
ICANN78 | AGM – GNSO CPH Membership Meeting
Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 4:30 to 5:30 HAM

SUE SCHULER:

Thank you. Hello and welcome to the membership meeting of a Contracted Party House. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor.

Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Samantha Demetriou and Ashley Heineman.

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.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Hey, folks. Welcome to the CPH membership meeting. Thank you, Zoe, for putting together the slides that are going to take us through today. In the interest of keeping it speedy, given everything we just said, I think we all know why we're here. So I think we can just dive right into it. Ashley, anything you want to say to open?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: No, nothing. Then just happy to have everybody here considering we just went through a very long day. So just happy to dive right in.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Great. So the first thing we've got up for kind of the majority of the agenda for today for this hour is to just get ourselves organized and prepared for our meeting with the board scheduled for tomorrow morning at 10:30 a.m. The ExComs have gotten together and discussed a couple of topics. I think those are going to be on the next slide. There we go. So you can see here on the left the topic we got from the board, which is a very generic question about what we think are some key strategic issues for ICANN over the next three to five years that should be addressed in the strategic plan and why. And so as we were coming up with topics that we wanted to bring up with the board, we kind of realized that all of them likely fall into the bucket of what are strategic concerns for ICANN in the next three to five years. So good on us.

We can kind of go through each of these. We did put a couple of talking points together in a Google Doc. Let me drop that link in the chat so that folks can look at it both on the big screen and in their own screens. That's the right link. There we go. So, as we usually do with this, we'd

love to get any volunteers from the membership if the topics that we've kind of put out there, if it's something that you feel passionately about, if it's something you feel that you would want to speak to, we like to get other folks in front of the board so it's not just the same faces meeting after meeting. Also so Ashley and I can take a little break.

So here are the three that we've kind of come up with initially. The first one, the registration data policy. It's obviously been a pretty hot topic for this week. We have gotten some updates from staff about what may be the next steps. We know that that's going to be a subject of the IRT that's going to get back together on Thursday. I think for the most part, based on our discussions with staff earlier this week, that the focus of the messaging here should be about how important it is at this moment in time given everything going on in the world and given the regulatory developments that we're all becoming aware of and that will impact our industry. It's really more important than ever to get the registration data policy in place. It's a pretty foundational policy for anything else that may be done as relates to registration data within the ICANN space. And so we just really want to encourage the board and the org to kind of finish the process on this one.

I think, Ashley, you can speak to this as well, but not getting into the substance of the question of urgent requests at all, that's sort of not what this messaging is about. It's really about reconfirming for the board so that they can hear it directly from contracted parties that this is an important thing for our businesses going forward and we need to kind of get this done.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: And just a little bit of background as to why we chose to do that is the decision is kind of with the board right now. And from what we understand is that it's going in the right direction and we really just don't want to tee off a fight on urgent requests in that kind of public setting. Not that we would fight, but I just think we can flag it. But I think the real prime message here is that we want to move forward on the registration policy and happy to find ways that we can do that that works. So anyway, just want to give a little bit of feedback on that since there were some questions in the doc.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry, I'm still getting into the Zoom room. Hi, Keith Drazek, I was covering the board GAC session a couple of hours ago, and Becky told the GAC that they were planning to basically set aside the urgent request question and publish the policy. So I think we've been hearing that coming along, but she was very direct with the GAC about that. So if we want to factor that into our conversation. Oh, I see Becky next, thanks.

BECKY BURR: I just want to clarify, we have to figure out the right way to do it, because I don't want the board doesn't want to be unilateral about it. So but this is all very good news. Let's just go forward with it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Makes total sense. I think so I think our messaging becomes like a vote of support and confidence in that.

BECKY BURR: Where the board is, agrees that the party that the EPDP Phase 1 policy should go forward without section 10.6. We don't think that the urgent request thing works. I said to the SSAC today, I don't see how it could possibly work ever without an authenticated mechanism. So there's going to have to be a longer conversation about it. But the mechanics of how we pull 10.6 out is not entirely clear, and we don't want it to be necessarily top down. So I think what we will do is ask the GNSO council to agree to do that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Does that mean we should not be picking it up in this meeting?

BECKY BURR: I don't I think it doesn't matter. But let's not get into a whole conversation about the GAC deciding that there was no consensus when there was.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Seb, did you want to get in the queue? So just looking up at the document, which I think we started a week and a half ago, definitely before what we learned here at ICANN 78, I think basically we're talking about kind of removing A and B, those two bullets from the discussion and focusing in more on C&D. Just to put a real fine point on it. Does

anyone else have any thoughts to share on this? Any questions about tabling this topic with the board? Does anyone want to run point on it?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm happy to take this one and turn to folks that were on the IRT, if we need to have some clarification on the point up, Reg.

REG LEVY: I'd be happy to run point on it if you'd like me to.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Cool. I think we need to be careful with this. I honestly do. I love you, Reg. And you've got an edge, which I love. But let me take this one, please.

REG LEVY: You asked for volunteers. I promise to be nice. But yes.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Also throw my hand up. I've been involved in this since the start and very much interested in seeing it get over the finish line. If it would help, I'd be happy to take point on this or do it jointly with somebody else.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Cool. So Ashley, we'll have Ashley lead off. We'll have the other folks ready to jump in and kick it over as needed. You guys are the experts. You guys have been working hard on this. So that's great. Topic number two, transparency in statements of interest. It's another one we've been talking about for a while. We've talked about it in our own stakeholder groups. We've talked about it jointly. The message here being, again, we don't want to get super deep into the weeds on what is going on at council, what the status of that vote is. I don't think that's what it's about.

I think what this topic with the board is about is that we understand that transparency in the statements of interest is something that has come up within the community. We think that it's incredibly important to the health of the multi-stakeholder model for there to be trust and confidence that the people who are coming to the table to develop policy are disclosing what interests they represent when they're doing that. For anyone who listened in on or was attending the welcome ceremony yesterday, Sally talked a lot about trust, needing to trust in each other, needing to have faith in the model itself.

Anyone who attended the GNSO 20th anniversary celebration heard Chuck talk about how important trust is to actually getting our work done and moving the ball forward on things even just within GNSO PDPs. I think really that is the main message here to the board that this is something that's really important to us as contracted parties, us as active participants in the multi-stakeholder model and us as parties who really want to see this model stay strong and continue to function well. We understand that it has come up in the GNSO, we think it's probably something that should come up at a higher level within the

community and that we'll be looking for constructive ways for this topic to be addressed and we're very sitting here willing and able to contribute to those discussions when the time comes. Brian, is that your hand?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Hi, Sam, Brian Cimbolic, PIR. So one, I'm happy to the extent you're looking for volunteers, I'm happy to try and take the lead on this initially, but I did just want to take, maybe suggest that on Sublet C that while we're talking about review teams and everything, while that would be an appropriate subject matter, those reviews are necessarily some time off and I think that this is an issue that every day that it happens is relevant to the trust and long-term viability of ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model.

So I think we should perhaps engage with the board, see if they have any reactions to this loophole and I think we should just tee it up as sort of we're asking their thoughts, we're asking if there's any concerns with this. Again, not weighing on specifically on anything pending before the GNSO, but the practice in general, because I don't think that we can wait for a review team some years off to deal with this.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Watch what I'm going to do. That was going to, it would have been so much better if it was immediate. Go ahead, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, Sam. Crystal with Google. I think it's really important also that the contracted parties make it clear that we are willing to abide by the strength and transparency requirements that have been proposed. There are rumors going around that we also pay people to go into other groups and don't tell people. So just be aware that in this meeting, I've heard that. So it's important that we get in front of it and say that, no, actually, hi, I work for Google. I have a registry. Like you're very clear about these things.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Is it getting paid for this?

CRYSTAL ONDO: No, I'm kidding.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Anyone else in the queue? James is in the queue. Sorry, I got back into the Zoom room.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, thanks, Sam. Also volunteering if Brian needs any backup on this. And I think one of the questions that I've heard frequently is was there anything salvageable in the report? If you're heading towards a no vote, doesn't that kind of throw the baby out with the bathwater? And our response on that, I think, has been correctly that there is some good in this report. We did come up with some valuable ideas that should be examined for the future, but they're kind of meaningless if folks can just

unilaterally self-declare that they're not subject to those rules. So it doesn't matter how many babies are in the bath. That metaphor is starting to fall apart here, but it doesn't matter how much good is actually in the report, if it's just not applicable to folks who decide that they're not covered.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Definitely a really good thing to be prepared to address at an appropriately high level. But all those points are great ones. So I think Brian and James as point on that, Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Sounds good. And I love the tag team. But I also just want to flag that I think we should also do in teeing this up a little bit of myth busting, because I've heard things that contracted parties are asking attorneys to break their ethical obligations. That's just categorically false. And I think it's pretty easy thing to address. And I think we should do so. So the board understands what we are and what we aren't talking about. We're just talking about the transparency that's required under the bylaws and the normative transparency practices of every policymaking body around the world.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Reg.

REG LEVY: Thanks. And that's an argument that I hear a lot as well from attorneys. So to the extent that we can have someone who is a lawyer presenting this, that would be helpful, because I've also heard as much as I love James's spice, that James is the wrong person because he's not a lawyer. So what can he say about this? So my understanding and please feel free to correct me if I'm wrong, is that there perhaps was at one point a recommendation in the working group that there be more disclosure from some attorneys than there is now. But regardless...

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: That's not correct.

REG LEVY: That also sounds reasonable based on who I've been hearing this from. But again, we should be emphasizing that this isn't a breach of any ethical obligations. And I don't know how familiar Becky might be with this, whether we want to drag another lawyer on the board into this as well.

JAMES BLADEL: If I could respond, first of all, I view not being a lawyer as a feature, not a bug, but to my friends and colleagues here. But no, I think we've been very clear that this is not specific to lawyers, although I think that some of those who heard this kind of heard that it was about them. We've mentioned that there are consultants, for example, that behave this way. There are folks that may or may not be representing governments

that also participate in the GAC that may that may be behaving this way. So it is a broader problem.

To Brian's point, this is why these different policymaking bodies have these have these rules. I wanted to point out when you mentioned about the professional or ethical obligations, what I heard was during the work and we were working on this for over a year, that there was a concern that this would break commitments or engagement contracts that people had with their clients, that they were not authorized to disclose them. And my response to that was you need to go back and tell them that those rules have changed and you are now required to disclose them. And if they decline, that's not a problem. That's working as intended because that means that someone is predicated their participation in the multistakeholder model based on anonymity. And that is exactly what we're trying to detect and to prevent.

So it didn't it wasn't a salient argument for me that that these special rules apply to special people that essentially make them superstakeholders, that that are not bound by the kind of the categorical bylaws and structures that the rest of us operate under. Another one that I've heard is that by disclosing. I'm going to be careful here by disclosing their affiliation that some folks would be telegraphing their business interests by coming to ICANN. And my response to that is we're all doing that right now. All registries, registrars, there are publicly traded companies sitting at this table. So that is, again, not a salient argument for me.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Reg, then I put myself back in the queue.

REG LEVY:

Thanks. And I agree wholly with all of those points. I think we should address the attorney argument and move on from it. There are plenty of consultants in this industry that aren't necessarily attorneys, although I can't name any off the top end. And this isn't necessarily geared like this isn't an attack on attorneys, despite the fact that they seem to be the vocal ones who are. Trying to claim that is that I had a second point and now it's gone.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

We can always come back, Reg. I would maybe underscore and support something that Reg just said there, which is like, I don't think this is the setting to get very deep into the nuances and intricacies of this. I think, like you said, Brian, kind of setting up a few. We are hearing the counterparties are saying this. We're here as counterparties. We'd like to correct the record on some of those things. But at the end of the day, the key takeaway, at least as I see this and I'm happy to hear if others disagree with this or if I'm not categorizing this the right way.

But the whole point of the multi in front of stakeholders is for there to be a diversity of interests. And how are you going to know if the diversity of interest is being served if you don't know what those interests are? Like it's on its face, like kind of problematic to just what it is that we all are doing here, but and also what it is that we want the world to understand that we're trying to do here. So I think you're just keeping it that simple. Sue and then Beth.

SUE SCHULER: I do have a question in chat from Jeff Neuman. Do you want me to present what the GAC stated to the GNSO?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I don't know. Do you mean today, Jeff, or during the board call tomorrow?

JEFF NEUMAN: I'll just wait for is it I can I could speak if you guys can hear me.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Oh we can hear you, Jeff. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. I got I was in another meeting and couldn't get back to the venue in time, but wanted to join, there was GAC GNSO bilateral. Most of I'm the GNSO liaison to the GAC and the GAC expressed in no uncertain terms that they expected complete transparency and that and I can present the exact words they used. But essentially it was that they themselves operate individually with complete transparency and they do not believe the attorney client privilege should prevent the disclosure of who is being represented. That was yesterday with the GNSO and the GAC and Keith is right that they did meet with the board. There were so many meetings, I can't remember if that was the same statement they made, but it's on a slide and I can certainly mention it. And obviously, any time the contracted parties are aligned with the GAC, that's pretty good.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Beth, did you want to respond to this?

BETH BACON: I can do a quick response to this.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Go ahead then.

BETH BACON: So this is Beth, Jeff, I think the GAC has already engaged with the board, so I am inclined to let them speak for themselves. I don't I wouldn't love it if they said, do you want to read the I'm going to read the contract party statement on something to the board? So I would say that we've spoken to other groups and we understand that there is broad transparency. We've spoken to other groups and we understand that there is broad community support for this, and you may have heard so from the GAC.

I don't know if we need to read the whole thing out, and I also just wanted to note, I think focusing on the trust and the multi-stakeholder model, we're hearing a lot of that from Sally, but we're also hearing a lot of that as it goes into WSIS and the legitimacy of the model. And we've been talking a lot about that for a couple of meetings now, and this is a huge part of that, the transparency. So I think if we can just drive it back to the legitimizing the model and making sure it's stronger,

making it grow, making it flexible for the future, I think that's something that's really important.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I agree. And just to acknowledge some of the discourse in the chat, noting that we understand that this is something that we an interest that we share with the GAC. Great. I think that's fine. We don't have to, like we said, we don't have to say their view for them. So I think we're good on that point. Anything else on SOI transparency? We're in pretty good shape there. Are we not on time? Doing okay on time. Last topic is setting a concrete date for the opening of the next new gTLD round. Seb, you speak quite eloquently about this. Do you want to at least see it up here? I know you said you kind of maybe want to take a break from saying it to the board.

SEBASTIAN DUCOS: I will need for this meeting to take a break because I will have talked about it two hours before as GNSO chair, so maybe we can have somebody else. And for the I'm sorry for the registries. I've told you this earlier this morning, but I don't think the registrars have heard. So I have been pushing for a day for the next round to know where we're going. And we had that discussion before. It's hard to find a date, but I want something that we that doesn't slip anymore, something that is pegged.

And I know, Jothan, in your experience last time, even getting a firm date was something that slipped, but you know what I mean? I don't think this week anymore, with the news that was given to us earlier that

Marika was going to take over this program, I think it's fair to ask for a date this week in the sense that she's not even a job.

She's coming in. She's going to start on the 1st of November. So we should make it very, very, very clear that we need a date, maybe not for today. I also heard from board members, but Danko is not any board member. He happens to be an experienced professional in project management and happens to be the vice chair, even though it was always in corridors, I think that is an important information, who is saying, I can't give you that date that early.

In principle, what we're hearing from org is we'll give you a date when we're finished with the AGB and that date will be a year later. And I'm saying, at least from a registry point of view, that is way too late because from a registry point of view, I have a lot of things to do, first of all, but I have registries, myself included, but I'm not the only one that need to go and evangelize that with clients who they themselves have long timelines.

And so I have asked, which, in my humble opinion and view, the ones that would have the longest timelines amongst registries, and that's the GOs, because dealing with governments takes a longer time, and the brands, because dealing with large corporations also takes a long time. And for them to give us an estimate of how long it would take before they can apply to start working with clients. And again, the idea is after 10 years of waiting for this, we can't say it's coming. Don't worry. Let's start working. We need a date because they're not going to. We've lost that trust. And so maybe, and I don't want to put them in, I can't see natural, I can't see crew here, but maybe they are part of the message

that we need to pass. I don't know that they're ready with that date. I get a feeling that it's going to be not a year, but more like two years. But that's the topic.

Now, if we go back to April 2026, two years from that would mean that they give us a date in April next year. And maybe it's a fair warning that we need to give them now that that's what we expect. So, again, I will have delivered that message two hours before as a GNSO, or I'd love for somebody else to take the mic and because there was also questions asked if it was my or GoDaddy's imperative because I'm so loud about it. I'd love for somebody else to say it, too. If you believe it, if you don't believe it, then tell me to shut up and I'll be happy to do that, too.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks. Got a bit of a cue, Jeff and then James.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, everyone. I think it's going back to SubPro. It's actually more than just a date. A date is useful and it's great. But the information that's really needed, in addition, there are certain, I should say differently, there are certain other key information that's needed for planning purposes, including costs, fees, at least an estimate, something much better than what they produced in the ODA. That is also something that's needed because, yes, you can have a date, but how can you plan a budget if you're not going to fully understand what the costs are? So I could probably do some other research into the SubPro report to see what other key information that was mentioned there that should be known earlier.

But I get just saying the date to me, they're going to just say, well, we said April 2026 and that's it. But I think we need to make them understand it's not just the date that people need to know, but certain other key information for planning for their own planning purposes, as Seb was mentioning. So I don't want us to have on a slide just the word date, because that's not enough.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Good news. No slides for the meeting with the board. So problem solved on that front. But your point's well taken, Jeff.

SEBASTIAN DUCOS: Jeff, sorry, I went a bit short. The pricing, the cost, a full plan of what is that last year going to need to be? How do they plan to get that? All these things. And by the way, the answer I got is, well, why do you need to see how the sausage is made? And I think that our answer is we're a community here. We need to because we're all part of it. We're selling this program for you. Of course, we need to be part of it. And the second was, do I want to work for ICANN now for seeing so much of it? And no, not particularly, but I do want to know how you work because I want to be able to work with you to sell this program.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: The integrated project plan that we talked about this morning in the registries. James?

JAMES BLADEL:

Hi, thanks. And so I thought Jeff and I were kind of going in the same direction, but he kind of took it at a different angle. So I have to think about that for a minute. But I think Jeff and Seb are absolutely correct. And I wouldn't ask to speak on the business and operational concerns with the new program. But I agree with Jeff's first statement. It's not about the date anymore. This has become a flashing red light on the credibility of ICANN as an institution and as a model. I don't even care what the date is, just the inability to stick with what it says it's going to do and deliver on meaningful programs has been, I think I find myself in the uncomfortable position of defending ICANN and the multi stakeholder model and a lot of different arenas.

And this comes up as kind of the first argument of why this doesn't work and why it just is not a viable model. And I think it's also speculatively here why there's so much interest in other types of naming conventions and naming schemas as I work around to this roadblock that is standing in the way of what people want to do online. So I don't know if we want to go there. I don't know if that's throwing kerosene on a fire that we don't know how to put out.

But I think we need to hold up that at this point, whether the date is in 2026 or 2028 or whatever is kind of irrelevant. This working group concluded, Jeff knows the date many, many years ago after many years of work. And now we're many years beyond that and we still don't have any clear path forward. And I think that is being used outside of these walls to chip away at the confidence in ICANN's ability to function.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, James. Well, I very much do not appreciate the reminder of how many years have passed and how I have aged accordingly.

JAMES BLADEL: We were all babies then.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I think that is a good point about, and again, it kind of speaks to like up-leveling it and addressing actually, or fitting this in the context of the board's question, right, about strategic concerns. And I think the point about the credibility of ICANN being probably the number one strategic concern that everything we do is in service of is a good angle to tackle this from. And not, like you said, not get up there and say, hey, board, give me a date for the next round. That's not what the messaging about. The messaging is about, this is something that the community needs. There needs to be something concrete that we're all working towards that we agree and commit to not slipping and all the other requisite things that should come with it.

I shouldn't say transparency again, but you know what I mean? The insight into all the different pieces, who's responsible for what, and really using this very, what has now become a very operational thing, to show that this community can deliver on what it says it's going to deliver on.

JAMES BLADEL: If I could just, I 100% agree with you, Sam. I mean, the message that it'll be done when it's done maybe works if you're writing the last Game of

Thrones book or something, but it doesn't, when you're responsible as a steward for a multi-billion dollar industry, that's not a responsible approach to program management and timeline management. So they need to put a date out there and then they need to do what's necessary to hit those dates, not just kind of like, well don't call us, we'll call you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks Sam, it's Keith. So while I don't disagree with James and I understand sort of the challenge of sort of defending the model and defending the org and all that, I think we need to be a little bit careful on sort of being overly critical of the timeframe, looking backwards. I think we can make the point that it's important to get to pick a date and make that date for all the reasons.

But I think if we start looking back and being critical of how long it's taken that points right back to the community. That points right back to the fact that the SubPro working group left some things undone that the board has now had to come back to the GNSO with. And so I think that they're let's be a little bit careful about the sort of hindsight being critical in hindsight, because that reflects on all of us as well. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I agree, Keith.

JAMES BLADEL: That's totally fair point, Keith.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I think it also just gets us back to kind of what you said, James, which is like, it's not about the date, right? It's not about the time that's passed. It's not about setting like specifically a date. It's about like putting a deadline and hitting it means. So really good point, Keith. Seb.

SEBASTIAN DUCOS: Just very good, Keith, you're absolutely right. This said, it's an argument that they also use in saying, I can't give you the date because there's too many dependencies, including to the community. And so the answer is, well, then show me that path. Show me where you need us and let us lead the community and make sure that we also meet those deadlines. And it's a given, whatever, win-win, we work together and all meet those deadlines together. And it is absolutely for sure, we have responsibilities in this, but now let's move forward and then meet also our targets.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Anything else on this topic? Who do we have down as volunteers for this? Good, thank you, Sue. Crews?

CREWS GORE: I would be gladly volunteer on behalf of the Brand Registry Group.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Do you want to introduce the whole topic or do you want to add in with Brand Registry Group perspective?

CREWS GORE: I think addressing the whole topic because it's important to the brands, it's important for all TLDs moving forward.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Great. I think we're covered on board prep. We're going to crush it tomorrow, guys.

JEFF NEUMAN: Hey, Sam, sorry, my hand's up.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Just go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'd be happy to present too, not from a brand registry and not from, I don't even have any clients for new TLDs, but I'd be happy to present more than the date and just some of the operational things that, reasons why we need to know more material information than just the date, so I can go into that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jeff. I think on that one, let's see how the response from the board progresses and if and when the time comes for like kind of the

operational detail piece, we'll turn to you, I think that's a really good idea. But I like having a new, Crews, I like having a new face at the table to present to the board. I appreciate you volunteering. Board prep done. Next slide. Just a couple updates on some things that are going on this week. The Contracted Party summit. Ashley, you want to take this one?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

We already talked about it in our last meeting. No, I don't know if Andy is here, but she gave us a -- is she running up to the mic? She gave us a fairly succinct rundown of where things are in the sense that we have a prep group that is meeting to hash out how this is going to happen. We have dates, which are May, well there we go. It helps if I'm looking at the Zoom thing. Dates of May 6th through the 8th. So they've narrowed it down on location. They're working on it. They know we want to know. It will be in Europe. They will let us know as soon as possible as to where that will be. And another thing that was pointed out to us that's not up here is that they're also actively looking at a location for 2025.

And that will very likely be in the APAC region. So something to look forward to. But as of now, what is planned is that will there be a separate event dedicated to DNS abuse discussions and might be held alongside rather than a corporate into the CP summit. So that's something interesting. The CP summit will follow the board workshop so the board can attend. I know at least in the registrar context, we're hoping that we could perhaps co-locate these alongside something else. But the fact that we're trying to get the board more engaged in

these meetings is going to make it very difficult to do that. But anyway, the planning group is meeting bi-weekly. The next meeting is November 1st. There is a deadline for issues to be discussed and that is October 31st. So that is coming up very quickly.

So we don't have them on the screen, I don't think, but there's a number of different issues. I think we've got a good coverage of issues that are of interest, but happy to circulate the list of issues to folks if they think that there needs to be additions to that. Thank you. Any questions? Sorry, I scared you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Can't wait to summit with all you guys. The next one, sorry, let me just double check. I think the next one we have on tap is an update on the AGP limits conversation. Keith's going to take that one.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks Sam. And Owen, I'll turn to you if you have anything you want to add as well. We had a good conversation between the registries and registrars on Saturday on the AGP limits issue. I think it was a very constructive and informative dialogue. We've been having meetings for many months now or several months. And I think this was probably the meeting where we made the most progress. I learned in, we've been focusing on this issue of AGP limits and the possible review of the AGP limits policy. But I think one of the things that I learned that I hadn't realized previously was that some of the fraud that is sort of at the root cause of these overages, even though we acknowledge that there's still

some tasting going on, then that we need to get to the bottom of sort of proportion and percentage.

But a lot of the fraud that's driving some of these challenges is actually being identified after the five day grace period, add grace period. And so to me, that sort of, I think brought into stark relief that while the AGP limits policy is still an issue and still a challenge, it's not the only issue. And that I think one of the things that we came to during our conversations on Saturday was that we need to be creative in terms of looking at ways to address this.

And if we're going to leave the AGP limits policy alone, then there's something else that we need to develop. And whether that's something separate specific to fraud, or if it's a tweak to the AGP limits policy or something else that we really need to sort of keep an open mind and be creative about the ways to approach this, recognizing that the registrars are dealing with some significant financial challenges because of this.

And so, again, I think one of the action items coming out of the conversation on Saturday is we really need to pull together some data so we can understand the scope, scale, depth and breadth of this issue and really get on the table what the sort of what the challenges are, are documented so we can figure out the best path forward. So there's still some work to be done on that front, but I feel like we made some progress. Owen, can I turn it over to you?

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Sure. Thanks, Keith. And I'd like to agree that I do think that we made a lot of progress. I think we had kind of a little bit of frustration going

back and forth, not really getting on the same page, but having that opportunity to be face-to-face and because it was a closed meeting, being able to share some rather confidential data, which we can't really discuss in public to explain where we're coming from, how this is going on. And I think we're in a much better place and hopefully we can make some meaningful progress in the coming weeks, months, so that we can find a short term as well as long-term solutions to these issues.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Sort of a testament to the value of face-to-face meetings, I think. Anyone have any questions or anything else they want to jump in on? The artist formerly known as the AGP Limits Policy Review Discussion Group. We might have to change the name. It'll be okay. We're going to do an unpronounceable symbol in its place.

Next slide. The voting stats. We got some new voting stats today from Carla. We're giving her a break. On the registry side, Catherine? Oh, it's your slide. Sorry, I forgot your own point for this one. Go ahead, please take it away.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: You guys can read. And if you can't, the RO fee approval threshold, which we need to get to 66.67%, is at 53.94, great job. And then we're going to move on to the next slide. RO is at 53.94, great job. RO majority threshold, you need 51%. You're at 49.26, so close. Registrar threshold, we need to get to 90. We are at 65 flat as of earlier today. That's really great. The website keeps getting updated. It's at that link, which I hope someone has and can drop in the chat if you need it. But I also want to

note that I believe Sam and Ashley, along with the negotiating team leads, does that make sense? We're sent and are being sent the list of registrars who have voted and have not voted. This is the same thing that gets published on the ICANN website. It's just that it takes longer to update the ICANN website. So we can circulate that to the SGs.

I really want everyone to check to make sure all of your registries and registrars have voted, where you have seen issues where -- So on the registry side, you had to vote for each individual registry operator, so it was much clearer. On the registrar side, you get one email that's supposed to be for your whole registrar family. It seems that some registrars maybe weren't familial correctly. I'm speculating on that issue, but it has been a thing. And so you want to make sure to check that list to make sure that if you think you have voted for everyone, that all your votes are being shown there, because it's not quite as clear, especially on the registrar side. But registries, you should also check, because just in case. Any questions about voting?

SUE SCHULER: And then when you both put a sticker on your...

CRYSTAL ONDO: I have a question.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Please, Crystal.

-
- CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, Catherine. Do we have a schedule of when ICANN plans to reach out again to folks who haven't voted? I know that it went to spam, because the actual voting doesn't come from ICANN, right? It comes from the no reply at whatever e-ballot it is. So some folks weren't even finding it in their email. And given that there were so many people on our webinars that are not members of the CPH, like stakeholder groups, it's probably important that ICANN reaches out to them and alerts them to what exactly the email alias it'll be coming from. I believe they have done that and they're continuing to do outreach.
- CATHERINE MERDINGER: I believe we did have a plan that they would email again when we get closer, and then again, when we get closer. I don't know what the exact schedule for that was, but we can reach out to ICANN and confirm that it's going to happen. And Karla has her hand up.
- KARLA HAKANSSON: It should be there. So whatever, if someone is not, if they haven't voted, then the vendor e-ballot is sending out multiple emails to remind the contractor parties to vote. And with all of the news that we've been delivering on the voting, if for some reason you're not getting an invitation to vote, please let us know. Contact customer support or your account manager, and we will figure out how to get that to you. And when we start getting down to the time, probably in a couple of weeks where it's getting more urgent if we have not already passed those thresholds, we are continuing to look, well, we're not going to wait until two weeks, but we are continually looking at the voting stats with the contractor parties who have and who have not voted.
-

And the account management team is reaching out to those contractor parties to either ask if there's a question, if there's an issue, if they haven't received the invitation, anything to make sure that it's on their radar and they're getting it in their voting.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Thanks, Karla. That's really helpful. I think it'd be great also if the account management team could, if they have questions to direct them to the negotiating team leads or the registry and registrar stakeholder group XCOM or something like that, so they can talk to people in their same business. So I think they should feel free to do that and let us know if you need us to pass that message along.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Will do, thanks.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Thanks, Karla. Any other questions or comments? Feelings, thoughts? Crystal again.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Sorry, Crystal with Google. I know we haven't spent a lot of time and I don't want to jinx it, but given that it looks like the registries are definitely going to hit these numbers and the registrars have a little bit further to go, at some point we might want to have a conversation about what happens if one passes and another one doesn't.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: We're thinking pleasant and happy thoughts for now.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: They're both going to pass. I have to say it every time the question comes up. We have to put it out there in the universe. But I agree with you and I think it, maybe we'll see where we're at, like at the halfway mark and schedule a time as needed to, we can always cancel this call. But to get the groups together on a Zoom call and hash out that issue, I will be the first person to be so happy to cancel that call. But I agree. I just also want to just quickly say that I, as Karla's email came in, I happened to have her last week's email right underneath it. And the registrars went up almost 20 points in one week.

REG LEVY: Where are you guys registering?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Pretty freaking great.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: We've got a queue unless they're old hands. Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN: I would also suggest that we cross that bridge if we get there. I think we will get there. We will make those 90%. And if we don't, there are other ways of making those talk comply. [Inaudible – 48:41].

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Volker. And in fact, I think we've got time and we're going to really focus our efforts on how to communicate with these folks. So let's just focus on that. I don't want to get distracted now by trying to figure out the worst case scenario. Any other questions, thoughts? Sure, go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Hi, I'm Jothan Frakes for the record. So one thing that as we're going through in voting, at least within the registrars, there was some confusion with the looser orbit registrars who don't really, they're not sitting in these rooms, but they may be listening to this recording. You may read the red line and see that there's sort of a rapid turnaround that you have to do. That language is already in there. Don't be concerned with it when you go through and you're thinking about voting. All this really is changes related to how compliance can have conversations with you. That timeline was always there. It's already in your agreements. So don't let that be the reason that you might hesitate, not vote or vote no. Thank you.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Sorry, is this back to me now? My bad. Any other questions, comments? I don't see anyone in the queue. We can turn it back over to Sam and Ashley.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Wrap up an open question. We did it, 10 minutes till end time. So any other AOB? Thanks everyone for a really productive discussion. I know everyone in this room had meetings all day today. So thank you all for showing up, contributing to the discussions. I think we're going to have a really great discussion with the board tomorrow. I'm definitely looking forward to it. And let's go ahead and get our evening started nine minutes early.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]