
ICANN79 | CF – GNSO: RySG Membership Wrap-Up
Thursday, March 7, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 SJU

SUE SCHULER:

Well, we are one minute away from start time. If anybody wants to join us at the table, you're welcome to join us up here, so we don't have to look behind to see you. Beth refuses to turn her head, so if you want to be seen, you have to come up here. Okay, the session will now begin. Please start the recording.

Hello, and welcome to the meeting of the Registries Stakeholder Group Public Comments Workshop. My name is Sue, and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Samantha Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks very much, Sue. Good morning, everyone. It's Sam Demetriou. As Sue said, this is a session. It's the last day of ICANN79 here. We're going to talk a little bit about some of the items that are open for public comment and just do some general wrap-up from the week and just any last-minute reminders before we all head off back to our respective homes.

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.

I do just want to make one quick logistical note about today's session, which is that it is technically an open session. We're happy to have friends and colleagues from the community sit in, but if there is anything that folks feel maybe is sensitive about something we might be putting in a comment or something that you think warrants maybe a registry-only discussion because we still want to workshop it, let's just tag that. We'll save it for our next bi-weekly call and we can also obviously work on it through the Google Documents, but otherwise, it's an open session, free-flowing discussion, and the recording, as usual, will be posted on the ICANN79 schedule page, so just something to bear in mind. So with that, I'm handing it off to Beth.

BETH BACON:

All right. Thanks, friends. Welcome. That comment was obviously directed specifically to Alan. We know how he goes. I feel your presence. So I just wanted to, instead of just kind of flushing the hour, since we don't really have a wrap-up, I thought it might be nice if we could get some face time and talk about the comments. We do have a few that will be due kind of imminently upon our return. It's not right after, but it's going to feel that way once we do our laundry and focus back on the work.

The first one is the final report of the EPDP on internationalized domain names. Jennifer Chung has very kindly offered to take a lead on drafting that. We will be doing a little bit of a small group, but I wanted to open that up first, do a quick overview, and just see if anyone has anything. And again, reminder, you can just do bullet [inaudible]. If you have a question, a comment, a concern, we can just drop in the document and

we address it later. So this is just to get the ball rolling. So Sue, if we could open that one, that would be super. It's a little teeny, so I might do a little bit of a dramatic reading for the peanut gallery.

The background on this is that following the GNSO council's work and approval, the ICANN Board is now seeking community input on these 69 recommendations of phase one final recommendations from the EPDP on IDNs. So this final report, this is for the entire suite. They've been working really hard. They've been turning a lot of time in on this. So if there is anything on the entirety of the recommendations that folks are still confused, concerned about, any overarching points that we want to make, I think that this is the time as we go into IDNs.

I think one thing that we've—to be frank, I understand maybe a third of what they're talking about when they do IDNs, giving myself—being pretty generous. One of the things we've talked about is just making sure that the IDN implementation doesn't impact or disadvantage in some way or provide an advantage to the IDN applicants by just taking existing TLDs and having an IDN that's just that. So it would be odd. There is a protection for existing. That was part of our previous advice, existing TLDs.

So if anyone has any other burning questions, please feel free to raise your hand. If not, we can go and do a little preview of the next one. It could be the shortest ICANN meeting of all time. No one cares. No one in the chairs cares. All right, great. All right, let's move on to the next. And again, we will be having a specific call and we'll bring all this up on the registry calls and the drop-ins, but for the IDNs especially, because it is 69 recommendations. It's a big report.

The other specific one is the proposed language for the draft sections of the next round applicant guidebook. I think this is going to be—it behooves you to take a look at this, whether you are going to be an applicant or whether you are an existing registry operator. Jen's rolling in. This one is not due until the 19th of March, but it's a Tuesday. We traditionally will then close that on a Friday so that we have the Monday to close it out. This is another very kind of beefy comment. There's a lot to review.

And again, if you're looking at the applicant guidebook, it behooves you whether you're an existing operator or you're planning to apply. Those two lenses are very important. Making sure that you have everything you need and you understand the process if you're going to be an applicant. And if you are an existing operator, understanding the process for folks coming into the industry. Craig?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ:

Thanks, Beth and Craig for the record. So I haven't looked at it, so I'm remiss in that, but does it focus on anything specific or is it just the whole kitchen sink?

BETH BACON:

So if you can see, there is the bullet points there. Outline what this—ICANN org published the following sections. So it's going to cover the predictability framework, code of conflict and conflict of interest guidelines. Guys, it's early, I can't talk, I'm sorry. Conflicts of interest process for vendors and subcontractors, applicant freedom of

expression, universal acceptance, reserved and blocked names, and geographic names.

So I think, certainly geographic, reserved and blocked, that's something that you're going to want to dig into a little bit. Conflict of interest and code of conduct, some of these things have been slightly amended from the last go around. So if you're thinking, oh, I have my conflict of interest from last time, I'm totally fine, there might be a little bit of amendment. Does that help? Does anyone have any questions?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Beth. That noise. Thank you, Beth. Just one other reminder from our meeting on Tuesday, we had said we'll get a group together probably in the next week or so to spend some dedicated time on this because it is a bit unwieldy. Like Craig mentioned, there's a whole bunch of things that are not necessarily interrelated because they are just a random selection of sections from the applicant guidebook. So we will have more time on this. This is a comment where like, please come to that meeting having read the sections or if there's just one or two sections that you are particularly interested in, if you want to skip some of them, that's fine. But if you're going to be there, I would recommend doing the homework in advance. Most of them are short. A couple of them are only like a few, two, three pages.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Sam. That's a good reminder from our previous session. Hi, Jen. Do you want to do IDNs? You want to talk about IDNs? Awesome. You know what's really fun about having these meetings is putting

people so uncomfortably on the spot. It's just really—it warms my little dusty hole where my heart should be. So can we flip back to the IDNs? I can't see that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: The contrast is low.

BETH BACON: Yeah. Maybe that's why I looked like Casper, the friendly ghost all of yesterday. Well, if you're in the Zoom room, you can see. I'm just being squinty and old. I've never been challenging. We know that, Chris. Calm yourself. So we have IDNs. What are your thoughts and feelings? It's big, it's beefy, it's 69 recommendations. When we went through this previously for the draft, we broke it out into every single recommendation. We had a chart and it was beautiful because I love a chart. Do you think we need to take that sort of approach again or narrow it down to specific items? Bless your heart, go for it.

JENNIFER CHUNG: So this is Jen for the record. And I guess, maybe just kind of take a half step back. The good thing about us being very comprehensive the last time around is that they really liked all of our edits and they put them in. Bless their little hearts. Because I think the IDN EPDP recognizes that the input from the registries is actually quite important to listen to because we will be the ones implementing, offering all of these upcoming things in the next round.

And also, of course, all the existing registries who want to offer IDN variants will have to go through these recommendations and kind of assess internally whether or not your tech team, your registrar partners, all of your internal systems will comply with the things that we will require. So with that being said, originally, I spoke with Dennis and Maxim, who are our two other colleagues on the IDN EPDP, and we were pretty happy with the phase one report. We were hoping to probably just say thank you for taking in all our comments before. Thank you for [inaudible] in this.

But then reminding, I guess, those who weren't here in our membership meeting yesterday, there is a higher-level point to all of this. And I'm also guilty of being in the weeds when we're trying to work through the very niche and separate problems. But at the end of the day, the reason why this EPDP is in existence is because the focus is on IDNs for the next round. And that means that we have to be able to actually execute. If we decide that all of these recommendations that come out is way too onerous for all of our internal teams and we decide at the end, why should we even offer IDNs or IDN variants, then this is not a successful endeavor. Not for us, not for ICANN, not for the entire messaging that's going around that says IDNs are important. We need to make sure that we get this right.

So I think in addition to thanking the IDN EPDP for taking in all of our comments for phase one report, we probably also need to include at the end, say the actual high-level meaning behind all of this work is to make sure when we go back to our TechOps, they're not like, "This is not going to be okay. We can't do this." And we're having this discussion in phase two about the harmonization, about the logistics, about

whether or not our TechOps people will be like, “This is not really going to work. You're going to recommend this and we're not going to be able to actually execute,” which is why we need to be listened to as a stakeholder group. So that's my general thoughts and feelings on all of this.

BETH BACON:

That's perfect. Thank you so much. You and Maxim and Dennis have been spending so much time on this and it is very complicated. Before you came in, I definitely said, I was like, I understand maybe a third of this particular effort and I'm very appreciative as is the rest of the stakeholder group.

So we have some notes captured in the document to that effect. If there's things that we want to dive into any further, that's great. Jennifer, do you feel like you want to have any more dedicated time on this or can we just do this online? Okay, we're fine. You're happy? Great. All right, so we'll just focus on getting together that little task force group for the applicant guidebook comments. That's one less thing to do, thanks. If there's no other questions on IDNs, comments? Okay.

Sue, can we just pop back to the list? I just want to quickly run through the public comments. Those are the two—I wanted to spend a few minutes and just gather immediate thoughts on those because they are the two most immediate deadlines. But there are so many more coming down the road. Starting at the end of March, we have proposed top-level domain strings for private use, string similarity review guidelines, review of the draft applicant support program handbook for the new

GTLD program, and proposed bylaws updates to limit access to accountability mechanisms.

I did, for this one—Xavier did stop me in the hallway quickly and he offered to come in and explain. This one is supposed to be very targeted to kind of correcting a drafting error. I think he's going to send a little bit of a letter and an update, which looks like news to Sam, but he found me in the hallway.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: The limiting the access for [inaudible]?

BETH BACON: Yeah, he said there's a little bit of a drafting error and so, he might be sending a letter and he's happy to come in and talk to us about it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay.

BETH BACON: Yeah, David.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Beth. David McAuley speaking for the record. I just want to make sure I heard you correctly. So Xavier is going to stop by and talk about limiting access to accountability?

BETH BACON: Yeah, it sounds funny, right?

DAVID MCAULEY: Well, no. No, that's fine, but I also would like to make comments on this one to set the table for how we look at it going forward when it's appropriate.

BETH BACON: It's appropriate right now.

DAVID MCAULEY: Okay. So this closes it. Oh, by the way, I participate in the Registries Stakeholder Group but you don't see me because I also participate in the ccNSO. So I won't be helpful, Sam, in the wrap-up part. But David McAuley is my name, employed by Verisign. So I've looked at this proposed bylaws update and I've [inaudible] what I said and I think my comments, Sam, will not get into sensitive Registries Stakeholder Group material, but I do want to set the table for our discussions on this.

And I have a couple of things I want to mention about it. One is, this is the genesis for limiting access to these accountability mechanisms. As I understand it is a desire coming out of the grants program, ICANN does not spend money defending its decisions. I'm personally on board with that. That makes great sense. Nobody that gives away money should have to get embroiled in disputes about it. If an applicant, either successful or unsuccessful, feels that they've been done wrong to some major extent, they have their courts available to them. But ICANN need not get involved in this.

In drafting this bylaw amendment, however, I think that we as a group could consider questions for clarification. And let me explain briefly what I mean. This is an amendment to Bylaw 4.1, which is not a fundamental bylaw. But Bylaw 1 is a fundamental bylaw, and it says that ICANN will remain accountable to the community as described in the new bylaws. And so, I think there's a legitimate question here. Should this not be treated in each instance going forward, where access is going to be restricted, should this not be treated as a fundamental step? Just a question for the community to consider. Sure.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, David. This is Sam again. I just want to jump in on one thing and why that distinction is so important. I mean, among other reasons. But when a bylaw change is proposed, and it is a change to not fundamental bylaw, the process through the empowered community is essentially, it's assumed it will go forward unless the empowered community participants object to it. So that would have to be at the GNSO level. There would have to be an objection to it.

Versus if an amendment to the bylaws is a change to the fundamental bylaws, then it has to be a proactive process of all of the empowered community participants actively approving that. So there is a very distinct procedural difference here that I think is important to keep in mind when we're asking that question.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Sam, that's a very good point. And there's one other difference. When a standard bylaw amendment comes to the board, they have to vote by a

two-thirds margin to approve it. When a fundamental bylaw comes to the board, they have to approve it by a three-fourths margin. When a non-bylaw amendment comes to the board, they have to act as they normally do under Article 7. And what that means is, if there's a quorum, which is more than half of the board present, then they act by a quorum of the directors present. So that number has come down quite a bit.

And so, by changing Article 4.1 to say in the future, we can restrict access in this manner. And to give ICANN credit, what they've put here is cross-community effort at this level. All of them have to agree. They've done a great job from the community side of making this rigorous. But the question I have is, on the board side, what is the vote to approve this? That's not clear. And I think that what we're doing here is we're restricting access or creating a mechanism to restrict access to reconsideration requests in IRB, and we should at least discuss, do we want to comment on this, what I'm talking about, the level of board engagement, etc.

So maybe I've gone on too long about that, but I will be happy to come to our list and say, here's what I spoke about. Here's the questions which I think are pertinent. And I think we should set aside some time during one of our meetings or drop-in meetings to discuss this before the close date. So in other words, I think this is important. Thank you.

BETH BACON:

No, I think that's spectacular, and I think it's very important to go through that process. Thanks, Sam. As new folks come in to the community, they haven't had the pleasure of going through that. So I think that's kind of a learning opportunity, but also a very important

point that we need to focus on fundamentals and focus on understanding the process and not making a change, thinking it's small, and almost accidentally screwing something else up. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Beth. And thank you, David. I agree. This is Chris. Just by way of a little bit of further background, the original intention of the auction proceeds panel, whatever it was called, was actually that the reconsideration processes and IRPs, accountability mechanisms, should not be used in respect to grants. That means not just by the applicants, but by me saying, I'm outraged that David has been given a grant. I wish to launch it. What's it? The board, I think, originally misunderstood the import of the recommendation. So they were looking at it solely from the point of view of the applicant.

And I think it's very important that we're very clear that it's completely pointless if you just stop the applicant from using the process if you don't stop everybody else from using the process, because otherwise—and it was grounded originally in the sort of concept which was rooted fairly early in the group, that actually this would be independently run. And therefore, it was totally inappropriate for the mechanisms to be used. But when it became clear that ICANN was going to insist on running it itself, then it actually became even more important. So I just wanted to add that to the mix.

BETH BACON:

Thank you very much, Chris. I think that's really helpful. And to be clear, the question—and this was again, it was like a drive-by bump in the

hallway. The question that I think ICANN is in there, and it's again Xavier, because he works on implementing the operational things. He was looking at this, and I think it gets to your point maybe, making sure that it's comprehensive. Right now, it says it's restricted to the decision of the panel, and not the decision of the other—inclusive of the other steps of approval.

So I think what they're hoping is that they can make a small edit so that it's the decision, and not just a restriction to the decision of the panel, and then have people split hairs and go in there. So that was the three seconds he gave on me. I think he also said that we can expect a letter and a communication on it. So I wanted to flag that as we think about this. We do have a little time on this one. David?

DAVID MCAULEY:

And so, he's talking about the grants panel. But I guess, my concern is that's not really relevant to this exercise. This is an exercise in which we would theoretically amend the bylaws now so that in the future, we can restrict access to accountability mechanisms for all kinds of circumstances. And so, this would apply to the grants. They could take this and apply it to the grants program. But they can apply it to a lot of other things too. So I appreciate what Xavier is going to do, but I'll march forward and come up with my email to the list.

BETH BACON:

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah. You're right, David, but I think it's worth—if we have time, it's worth just digging one stage further, which is actually the reconsideration process wouldn't apply to the panel anyway. The reconsideration process applies to decisions made by org or the board. I suppose you could argue the panel is [inaudible], but leaving that aside for a minute, it's an independent panel. It's the board's decision. My understanding of the process is the panel says, David should have a grant. I just want to say David has not applied for a grant, but I'm just using David as an example. David can have a grant.

My understanding is that the process will be that they will give the list of people who should be given grants to the board, and the board would simply check that the process has been properly followed. They're not going to comment on whether the grant is right or not but the mere fact that the board is involved by making a decision that kicks off David getting his money, that's the challenge, because I would then say, you shouldn't have done that.

So I think that's relevant and then you've got the subsequent thing, which is while we're here, why don't we make an amendment that does this as well? And whether that's a good thing or a bad thing, I'm not entirely sure, but everything you say about it is right, I think.

BETH BACON:

Yeah, and I think that's an important point and I just wanted to flag that this was something that they've related to this. It's in the mix. Let's keep it in mind. It may not impact our comment, but I know that folks have worked on this for a while, and I wanted to make sure that we had all

the input necessary. And to be clear, David can have whatever he wants. Mark?

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Beth. Marc Anderson. I want to tack on to what Chris just said. In the related session earlier this week, that was a particular topic of discussion. A lot of people that commented, picked up on that and were concerned. Why are you creating this open-ended process? Is there something else you see coming? And I think it was Becky who said, “No, we don't have anything in mind. We have no ulterior motives.” But a lot of the comments and response were like, “Well, then maybe we should make this very targeted. And if we find there's another need or another use case, we can revisit it later.”

So I think, David and Chris are right. That's something we should consider as a stakeholder group is, is there a position we want to take?

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Marc. Yeah, and again, we have some time. This closes the 15th of April. So we have a little bit of time to draft and discuss. Does anyone have any more comments, questions on this particular? I don't see. Oh, there's a question in the chat. Does a bylaw have a strong locality of reference in ICANN? Normally, when one says constitution and bylaws, it's the bylaws that give the local geographical authority. I'm not sure. Are we looking at the bylaw as foundational? Is this the question? Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: In case of ICANN, the bylaws are simply put, it's rules of operation. The way in which it does stuff. They're binding. They have to be followed. The board can be sued if say, they breached the bylaws, etc. Slightly more complicated with ICANN because, of course, some of the bylaws actually deal with the way that the SOs and ACs operate, and the SOs and ACs are a construct. That doesn't actually exist in real life. And so, it's more complicated than that, but simply put, they're the rules.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Chris. And hopefully—yes.

DAVID MCAULEY: David McAuley again. I'll say one other thing about the bylaws. Coming out of the cross-community working group on accountability that led to the IANA transition, and that is the bylaws, I agree with everything Chris said, but it's also important to note, especially in Article 4 that the bylaws are enforceable by the empowered community and by individuals at an IRP level. They can actually go to court and get a decision enforced. And the decisions are presidential, so it's an important body of words.

BETH BACON: Thank you, guys, so much. I will say, when I was kind of starting out in ICANN, and people will say, “What’s going on?” It's like, “Read the rules.” I would send them the giant packet of bylaws. So that's a great way if you are kind of diving into the stakeholder group, or ICANN. You always want to read the handbook. It's not IKEA furniture. We can't just

figure it out. I'm very spatially gifted. Can you guys not figure it out? Okay. All right, well, now I've poked a sore spot. Does anybody else have any questions, comments on this particular item? Thank you for the question in the chat. I don't see any other hands or anything. Okay.

One final item that I would like to flag, and we will be following-up with our delightful funded travelers. We do have the Registry Stakeholder Group takeaways document. This is kind of an experiment that we've done to categorize, collate what we have, what we've done, what our major issues were for the past few ICANN meetings to create sort of a record for those coming into the Registry Stakeholder Group. But then also, if you go home or you're working somewhere and they say, "What are you doing at ICANN?" This is what we worked on. These are the things we're doing. In addition, we have said, for the funded travelers, it's one of the requirements for receiving that funding is to do three bullets a paragraph in this document.

Currently, I think we have zero bullets and zero comments. So if we could get our friends started here with maybe identifying one or two topics that we think are takeaways, big focuses for this particular ICANN meeting, and then we can allocate some responsibility for those and get those drafted. Does anyone have anything they think that we should add? I'm not going to presume. I mean, I always have thoughts. Has everyone just been by the pool because I'm jealous. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Beth. There's been a good deal of work related to the next round of new GTLDs and moving towards the opening of that next round, so perhaps that's a prevailing topic there.

BETH BACON: When the letters spell the word, it really challenges me. So, I think also, I wonder if folks working on DNS abuse amendments would like to drop that in so we can talk about our focus on measurement data and all of that. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think, yes. I think that's right, Beth. I think the sort of comments made both in the pre-calls that we had with the different groups and in the outreach session and everywhere else about what happens next, I think that's—because I think that really is, we're going to concentrate our minds on that and our relationship with compliance, which I think is a key point.

BETH BACON: Thanks very much. And to keep in mind, this document is public, obviously. It will be posted on our website, so it's a bit of a wee communique from us. So we can capture our views and what we've been trying to deliver for the community and keep it as a resource for them as well. If this becomes a burden and not a utility, then we stop doing this. But I figure we're giving it the old college try for a couple of ICANNs.

So we have these two. Does anyone have anything else that they've really—even if it's something that you've heard that we have not engaged on, but is a theme and we would like to add some comments?

Those are also valid. Checking the chat. Registration data policy implementation and DPA. Sure, great.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: This is Sam. I think those could tie into one large topic about registration data because the other thing that was a major topic this week was the RDRS. I know that registries obviously don't participate in the RDRS, but I think we have an interest in the success of that pilot and it certainly was on the agenda for a lot of meetings this week.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Kudos to Lori.

BETH BACON: Thank you all very much. But we'll do the DPA and RDDS, etc. And we can nail that down. I feel like that's—I mean, three is good. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Could I just make a sort of entirely side point, but relevant to this list? I have the privilege and joy of being on the community improvement working group on behalf of the registries. Thank you all for your trust. And of course, one of the things that it's about is what is your stakeholder group, et cetera doing in respect to continuous improvement? This is an example of something that's about continuous improvement.

So I just want to ask people to—when the subject of continuous improvement comes up, often people get spaced out and go, “I don't

really know what that means and how this...” So it's useful to have these sorts of concrete examples to that. Are we going to have an AOB because I have something else. So whenever you're ready.

BETH BACON: I think we can move to AOB. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: I'll just point out you have a suggestion in chat for SOI transparency.

BETH BACON: Danke. I don't see anything else other than chat. Thank you very much. That was very helpful. Thanks, JC. All right. I don't see any other hands in the room or in Zoom. Chris, thank you for your service. AOB.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I'll be just—and I apologize if I've missed this. The letter from Theresa on whether we should have yet another ATRT. So I was in the ccNSO yesterday and it came up in the ccNSO and it was like, say what? And yet, when I was in the community improvement session, Cheryl seems to think it's a done deal because it's what ALAC wants and so therefore it will be a done deal. It'll be a focused, very specific ATRT4.

Whilst at the same time, we're going to be running the pilot holistic review program, which just seems to me to be completely and utterly insane. No offense to Cheryl if she's listening. And I just wanted to flag it. We've been asked the question and I would personally like us to be responding in fairly firm terms that the pilot review has got itself sorted.

We're comfortable with that. I agree. Thank you very much. It would be madness to—obviously, we won't say that, but you know what I mean. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks so much for bringing that up, Chris. That was one of the wrap-up and forward-looking items that I had also wanted to flag. I think the first time this pinged a lot of our radars was if you listened in on or listened to the recording of the prep week session on reviews, I wasn't able to listen live, but when I listened to the recording, I was quite surprised that we were talking about ATRT4. I guess, this communication, there was an attempt to send it out. Somehow none of us actually received the letter. So we've gotten it—yeah, I'll leave that aside.

Usually, it's just me, things get lost in my inbox. I will admit that, but this time it was everyone's problem. There was a discussion on this topic here at 79. Unfortunately, it was one of the five different sessions of interest to our members that conflicted with our CPH membership meeting on Tuesday morning. So we have the letter. I will circulate that to our membership mailing list. I also did run into Larisa Gurnick, who is the staff contact on reviews broadly and she said she's willing to come chat with us at one of our upcoming meetings.

I think I'm going to target the first biweekly meeting, which will be two weeks from yesterday to just get her to give that overview, so that we can pull the thoughts on this together. I mean, I think generally speaking, most of us at a stakeholder level are very supportive of seeing

how the pilot holistic review goes down and that starting an ATRT4 that overlaps with that would be a mistake.

Also, just purely from my perspective as chair, it's really hard to find volunteers for all of these different overlapping efforts and I think we want to be well represented on both the pilot holistic review process and a potential ATRT4. So I think that's another factor in advocating for the deferral.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yes, effectively it would be deferral. Sorry, it's Chris again. I agree with you. Just to say, I think there are some fairly well-crafted hints in Theresa's letter about reasons why we might not want to do this. But yeah, if we could just put something together. So two weeks, we're going to talk about it, yeah? Okay, super.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Chris, for flagging that and for Sam for forwarding around the letter. From personal experience, I can tell you an ATRT, it's your whole life for a little while and it is hard. And to your point of finding volunteers, I wouldn't do that again. It's a lot. Marc, I saw your hand.

MARC ANDERSON:

New topic. Are we ready?

BETH BACON:

Any other questions, comments on ATRT? Pre-emptive volunteers. Did I see a hand? No? Alan, comments? Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. Beth, can we go back to the public comments? I want to raise something on the internal TLD.

BETH BACON: Sorry, the private use?

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, the private use part.

BETH BACON: Oh, yeah. Okay. We can open private use. Spectacular. Thank you, Sue.

MARC ANDERSON: So I don't know if this is a question or a comment or maybe a combination of both. This was kind of curious. The SSAC produced a recommendation basically to the board to reserve a string for private use. And rather than doing that directly, the board first directed org to develop a process for reserving a string for private use. And so, they developed that process and now they're using that process to recommend .internal for private use. And I guess, I don't—I'm okay with the proposal to use .internal for private use, but I'm wondering the parameters around when they would use this procedure again. Why they developed a procedure rather than just reserving a string. So I don't know if that's something that we would want to ask. Is that a question or a comment or something we would want to put in there?

But I found that a little curious and I just wanted to flag that for our consideration here.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Marc. So I encourage you to Google Doc that. It's open right now. You'll see that Crystal and Rick have kindly gotten us going. So if you have a plus one to anything they have or if you want to add that for discussion, we kind of already have the ball rolling. So please feel free to add that. And then we can always walk through it quickly at a drop-in call or just get the small group on a call and iron out any concerns. So I think that's super-duper. Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON:

Sure thing. Yeah, I'll drop it in there. I just thought this would be a good opportunity to key it up with a broader group.

BETH BACON:

100%, that's why we're here. Thank you. All right. I think that may have been all of the comments. Does anyone have any questions, comments, concerns? We did AOB. Is there another AOB? Gentle wrapped up reminders. Sue, I'm looking at you. Have we done anything wrong? She's like, nothing I actually care about. All right. Well, thank you, guys very much for hauling in at 9:00 on the last day even though we didn't do wrap up. I think this is pretty helpful. We don't do a comments workshop like we did in Hamburg every time and we repurposed that slot, which was good.

But I do appreciate you guys coming in and talking, because again, the comments don't write themselves. You guys do it. I try and help. Wim is an angel and helps us in so many ways. So I think that if we can get him going—again, if you want to do comments, thoughts, if you just have a question like Marc was like, do we want to talk about this? Drop it in the Google Doc. We can discuss it. There is no such thing as a stupid question in the comments. If you have concern about it, just put it in there. And I guess, with that, I will say thank you very much and safe travels home.

SUE SCHULER: Thank you. We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]