does have operational impacts to what's going on. So I'd just encourage you to think about that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks for that, Rick. All right. Let's move right along then to preparation for our Board meeting. Oh, boy, was I crusty about this. We pitched a new format to the Board because I think historically we found the usual format of we always end up for whatever reason, the last slot in the day. The Board is exhausted, we're all tired, and we end up with a few people at the top of the table and it's never material interaction with the Board.

So, we were trying to work out a new format. We pitched that to the Board and they decided they weren't ready to do that. I was unhappy about it, but here we are.

I feel like we maybe have agreement from them to try something different for Cancun, so expect to see that. So this is going to be the sort of status quo business as usual approach to meeting with the Board. Fortunately, because of us trying to do this new format and conveniently I pitched it and then promptly went on vacation and made other people sort out the details … Thanks, Sam and others.

I think we're in a pretty good place for the Board meeting in that we have a number of topics identified and people, for the most part, on top of those topics. So maybe I should pass this over to someone who has been more engaged on it than I have. Is that you, Sam? Donna? Anyone?

[SAM DEMETRIOU]:   Just bailing you out left and right. So, the Board floated their one topic that they would like to discuss looking at the agenda up here. It's sort of number three. Number three is a very brief moniker, if you will, for the topics they want to talk about.

For anyone who was present at the welcome ceremony yesterday, or who has otherwise been listening to Cherine talk over the last couple of weeks, it really has everything to do with ICANN's vision for the fiscal year '21 through '25 strategic plan along with the other plans that are designed to accompany that, so the financial and operating plan as well as evolving the multi-stakeholder model project that Brian Cute is going to be finishing and delivering at the end of this year. So his deliverable for the end of this year is going to be a work plan of how to improve things within the MSM.

It will then be up to the collective ICANN community, Org, and Board to execute on that plan. So that topic, specifically, is about the readiness of each of those three levels, the Board, the organization and the community, to tackle those plans, get them up and running, make sure they're faithfully executed. And I'm sure Cherine is going to want to talk about that he intends for the strategic plan to be a living

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

document. So there will be mechanisms built in to review it periodically throughout its life.

I'm just giving that overview because I think that's the one we internally have discussed a little bit less, but we've had kind of sidebar conversations about it generally, and I'll be more than happy to hash out a little bit here before we go into it.

The other two topics are ones that we've identified as things that we as contract parties want to talk to the Board about. And so for each of those I'm going to turn it over to their leads to give you guys a brief preview. I'll start with the one that's top of list, Pam and Donna, prioritizing, planning, and the completion of projects.

PAM LITTLE: I'm here.

[SAM DEMETRIOU]:   My big head was hiding her.

PAM LITTLE: Hi, everyone. On this topic, I guess it's also related to a number of governance-related improvements ICANN Org or ICANN Board, and the community as a whole have been working on, which is to really improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. But I think our concern is by introducing all these improvement initiatives, like the multi-stakeholder stakeholder model evolution, and PDP3.0 that the council has initiated already, and the latest effort

is the global or the introduction of this global public interest framework that the Board is actually seeking, or has been seeking community input on.

We are kind of in this perpetual improvement cycle. But I wanted to be more efficient and effective when introducing all these improvement and changes related to governance. And then we are actually spreading ourselves even more thin without those improvements initiatives.

So, our point is to ask … I think, initially I was thinking along the lines, hey, we are doing too much. And we all are volunteers. So please, stop, give us a break, and we need to prioritize. We need to probably resist doing too much, taking on more than we can chew.

But having had the benefit or the conversation with the contract parties ExCom the other day, I think the sense, the impression, I took from that meeting was ICANN is not going to take that well as a message asked them to do less. So maybe I was thinking we turn this into a question asking the Board how they are going to prioritize. Because we heard a lot of prioritization. We need to prioritize because we're doing too much all at the same time. But no one actually, to me, has articulated how we are going to do that, including at the Board level. So, Donna, what do you think of that? Because I think the Board has set a grand plan, like the five-year strategic plan, the financial plan budget and all that, but how are they going to really prioritize?

I think at the council level, Keith and myself and other councilors, we also are very mindful of what the work is coming in front of the Council

in the next 12 months or so and we really have to be more judicious, even more judicious than ever in terms of what work we take on, how we schedule our work, how we prioritize our work. And the Council has a strategic planning session in January next year. But I really would like to know, from a contract party's perspective, what the Board is thinking in terms of being able to really prioritize the work.

And we are, of course, conscious that the board is getting a lot of pressures, or requests from the various corners of the community to do this and do that, including maybe restarting [PPSAI] maybe making a new policy for domain abuse and all that sort of thing. But from contract parties' perspective I feel we really need to have that conversation with the Board and let them know we are actually stretched very thin as a stakeholder group, for example, from the registrar or registry stakeholder group.

Not only do we need to manage our affairs within the respective stakeholder groups, we also now have to send people to these various working groups, and some of them are really quite time consuming and a tremendous effort like the EPDP.

But if you look at the makeup of our groups, or respective groups, we usually … I think you can actually identify, out of the 100 there are probably 20 active participants. That means we really don't have a huge pool of volunteers to draw upon.

So it's a challenge for the community, for the Org, and for the community as a whole. We can't become efficient or effective as a community. That has to be at all levels, at the Board level, at the Org

level and the community level. And I think the Board has now said that very clear; whatever we do at these different levels has to be aligned with ICANN's strategic priority. But I really would like to know how are we going to do that in a coordinated fashion to make it really a concerted effort. I'll stop there and see whether other people have ideas and input to that.

I'm happy if someone wants to lead this discussion with the Board. Obviously, a native English speaker would be much more eloquent than I am. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't know, Pam, I understood you perfectly. So, in that conversation that Graeme and I had with the Board the other day there was an interesting fact that Graeme had on his slide and that is that within the Registry Stakeholder Group, only one organization has a dedicated policy officer. So all of you that sit around this table, this isn't your only job. It's something that you do as a combination.

We just had presentation from Becky Nash for the budget for next year, and ICANN has dedicated 393 staff. They've got a headcount. It would be interesting to have a volunteer headcount alongside that. So when they're prioritizing, they understand what the fuller resources are that's available. And I think that's potentially one of the missing elements when they start these efforts. They know that they've got staff to do the work but do they really understand whether there are other resources within the community to do the work? So I think that's

where I'd like to take the conversation, but with preface as to how you started this, Pam.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I think the point raised there about the volunteers is very, very good. I'd take it a little bit further because ICANN staff are full time. We aren't. So if you take for every four to five volunteers is equivalent to one person potentially, or depending on how crazy we are. But you can't make a one-to-one comparison, because apart from those who are dedicate to policy, most of us are doing it in our free time as a hobby, as part of something to break up the day, I don't know, but it's not our full time job.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Michele. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Graeme. Hi, everybody. So just a couple of observations, and there's a couple of different things I want to cover here, but I'll try to be brief. First, as we talk about the multi-stakeholder model evolution effort, I just want to put a marker down to say that in the conversations this week with the Board and Cherine and others, I think there was a concern—a legitimate concern and perception—that this MSM evolution thing that Brian Cute's been running was going to suddenly turn into a workload that needed to be accomplished like by February or by July when this strategic plan goes into effect.

And I think we've heard somewhat clearly—maybe not clearly enough—that no, no, this MSM evolution sort of work plan, or framework that's being developed right now is intended to essentially say over the next five years covered by the strategic plan, these are the things that we want to try to work towards accomplishing. So that actually gave me a little bit … I mean, I was relieved to hear that, because I was afraid that, in this Board initiated effort it was going to turn into something that was going to just completely overwhelm us when we have so much else going on.

So I just want to let everybody know that at least the conversations that I've had with them this week, it seems like the concern that I had was maybe a little bit unfounded. It is still additional work, but I think it's perhaps work that in the long run can actually help us with some of this challenge of workload prioritization, volunteer burnout.

And I'm also glad that we've mentioned staff, in terms of ICANN's staff resources. They may have 390-something headcount, but a very small subset of them are dedicated to supporting the GNSO policy development work, for example. And while we know that we're stretched thin, I can tell you right now from working at the Council level and working with staff every day, the workload that we have today and what's coming in 2020 because of the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations and the impacts on all other existing policies and procedures, we've got a lot of work ahead of us and we simply don't have the resources either in the community or at ICANN, I think, to be able to deal with what's coming.

And so I want to say I think this discussion about prioritization is critical, right? I mean, we need to make sure that we understand how much we can accomplish in a particular timeframe with the existing resources and still produce a quality product. And then I think we need to then say to ICANN and the Board, if you expect us to take on additional work then we're going to have to look at where those additional resources are coming from, or decide that we're going to stop doing something, or put something on pause, but it's going to be those hard questions that we have to deal with. And that's going to be the focus of our strategic planning session of the GNSO Council in January.

It's going to be topic number one is figuring out what are we going to be able to do this year, 2020, and what's going to have to be put to the side? We have three active PDPs. We're going to have several more because of the EPDP Phase I recommendations. There's a lot coming there.

But we've also got this MSM evolution discuss. We've got the DNS abuse topic that's now been bubbled up. Global public interest framework. It's not just the PDPs that we're talking about.

So, I think this key of prioritization is going to be really, really important and we need to make sure that the Board understands that we're aware of the issue, we're concerned about the issue and we're not just going to sit idly by and take on new work that can't get done. So, I hope that helps. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Keith. I think we've got Pam and Donna on the hook for this topic and I feel like that was some good input, so I want to make sure you guys feel like you've got everything you need to tackle this with the Board. That was a question.

PAM LITTLE: Yes. I think in response to what Keith just said, I think what we want to get the message across to the Board is prioritization should not be just about setting a laundry list, because if you have 100 things to do on your list [inaudible] things to do, that's not prioritization. Prioritization actually requires saying no to certain things or even terminate some of the existing ongoing work or something. But just the idea of everything is … We're going to accomplish long list. I don't think that approach is going to work anymore.

And I take Keith's point about Cherine's comment, this evolution effort of multi-stakeholder model. It's not that it's going to turn everything upside down and we are all going to become efficient overnight. Cherine did make that clear. It's the approach that we will see at this meeting or something or by the end of the year, not solutions. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: I've got Ken and then Rob in the queue.

[KEN RENARD]:   My biggest concern is ICANN is going to short staff us. And by short-staffing us, then Org gets to look at you and say, "Well, if you guys

can't finish the work, then we'll take it over. And, oh, by the way, we'll do it the way that we want to do it." We started to see some of this recently and it's pretty easy to put short deadlines on us and push our backs up to the wall. If we don't have the staff, it's just going to be a continuing problem in the future.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Rob and then Beth and then Elliot.

[ROB]: I've been away for a couple of years and it's interesting that we're still having the same debates that we had a few years ago. I worry that we've been saying this for a while now, that we don't have enough resources and you need to prioritize, which we hear as you need to limit the amount of things you have to work on at any given time.

But I think unless we come to them with a solution or a proposal, we're just making the same noise we always have. So, I'm curious as to do we have any solution or proposal for them to say, look, limit it to this many that we need to concentrate on as opposed to just using the word prioritize. Because you're right. If you just keep saying, "Please prioritize," they'll say, "Here's the 100 things that we're going to do this year," and we can only work on the first 10 or 20 or what have you.

So, I think we need some concrete of evidence of this is the number of volunteers we have. This is the amount of projects we can work on. Tell us which projects and that's we'll concentrate on. And the rest, please don't do.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Rob. We don't have a ton of people to do it. Beth, Elliot, Keith.

BETH BACON: Thanks. I do think that one thing we're going to hear immediately from ICANN Board in response to this is, "Well, we're just doing the work that you've asked us to do on behalf of the multi-stakeholder model." So, I think that we should be prepared with a response to that, whether it's, fine, we'll work with you to help prioritize and knock some things out or just be ready to respond to them and say a lot of this is Board-generated. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: thanks, Beth. Elliot?

ELLIOT NOSS: Yeah. I feel like I want to pull together a couple of threads. Keith laid out kind of a nice horizontal list of things, and Beth accurately in a beautifully, the animated version of ICANN whiney voice would be saying that this just came from the community. You can do it again. That would be great.

                   We are … I think that there is so much inter-relationship between so many of these pieces of work. When we're talking about the EPDP and the work that comes out of that, so much of that is deeply related to DNS abuse and that discussion.

And so much of that, thankfully, replaces the previous WHOIS discussion where that's where we talked about the problems in the DNS.

I'm going to bring back into the stew as well this work on the multi-stakeholder model. I think these are all deeply related. We need to recognize that the iteration of the multi-stakeholder model takes a very—naturally a very specific form. This is the only working example of global governance that we have in the world where there is real subject matter that the organization is seized with. That is unique. So, it's really only here that we can iterate on multi-stakeholder.

And I think what's clear and what's clear through this DNS abuse discussion, through all of the output of GDPR leading to EPDP one and then two, and then DNS abuse is that this community uniquely is the only voice for the global level today. So, we need to be thinking about when we're talking about prioritizing and when we're talking about staffing and when we're talking the issues we take on. De facto, we have become the voice for global governance, the voice for the global layer. And I think that that's just a filter that we need to bring to all of this. Very specifically, I think that's something that we should be putting in front of the Board.

GRAEME BUNTON: All right. I've got Keith and then I think Michele. Is that right? Do you have yourself in the queue? No, we got you. Okay.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Graeme; and thanks, Elliot and Rob. I think all good points. I agree. And, yeah, Rob. This is something we've been talking about for years. Volunteer burnout, we started talking about that in 2014. This is nothing new.

But I think if we – and this goes I think to both of your points. If we look at this in the context of the five-year strategic plan that the Board has pulled together, I think it's actually a really good framework for us to consider and the next level down is, of course, the financial and operating plans, the annual financial and operating plans. Then, at the bottom or the next step is this evolution of the multi-stakeholder model.

You'll probably hear this from Cherine during the conversation this afternoon but there's a clear recognition that the Board has certain responsibilities and then ICANN Org has certain responsibilities in terms of the implementation of the strategic plan, getting it right. But there's also a recognition that the community, that we as the volunteers, have an obligation to try to improve our own processes and to be more efficient and effective ourselves. And I think that that's a responsibility that we have, in terms of the iteration, Elliot, that you mentioned. The continual improvement. That is our responsibility. We don't want them telling us how to do that. We should have that interest over the next five years to figure that out right.

One of the things that's been identified during the Brian Cute effort on the multi-stakeholder model evolution is that prioritization is a key factor. That's like one of the six or eight bullet points that's been

distilled down as one of the things that Board, Org, and community need to figure out and do a better job of. And I think that's what is being teed up here.

Rob, just specifically to answer your question, what can we go to them with or what can we develop ourselves in terms of a proposal that will address this once and for all? And that's one of the things that we will be talking about at the GNSO Council level in January. So, I think we as the contracted parties need to start thinking about what would we want to see in terms of that process of prioritization, so we can feed that into the Council-level discussion.

And there's going to be a meeting at the same time, right around that same time block of that week of the SO and AC leaders. So, GNSO, ccNSO, ASO, ALAC, GAC, etc. Talking about the same kinds of things. So, we have the Council focus and then there's the broader community focus on the topic. The Board will be having a workshop at the same time and I think this is going to be an opportunity for us if we seize it.

I'm starting to think we probably ought to pull together a small group, like we need another small group like a hole in the head. But we need to pull together a smaller, dedicated group of folks from the contracted party house to start working on the proposals that we'd like to feed into that discussion.

I had another point but I'll stop there. Thanks.

EN

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Keith. So, we need to [inaudible] three more topics or two more. Two more? Really, just one more?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Unless we want to talk about the Board topics more but I don't think we really need to because this is going to overlap.

GRAEME BUNTON: Right. So, I want to make sure that, Pam and Donna, you feel like you've got enough from this discussion that you can incorporate and some good bits and we're all on the same page.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, I think what's really important here is that we don't have to be the only people talking. Everybody is welcome to come to the mic and say something and I'd prefer that that's the case, so it doesn't look like it's just me and Pam sitting up there whining. It would be good to get other people involved as well. So, please do so.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Donna. I think that's a good point. Keith, do you feel like you can talk about this stuff, too?

KEITH DRAZEK: Certainly. Thanks.

I C A N N | **66**
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

GRAEME BUNTON: Is there more? Okay. Moving on from that one. We feel like we've got that one pretty covered. What's the Beth one?

BETH BACON: The Beth one [inaudible] title it for the Board. So, the Beth one was supposed to be the Beth and Darcy one but she's terrible and left me here with all you people.

What the small group had proposed was to talk about what has kind of happened with the languishing effort on ICANN's part to establish how they will engage with governments and standards bodies and do some regulation and regulatory tracking and reporting. This kind of dovetails into what Elliot was talking about and then also the pervious topic in that there was this little surprise gift from the EU called the GDPR and it's led into the EPDP and there's now many, many work streams coming out of that.

So, the small group for the contracted parties as we were planning this really found value in seeing where this effort stands right now. As I said, it's languished a bit. So, basically, we sent some status questions and inquiries into the Board asking them about the plan, where it is, where it's going, if they would like our help and our input. They've said a few times that they started it but then felt they could not actually continue with the effort. I think it adds value just simply because we already know about a few more EU regulations that could be coming our way impacting our industry specifically. So, I think that if we get this into a nice process now, it will serve us well in the future and we won't be so reactive and could be a little more proactive. Thanks.

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Beth. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much. So, I think we'll hear also from Cherine and the Board today that this is something that's on their radar. They're definitely aware of it. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, that it's one of Goran's goals for the upcoming year. He's got it actually in his annual goals.

One of the things that they're looking to do is to engage with the community. I think going back to Marrakech, they proposed repurposing or the community repurposing the cross-community engagement group on Internet governance to try to help provide an interface between the community and the Board and Org on issues of identifying these potential regulatory impacts or legislation coming down the pike and to make sure that it's not siloed in terms of Board, Org, or community, that we have an opportunity to sort of come together and work together to identify these issues.

I've heard that the GAC is actually interested in participating or members of the GAC are interested in participating in such a group. So, I think the question before us is are we going to look to possibly re-charter that group? It's only currently chartered right now by the ALAC. GNSO and ccNSO both pulled back after we realized it wasn't really truly a CCWG and it wasn't really serving much of a purpose. But

I think we do have the opportunity to sort of use that if we decide we think that's the right sort of vehicle.

But this is definitely a topic that's on the Board's radar. It's in the strategic plan. It's in Goran's goals and they're looking to tap the community for input because they realize they can't just do it by themselves, and frankly probably shouldn't.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Keith. I had heard that proposal I think from Goran directly that we could re-task the CWG on governance with this. My preference would be to build a new thing. I think that particular CWG was kind of tainted and I don't know that reconstituting it is the best choice. It might be better to start from scratch and I also don't think that's a hugely material amount of work.

Who else wants to speak to this particular topic? Do we feel like it has the legs to take it to the Board? We can just throw Beth to [inaudible] or something. Anyone? Anyone feel …. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: We did propose specific questions to the Board, so they should be prepared. It's not a terribly difficult one. But yeah we flagged the items in the strategic plan, so they should be prepared to respond to it. If that helps anyone wanting to join me …

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Beth. Donna mentioned to me—and this is good—that we should ask for feedback from the Board on the presentation that Donna and I gave earlier this week. I've heard good things privately. I suspect Donna has, too. And so maybe we can get some of that on the record. So, maybe we'll start with a bit of 10 or 15 minutes on that topic and then we can go to this prioritization and then we can go to legislation and regulatory. Do we have anything else on the menu? Is there anything else that people think is …. I saw Elliot first and then I saw Jeff.

[ELLIOT NOSS]:   Yeah. I'd really like to spend a couple of minutes with them on domain abuse. I think that it's our opportunity to, in a smaller probably less sensationalized setting, have a discussion with them about where we are, the statement we put out, what that means, what that doesn't, get a sense from them. We've seen some public statements from them that have hit our list and people interpreted them one way or another and get a sense from them of where they stand on this as well.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Elliot. I would caution, though, the statement "we". We need to be careful with how that statement comes out because that was "we" being a small group of people and not "we" as stakeholders.

I think we bounced the idea around of addressing DNS abuse with the Board before I went on vacation and stopped paying attention, but I don't recall where those discussions ended.

BETH BACON: I think we just concluded that we're going to be talking about it 478 other times this week and that we didn't need to use this particular 90 minutes to do so. But, hey, if you guys change your mind …

GRAEME BUNTON: How do other people feel about that topic?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That was something I was going to suggest as well with Elliot. I'm kind of trying to follow along the GAC/Board discussion that's going on now and the GAC is basically asking the Board to—which is what I thought—not start any new gTLD round or even approve the round until they solve the issue of DNS abuse but of course saw that coming. And then also they are grilling Goran as to why they can't just accept the CCT recommendations on DNS abuse as is and basically just force the contracted parties to … I think the words were "do better".

But Goran actually gave a fairly good response saying that there's complications and some of it is within ICANN's remit and others. So, every other group is bringing it up with him and I know we're discussing it in 500 other locations but the Board is there. There is our only one-to-one face time and frankly and selfishly, for the—and I'd be happy to talk about the relationship of the new round and DNS abuse because it's something we've talked about within SubPro. But we would be remiss not to use this opportunity to … We had a great discussion in the registrar section. I don't know how we can

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

summarize a high level, if we want to. And Elliot would probably do that really well. I just think we should not let this opportunity pass.

GRAEME BUNTON: Anyone disagree? Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I think we'd be quite careful how we frame it. That's my only concern. I think it's important to hammer home some of the messaging but we need to be careful because what we don't want is this to be seen as us accepting that, as contracted parties, we want more obligations in our contracts. I am personally more than happy to put all sorts of crazy crap into my terms of service but that's something that we choose, as businesses, to do. I do not want and I will not accept that ALAC, BC, IPC, or GAC start telling me how to run my business.

GRAEME BUNTON: There seems to be pretty universal agreement on that point. Jeff?

[JEFF NEUMAN]:   And that's really good. I think making the statement in that open meeting that we are all doing things in our own way to combat abuse, it's not as if we're not doing anything and to just … We're happy to engage in discussions. But really emphasize the point, the framework, that some registries and registrars released. We all have things in our terms of service. And to point out that even their studies found, when

they did the registry audit, that there was such a small portion that was responsible for so much of the abuse and the community seems to be holding the entire contracted party's house responsible for the bad actions of a few.

[BETH BACON]: Do you really feel like that's what's happening right now, that groups are holding the whole other contracted parties responsible for this stuff?

[JEFF NEUMAN]: Absolutely.

[BETH BACON]: I don't feel like that really jives with some of the other more constructive conversations that we have been having. I don't want this session to be like backslide. I don't want us to get upset because of something that we heard someone else say in their session and have this be a bit of a rant because we talked a lot about how we, as contracted parties, wanted to kind of go into this week and make these conversations about DNS abuse constructive. So, I don't mean to be critical. I'm just saying …

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. I'll give you an example. When the IPC met with the Board, the IPC specifically brought up DotCom and what are they doing to help

with abuse on DotCom and the answer Goran gave was, "Have you seen the DotCom agreement? There's nothing I can do."

So, all of these groups are attacking. Even the good players. The good players. Yes, this is a problem. Yes, we need to address. We need to let them know that we are doing good things and they're holding the entire stakeholder groups responsible for what even ICANN itself found were the actions of a very few.

GRAEME BUNTON: I think the proactive piece is still really important. I've got Maxim and then Elliot and then Beth in the queue. I feel like there's enough agreement here that this is a topic we should bring up and so let's just make sure that we've got it framed correctly and it feels like Elliot is on the hook for it. So, let's see if we can tie this all together. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, it's quite hard to be positive when the only option they give you is agree to those changes to your contract, bending you more and more. So, I suggest we ask them if they wish to extend these ideas to ccTLD world, so no more new [inaudible] until the issue of DNS abuse is resolved and to enforce the standards a ross all [ccTLDs] because quite a large number of issues are sources from that part of the world.

So, to prevent a situation where, for example, we cure all bad things here and all of them go to ccTLD world, it will might undermine the ccNSO image. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Go ahead.

[ELLIOT NOSS]:   Yeah. It's great. I don't mind sharing . That's beautifully consistent with where I would want to go in the statement. I think that they underestimate the role of ccTLDs. They underestimate the role of compliance. They underestimate the role of nation states. And at the end of the day, if we really care about this problem, we have to move away from feeling good about putting words into a contract and move into actions. I think that there's a great opportunity for that. My intention with everything I say is to take the heat down from that contract discussion.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Beth, then Michele.

BETH BACON: Thanks. Elliot, I think that sounds great. I do reiterate that we've had some really good conversations. We've done a great job as a contracted party house. Just changing the conversation to having folks come and ask questions and talk about the positive things that we can do and the actions that we take outside and just kind of ignore the contract. They're moving towards, "Oh, we understand that you do these things despite the contract. We understand ICANN's role. We understand your role." So, I'm just hazarding against sliding back into

adapting and being defensive to their narrative and just sticking to ours because I think we're turning a corner and it's helpful. And that was more my point. I just don't think we need to sink down to the level of some of the other rhetoric just out of response to it.

GRAEME BUNTON: And that's why I think Elliot would do a great job if he's willing to take the lead on the discussion.

[ELLIOT NOSS]:   Uh …

GRAEME BUNTON: I just complimented you, Eliot. Michele, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I think there's a lot of great stuff here. I think one thing we also need to remind people is that a domain name is a pointer to content, so that even if we all remove all the domain names and the Internet ends up domain-less somehow, that doesn't mean that the bad stuff suddenly magically disappears. So, just to remind people that domains are just pointers.

GRAEME BUNTON: All right. Elliot is on the hook for a topic. Feels like we're … Sorry. What? Rob needs one. You're back. You want to chat with the Board, Rob? Okay. I feel like we've got a good … That's progressive. We're not

sinking back to just the defensive "this is the contract". We're talking about the good stuff that we all do.

So, just as a brief recap, Donna and I are going to ask for feedback on the presentation that we gave to start. Then we'll go into the two topics which are really three that Donna, Pam, Beth and then we'll go into abuse and that is likely going to eat up the whole 90 minutes, I think. Almost certainly. Typically does. Or we could start with abuse and we won't do anything else. Do we have anything else to talk about before the Board meeting specifically, before we move on to AOB, now that we have everybody together? Okay. So, that feels like we're in a good spot for the Board.

Now, actually AOB. Does anybody have any other bits and pieces? Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just one question. Are you going to talk about the format at all of the meeting? Where will that fit into? I'm just wondering if that comes up front or at the end and just say we mentioned the change of format, you didn't seem willing to do it.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jonathan. That's a good point. I will add that to the front end, too, because that's a good reminder that we pitch for a new format. They didn't seem ready. But we would expect to do that in Cancun. Happy to work together with them to work out some wrinkles but we would really like to try something different. Thank you. Jeff?

[JEFF NEUMAN]:   Yeah. So, I think we should end it with thanking Cherine for his years of service and let him know that there's an opening for the registrar chair.

GRAEME BUNTON: That's another good one. Thank you. We should make sure not to forget that. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I think the other thing … I'm not sure whether this is the appropriate venue to do it or not but trying to encourage them to have those kinds of sessions that yourself and Donna did the other day with them on a more regular basis in terms of capacity building and understanding because it is ridiculous when you look at it in terms of where ICANN's revenue comes from and how little of a clue they actually have about what we're all doing.

GRAEME BUNTON: I might not frame it quite so provocatively.

MICHELE NEYLON: Of course not. That's why you get paid the big bucks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Chair definitely pays a lot. Okay, meeting format, the presentation feedback, prioritization, legislation and regulatory abuse. That's clearly going to eat up that session with the Board. Any other last bit Board meeting bits and pieces? Going once, going twice.

Okay. Any other AOB? Anything we want to raise with registries want to bring to registrar's attention or vice-versa? We have some time. I think we still have half an hour before we need to move and then there's another break. Go ahead, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Graeme. So, we had a presentation from Becky Nash from Finance, so I'm just wondering how closely you guys pay attention to the operational plan because it's out for public comment again. Xavier has encouraged us to make comments because, if we don't, we can't take any action if we don't like the ultimate outcome. So, I don't know if that's something … Jonathan tends to hold the pen for us now that Jacques has moved on. But I just wonder whether you have dedicated people looking at that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Donna. Good question. In theory, we have dedicated people but I'm not sure we started the process of looking at that yet. Zoe. I'm looking at you through several heads. Do you know who we have pegged to look at ICANN Finance stuff off the top of your head?

ZOE BONYTHON:	So, of course we have [Bernie] in our [inaudible]. We also have Frederick and we have Caroline who is Blacknight's accounts person.
GRAEME BUNTON:	Oh, that's right. So, we do have a couple of people on the hook for looking at this thing and presumably it's public comment for whatever usual number of days. Okay. But we should put our collective heads together on that, too, and make sure that we're aligned. But good point. Okay. Keith?
KEITH DRAZEK:	Thanks, Graeme. Just to underscore what Donna said and provide more context for those who haven't followed it that closely is that when she said if we don't comment, we don't have the power essentially to reject the budget, that's right. Under the empowered community construct and as a decisional participant as the GNSO, essentially we have the ability—and each stakeholder group I think has the ability—to begin the process of saying, no, we don't agree to a budget. But in order to have that power and that standing, you have to comment on it at this stage. So, it's sort of like speak now or forever hold your peace. If we, as stakeholder groups, or the contracted party house or whatever don't make a comment, if we see a problem now, if we don't make the comment, we don't have standing to go through and initiate that formal sort of rejection process as a decisional participant in the empowered community. So, important stuff. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Keith. Good point. We'll make sure to do that and we'll put our heads together to do that. Anyone else? I'm enthusiastic about giving people a little bit of time back.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A quick reminder of the room to meet the Board.

GRAEME BUNTON: Does anybody know? Next door?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, the main room which is just to our left, if you're facing the screen.

GRAEME BUNTON: 517-D. Okay. Great. Well, thank you, registries, or joining us. It's always a pleasure. We'll see everybody again, I think, at 5:00 does it start? Right next door. Enjoy your extra 40 minutes. Thank you, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]