ICANN79 | CF – GNSO: CPH Membership Work Session
Tuesday, March 5, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 SJU

SUE SCHULER: Hello and welcome to the meeting of the Membership of the Contracted Party House. My name is Sue and I'm 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 and Ashley Heineman.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Sue. This is Sam Demetriou, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, and here with Ashley, chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, we want to welcome you to our joint CPH membership meeting this morning. Just to kind of tee things off, we have an hour here together today. We'll take a 30-minute break and then we'll be meeting with the ICANN Board directly following the session for a 90-minute block of time from 10:30 to noon.

So, what we're going to cover today, this is the welcome and overview portion. I'll hand it off to Ashley in a minute to say her welcoming remarks. Then we'll do a little bit of a preview of the joint working sessions that our memberships will be having later in the week, mostly tomorrow, I think. We'll do a rundown of what topics we're going to cover with the board. Get members' inputs on how we're kind of teeing those topics up. And then the last thing substantively we'll cover is introducing the process that we will be following to select the new board member for board seat 13 when Becky's term ends at the end of the annual general meeting in 2025. So, that's what we're looking at today. Ashley, anything you want to say to kick us off?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: What she said. Yeah, good morning. Let's go.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Awesome. All right. So, unfortunately, we already are running into a scheduling conflict due to a session that was added kind of late in the day. So, Sarah won't be here to preview one of the topics. Beth can give us the overview of the DPS presentation. So, I'll hand it over to Beth, and then we'll fill in on the RDRS session.

BETH BACON: Thanks, folks. This is Beth Bacon. This is going to be a very quick preview. We are holding an overview of the DPS. For those of you that don't speak policy nerd, the DPS is going to be the Data Protection Specification, which is just a DPA. And we've been working on it, as you know, for several years with ICANN. It's out of the EPDP phase one work. We are down to the teeniest, tiniest, iddiest, biddiest last item.

And we are hoping that ICANN will resolve it for us this week. But because it's a tiny issue, we are prepared to walk you through in some detail of that final text that you guys haven't seen before. So, if you have an interest in that, please be prepared with questions and comments. You won't get the text before. We're going to give you the overview, and then we will share that following. So, any questions, happy to take it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. All right. Any questions about what to expect out of that session? And that will be taking place if you refer to the slide up here. That's going to be tomorrow morning, this time slot, in this exact room. So, it'll be déjà vu all over again. All right. Looks like we're good on the queue. Beth, I know we had Sarah tagged to give an overview of the next session. But since you're also involved in planning that, would you mind taking over again?

BETH BACON: I would be tickled. It's a lot of me this morning. Sorry. So, we are also in preparation for implementing and the cooperation that's required to implement the registration data policy that was published on 21 Feb. We are going to have just a very unstructured, mediumly structured, you're not all losing your minds doing interpretive dance, a very lightly structured brainstorming session. So, a little bit of pain points identification between registries and registrars. For those of you that have been following the TechOps group, has been doing a lot of really great work on this for several months.

So, we're going to have Rick come in and he's going to share some of what they've been talking about. And then Sarah and I are going to share some of the issues that we have been discussing, just thinking, trying to plan this out. As a reminder, we have six months of coordination and then a year of implementation. That is going to go pretty quickly. So, we wanted to make sure we hit the ground running and we are cooperating out of the gates. So, come with questions, comments, concerns, things that you are thinking about as a registrar or a registry that might have some lead time. And we are going to come up and do a little bit of brainstorming. And I see Rick's hand.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Beth. Rick Wilhelm (PIR). I just wanted to plug this session. We had a session in CPH TechOps that we had, which was closed to only CPH members. And that resulted in an extraordinarily vigorous discussion, which included a fair bit of chin scratching, temple rubbing, and scalp massaging for those involved. And maybe even a little bit of follicular dislocation. So, if you're not concerned about the timeline on this, then you're not paying attention. And so, you should attend this session and either get rattled yourself or prepare to rattle people back at your home office. Thank you.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Rick. And I just want people to think of this is not something where we're necessarily going to have concrete outcomes. We're going to come out with some questions and we're going to keep trying to do some coordination on this. Because as you guys, if you were in the IRT session, you'll note that IRT is, it's not something that we want that group to be telling us how to implement things. That's not their job. But they're more of a registering. Registrars have decided to do, thus and they will let folks know. So, I think that if you do have questions, again, come in. It's going to be Wednesday. It's in 201. Everything's up on this. Any questions, comments? Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. I don't expect a full preview, but I don't expect us to go through the actual content of that session. But just out of curiosity, just so we can prepare ourselves mentally, especially after what Rick just said, are we really expecting pain points between registries and registrars or is this more of a we just need to think about how we're going to implement? Because when we've had preliminary conversations as registrars, we weren't necessarily expecting a whole lot of pain points. So, I just want a little bit of clarification.

BETH BACON: Yeah. And I apologize. Pain points was just the term I was pulling out, not necessarily saying that it was going to be contentious in any way or that we were going to be like, no, you, no, you. It's really just what are the things that we need to do and what individually and where do they touch and where do we need to cooperate? So, I think a lot of folks are at different phases of planning, of thinking within registries and registrars. I think there's just different levels of where you are on the runway of preparedness. So, it's also learning. So, if we can say, this is what we're thinking in TechOps, this makes sense from that perspective, you can then take that back internally to teams that aren't here. And then we can keep that conversation going, but it's just to get us off the ground.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. We do have a little queue. So, we'll start with Maxim and then Rick, then Jothan. Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba, for the record. Actually, it is time to do a couple of things. First of all, to ask your operations, those who plan procedures, how people interact, et cetera, to start making plans of the implementation. It's the first thing. The second thing, please send at least someone who understands technical and operational side of things to the TechOps, if you're a registry or registrar. So, you get more understanding of how complex the issue is.

And if you're planning something and if you're a registry, please try to have conversations with at least one registrar. So, you have plans, yeah, unofficial, technological, nothing more, of how do you see the interactions. Because you will have to do a lot of fancy things, like establishing few different kinds of OTE environments at the same time. Also to plan how to interact with technological people in other companies. And also in this process, we shouldn't forget resellers.

So, if you have some kind of informal planning, technological kind, please ensure that you have at least one sensible reseller in the procedures. So, you play with some databases, it's important to have some non-real data there. So, everything in OTE. And if you do not understand the terms I use, please ask at least one engineer to listen to this part of text. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Maxim. Some good words of advice that I expect that's the kind of stuff tomorrow, the session will cover. But Maxim also raised a good point about the kind of folks who should be part of this conversation. And it brings me to a logistical item for about this session. So, there's two things here. One, as you can see on the slide, if you're looking for this on the ICANN agenda, look for the session titled *RySG* public comment workshop.

There's a funny little quirk that once you get a title, a session title entered into the Sched system, you can't change it after a certain date. So, we're repurposing that. Just, yeah. I'm going to leave that aside. So, look for that. This is the information. This is where you should be. But secondly, the session itself is closed to contracted parties and contracted party employees and reps. There will be remote participation that's available to folks who are within the CPH. So, if you have engineers, if you have platform managers, if you have internal tech folks that you would like to dial into that, that will be available. And we'll make sure that that information is in your inboxes before the end of the day today. Rick?

SUE SCHULER: The other logistical part of that is that room was requested for about 30 people because it was for our workshop. So, it is going to be a small room, unfortunately. Yeah. And we did look it up and I think it'll fit 56. But that's what it was requested for.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Prepare to get cozy. But also, if you'd like to dial in from your room, from the hotel pool, that's fine, too. Rick and then Jotham.

RICK WILHELM: I'll be quick. Just an answer to Ashley's question. Most of the challenges I think are going to be around timing, not so much around the technical implementation about just getting everybody through the toolkit at the same time. And WIM always draws a lot for his public comment and stuff. So, that's why we needed 50 people in the room. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Rick.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I'll jump ahead just at a respective time and I'll be brief. So, Rick presented, I think, a great chart. And unfortunately, we don't have it in this deck to show the timeline. And really, the fundamental issue here was that you've kind of have two dimensions here, multiple registries and multiple registrars that will be performing this activity where you've got sort of a before and an after. And you have a variety of dates when you can start and finish, when you have OTINI [ph] available and conclusion of transition.

So, we have an order of operations that we have to figure out from a project management, product management, planning and resources within registrars. It'll be very, very helpful for those registries that are commercially open if you can communicate the dates of availability, what your start and end points are for these transitions so that we can make that resource planning happen inside of registrars and get that to us as quickly as you can. Rick's been showing this off since, I think, the CP summit, but now that the dates are much closer, the reality is getting a little bit better.

It's almost like a global warming that you're starting to realize, okay, gosh, it's imminent. We need to take a look at this. And so, the dates will be very helpful for us and let us get to that planning. And people who are listening who are registrars, get your project managers and resource planning people involved in this because it's going to be potentially large and you want to be coordinating that across all the TLDs that you integrate with. Thank you.

BETH BACON: Folks, so these are all really good points and I look forward to discussing them during the session. If there are things like, I mean, maybe a little bit less ominous than global warming, but if you want to make a gentler analogy, that would be great. But please find me and let me know. And we'll add them to, we have a list of items that, you know, just brainstorm to get us talking. So, if there are certain things, Jothan, just let me know and I'll add all these things to our brainstorm. I'm glad that everyone is energized.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Beth. Thanks, folks, for the good discussion there. I think this will be a really productive session and it certainly won't be the last time that we as joint stakeholder groups get together to discuss this very important topic. Okay. I think any questions about these sessions before we move on to the next portion of the agenda? All right. Great. Next slide, please. All right. Next up is prep for the ICANN Board. Ash, do you want to take this one?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sure. So, we're taking a slightly different approach and this was discussed during our last meeting with the board in Hamburg, which is the desire to move away from the very broad questions that the board proposes to us in advance and instead focus on topics so we can have an actual kind of dialogue. So, not that we're going to ignore the board question, but we think we can answer the board question by kind of going through the topics that we proposed. So, at this point, what we have already shared with the board are these topics that you see here.

So, NIS2, and that is largely going to be in response to a question that was posed to Council, and essentially the position being we don't see a need for ICANN to take action on this particular issue in terms of a temp spec or a PDP because there's really nothing in NIS2 that conflicts with our contractual requirements. Then RDRS, again, kind of want to focus at the high level of, we're here at least as registrars participating in the pilot to be constructive in gathering input and feedback and also flagging that we do have some concerns with some other parts of the community in terms of their expectations of this pilot.

Largely, as you've probably heard in previous sessions, that there seems to be this, if we're not getting the data we requested, somehow this is a failure of the pilot, and we want to make sure that we shift the focus back to the intention here. Well, first of all, recognizing this is a pilot. There's going to be issues. We're having our own issues as well, but we really need to remind ourselves that this is a pilot and it's about collecting data and not the ability of folks to get the data that they requested. I mean, sure, it's great if they get that, but that is not one of the measurement factors. Also, just to note that it's way too early in the pilot to come with hard and fast conclusions as to the success or the unsuccess of the project. Also, DNS abuse.

We've got, I believe, Owen and Chris lined up to kind of just express where we are. I'm sorry. Or just Owen, rather. I'm talking about, where we are. Sorry. Well, you're on every other panel, Chris. I got to, you know, just talking about the amendments and where we kind of see things moving forward. And then last but not least, SOI transparency, because we do want to keep this issue alive in terms of making sure that we do maintain some level of transparency and accountability in ICANN through the SOI process.

And I believe Sam is going to be asking a follow up question from our last conversation with the board. So, yeah. And hopefully this will kind of cover the board topic question, but I'm sure there'll be some-- we're hoping that there'll be more dialogue this time based on this. Do any of the topic leads want to raise anything that I may have missed? Or does anybody have any questions about the meeting with the board? Oh, Beth, sorry.

BETH BACON: Thanks. This is Beth. I just wanted to say, if there's anything specific that I think some of these are going to be kind of generic, this is what we think, especially on the NIST2, but if there's anything you'd like us to particularly raise or highlight, please find me after or speak now. STTS.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I was starting to type a response to the question Chris raised in the chat of whether we'd be addressing our topics first. Yes. And the attempt will be as we're both teeing them up and maybe summarizing and transitioning into them. We will do our best to tie them into the board's topic because these are items, maybe with the exception of the top one, but these are items that have been issues of strategic importance to our community for some time. I expect they will continue to be items of strategic importance going forward. And so, I think there's, as Ashley so, you know, adeptly mentioned at the top, there are a lot of natural touch points between what the board is interested in hearing and what we are interested in covering. So, we'll make sure to draw those connections for the board as we go through each of these. Go ahead, Chris.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Is there any appetite to at least address it in a question to the board with their attitude to WSIS?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: We certainly can because we know that they do have an appetite for it. I don't know if it's an appetite, but upchuck, reflux, but that wasn't appropriate. I'm sorry. This is recorded.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And it is forever now.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: And I think that they're prepared to speak to this. So, even though we haven't flagged it as an issue, if we have time, I certainly think that's something we can talk about. Michele, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Good morning, Madam Chair. Just on the SOI transparency, while I do love this topic and I feel very passionately about it, as do others, the only thing I would ask is what on earth do you expect the board to do? Because I don't think they can do anything apart from saying, yes, we hear you. No, we don't disagree with you. So, that's my kind of ask is, why are we, like, I think it's good that we're talking about it, but I'm not sure what you expect to get out of it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, excellent question, Michele. And I should have maybe done a better preview of this one. So, the reason we're putting it back on the is because, to underscore your point, we brought it up at ICANN78, and there hasn't been a follow up that we have heard from the board. We do know that this is a topic of interest for the GAC, and we found out that the GAC actually just sent the board a letter, I think it was last Thursday, with a very concrete request for the board to come back in writing with their assessment of how the requirements in the bylaws regarding the operation of not only ICANN, the organization, but ICANN, its constituency bodies, their obligations to operate in as transparent of a manner as possible.

So, the GAC has made that request. It's in writing. I think for this topic, given that context, we're going to just let the board know that, (b) it's something that the CPH still cares a good deal about. (b), we had a great conversation with the GAC yesterday, and I think our interests are very much aligned. (c), we understand that there has been a question raised, and we're looking forward to seeing the answer, but then asking the board if there's anything that they can share as to whether they have had discussions at their workshops in between October and now that they're willing to talk about publicly. I do have the expectation that this might be a thank you for your input next, but it's sort of more about just continuing to underscore that this is something that shouldn't just disappear.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah, thanks. That's helpful. I think it's good that we've managed to get the GAC interested in this. So, for once, the GAC is actually aligned with the CPH. That rarely happens.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Don't say that too loud. It can always change. Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just to add to say that it's not beyond the realms of possibility that the GAC will move to the next stage and give advice to the board. That the bylaw should be changed or the bylaw should be interpreted in a particular way. So, I think we should look at this letter, which we haven't seen, have we, the letter? Okay, cool. We view this letter very much as a step on the GAC's behalf. They certainly have the bit between their teeth and there is complete consensus on the GAC that this matter needs to be sorted out rapidly. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. Reg?

REG LEVY: I'm always confused about where I'm unmuting. I apologize. I also think that this is important for us to continue to hammer the SOI thing. Like, we may have briefly won, but it is the kind of thing that we need to keep on because this is an extremely important issue for transparency and trust in the ICANN community as far as I'm concerned.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Reg. Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: So, yeah, I totally agree with following up on the pretty specific request from Hamburg, which I think was to look at their bylaws and give an opinion. I guess my question would be, do we want to add a note that this work should continue in a CCWG or is that just muddying the waters or that allows them to put it back on us? Like, should we be silent on that point that how this work should continue should be a CCWG or should we just stick to the question about what we've already asked.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: That's a great question, Greg. And when it came up last ICANN meeting, we, I think, had talked a little bit more broadly that if this becomes an effort for the community, we would be eager to participate in whatever that ends up being. I think waiting and holding that fire until we see what this response is, but keeping that as an option in our back pocket, something we internally should be thinking about, but I don't think we need to say it in this specific context. So, thank you for that.

BETH BACON: I 100% agree. I also think that if we have that GAC advice, kind of advice or letter at this point process, it may drive us to resolution more cleanly simply because if we go to the CCWG, we're going to have the same problem we had during the CCOICI. I can't believe I remember that now. It's too much, where we were just at a general stalemate and it was a problem. So, I think that this kind of alternate path is maybe a good thing for us to, as Sam says, explore and wait to see how that plays out.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Any other questions, comments, thoughts? We'll be meeting with them shortly. Okay. What's next? Is that it?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yes. Unless anyone else has any further thoughts for points that we didn't cover, things that we should make sure we hit on or any refinements to any of the topics here that we want to make sure we can hash out before we get into that room. All right. Oh, Michele, go ahead, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah, thanks, Sam. It's Michele again. Do we want to ask about them getting off their ass and actually hiring a new CEO? Sorry, but they've completely overcomplicated this thing and the idea of crowdsourcing the hiring of your CEO is the dumbest idea I've ever heard in my entire life.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I think Beth would like to respond.

BETH BACON: On your scale of dumb ideas, if this is the dumbest, I mean, you've not lived, it's not great. But I think they're in the timeline. I do believe that the rumbles are that it's either right at the end of this meeting or very shortly after, they're going to make a move. And I don't know that us poking the stick is really the best use of our capital at this point, if they're just going to do what they're going to do.

MICHELE NEYLON: I mean, sure, but we can still ask them the question. I mean, people ask questions all the time. I mean, just asking the simple question that, from our perspective, the fact that they've had an interim CEO for how long, I don't know how long at this stage, I don't keep track of them that closely, 14 months. Thank you. So, 14 months, it's not a great look.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: No, that's fine.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: No. I just realized I was breathing heavily into a microphone. No one needed it. I mean, Michele, I think this falls into the camp of you're just going to get the standard book response. I had a chat with Tripti earlier this week. I just asked if they had any further updates to the timeline. And her response was, check the website. So, let's say it's not like totally off the table, but I'm not expecting much productive to come from it. So, we'll see how the hour and a half plays out. I have Reg and then Jeff in the queue.

REG LEVY: Yeah. To the CEO conversation, I think it might be worth saying that emphasizing that the job description is a corporate job position, but the position of ICANN CEO is a political position. ICANN should probably have a COO to manage the day-to-day workings, but what they really need from a CEO is somebody who can stand up there and talk to the entire community in a coherent manner and listen to the concerns. So, I'm not convinced that they're understanding what they're looking for. And I think that, that might be worth articulating rather than just like, you're doing it wrong, but a very specific, you're doing it wrong.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Jeff and then Chris.

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, actually, if Chris has something on this topic, I was going to do something else, so.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. I don't know whether, I don't know how much of this is public or not, but my understanding of the situation is that they're down to the board interviewing in a few weeks' time, a small final slate. So, putting in comment, everyone's welcome to say what they like, but putting in comment about, we think you should be looking for a seven-trick pony rather than a one-trick pony or whatever it is we think is probably a little late now, but there is progress is being made. And I think that they're weeks away from, assuming that the slate is acceptable, one of the people on the slate is acceptable to the board, then I think they're fairly close to reaching a decision. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. I'm just going to quickly, before we go to Jeff's topic, take the temperature. I feel like we have some thoughts and feelings around the CEO, but I don't know that all of us fully-- I don't know that we all maybe have the same views on whether this is a great setting for it. What do folks think? Open mic. The CEO topic, while great points were raised right in here in this room, whether bringing this up with the board in the next hour is-- if we think we're going to achieve anything.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's a dead topic. I think all they're going to do is refer you to the website. They're not going to tell you anything. They can't tell us anything. They can't, and they won't. So, I'm not sure that it's a valuable use of time, but if people feel the need to vent, then.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. Maybe save the points for a different setting. Okay. Thank you. Good discussion though. And Reg, incredibly good points. I don't want to undermine those.

REG LEVY: No. I was just going to say, given that background that Chris just conveyed, absolutely, this is not the time. The time for that was when they posted the job posting, and I thought about it immediately.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much. Jeff, thank you for waiting patiently.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, sure, no problem. During the last meeting, at least, the registries had, in our conversation with the board, it was the full CPH, but the registries had said that we'd come back with a document on milestones that registries would need for the next round. I thought it might be sort of helpful to take maybe two minutes to say we've delivered that, in case they didn't know, and maybe, like, a couple sentences on, what it is.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jeff. And just to confirm for everyone else in the room, it's been delivered. Marika has acknowledged receipt. Marika mentioned that she will share it with the board, like you said. So, we'll see how the time in the session goes, and if we end up having a couple minutes at the end, we can touch on that. Okay, great. Anyone else on the board meeting? Awesome. Then we can go into the next topic, which is not unrelated to the ICANN Board.

So, just to give folks the background, I think many of you are probably already aware of this or have heard us start talking about it. Becky Burr holds board seat number 13. She was elected to that seat by the Contracted Party House. She is currently in her third term, which is the maximum number of terms a board member can serve. That term will be expiring at the annual general meeting in 2025. So, next October. Not this October. Next October. We, as the CPH, are tasked with selecting her replacement. We consulted the GNSO procedure document for that, as well as the very helpful GNSO secretariats, and they have let us know that the deadline to have the final name selected is very early April of 2025. April 2nd, effectively.

At that point, the name goes to the GNSO Council, so the GNSO Council can approve it, and then the person can go through all of the screening processes and onboarding for the ICANN Board. So, if you'll go to the next slide, please. I already covered all this. Sorry. The next slide. I forgot I put this slide in between. I'm lucky I remember the dates, though, guys. I'm getting better at that. So, here is a very high-level sample timeline that we've put together for the different steps in the process. To give you guys just a bit of a recap of the GNSO procedures that are in there, the CPH is meant to choose this candidate jointly. The process accounts for the individual voting procedures that happen in the Registry Stakeholder Group and the registrar stakeholder group.

In the event that both groups select and support the same person, the process is really easy. That person goes forward. In the event that the registries vote for someone and the registrars select someone and those two people are different, then the procedures contemplate that the executive committees should come up with a process to select that person. We, as the executive committees, have talked about, wanting to keep this as open and transparent a process as possible, where the stakeholder groups themselves have, like, lots of time for input into this process in the hopes that eventually we select the same person, because it just makes the process a little bit easier.

So, to facilitate that, we're trying to build in lots of opportunities for the stakeholder group members to have opportunities to talk with the potential candidates. Another thing that Ashley and I have talked about, and we'd love to hear your feedback on this, is that Becky is leaving some very large shoes to fill. Becky has done a really excellent job as a board member, but also as kind of a liaison with the Contracted Party House in her role as board member. So, what I think we would like to do is gather input from the full membership, executive committees as well as membership, about what we'd like to see in the next board member and kind of develop our own job description, maybe ever so slightly shorter than the ICANN CEO job description that got published, but have an idea for, like, what we're looking for in a way that will hopefully guide folks who are considering whether or not to run for this position.

We also would love to ask Becky to share her views and her experiences. And so, one of the things we're thinking about trying to put together is a forum at the next ICANN meeting in Kigali for our membership to come together, talk about what we're looking for, what we'd like to see in the next board member, and invite Becky to kind of give a short presentation or be available for questions about her experiences, what it takes to be a board member, things that have gone well, things that, could go better for the next one. So, that would be the next ICANN meeting. Following that, we would open a process for interested applicants to submit expressions of interest.

That would go to both stakeholder groups for everyone to consider. And then, before we actually hold any kind of vote, we'll use the ICANN81 meeting in the fall of this year, November 24, to hold a candidate forum where those interested parties can present to the full stakeholder groups, the joint membership, also hold, one-on-one conversations with members and things like that. And then, that would put us at voting starting at the very end of the year going into the first quarter of next year, if needed, and that hopefully will line us up with the deadline that we have to meet for the GNSO.

These are the process itself and the dates, like, we're subject to tweaks here and there. If you guys think any of this doesn't meet your expectations or might not work out well, but this is just a high level of how we think this process, how we think structuring this process will hopefully make it go smoothly and hopefully give us plenty of time to find the best person to replace Becky. Mike, I see your hand?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes. So, a statement and then a suggestion. So, with regard to the timeline, I agree, but as the noncontracting party houses demonstrated this year, notwithstanding the bylaws, we have some flexibility here. So, that's my statement. My suggestion would be, perhaps pushing back the candidate submissions of the EOIs until November, and the reason I say this is Edmon Chung, who's currently on a board through the NomCom, I believe he's up for re-election in this cycle, and he's going up against some, basically, the chair of the ICANN Board and the vice chair. So, his ability to potentially be re-elected, we don't know.

So, I think Edmon potentially would make an ideal candidate from the registry constituency, and if we go with this timeline, he may be precluded because the NomCom may have not yet made that decision within this time. So, I think it would be important to maybe just push it back to have the statements of interest be the week after the annual meeting, and then we could do something, as far as a Canada forum online, particularly to maximize participation for those that may not be in physical attendance in Istanbul at the annual meeting. That would be my suggestion to maximize the Canada poll.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that suggestion, Mike. Thank you for also mentioning the non-Contracted Party House selection process. That is sort of fresh in our minds, and to be very blunt, I understand that this is recorded, but

I'm still okay with saying it into a microphone. I would like us to do a better job in managing our process than what happened the last time around.

So, that's kind of the reason we're getting an early jump on this. In terms of the question about tweaking the dates for that, thank you for the suggestion. We'll take it on board. We'll give it a thought. Off the top of our head, are our NomCom reps? They're not here. I think they're in NomCom meetings. Oh, Craig, perfect. Thank you, Craig. Sort of expected to see you at the table, but that's fine. I'm teasing. Craig, can you give us a quick fact check on dates and when NomCom expects to have its slate finalized?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Thanks, Sam. Craig Schwartz for the record. So, as most folks know, NomCom met this week. We're meeting again in Istanbul in the first week of April, and we'll finalize our work at the policy meeting in Kigali. So, that's when our selections will be made, and then it'll probably be announced by staff, I think, in late July or early August, kind of like it historically has been.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay. So, perfect. So, that should allow us to stick with this and still hold our EOI sufficiently after the NomCom publishes its selections.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Correct.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay. Perfect. Thank you for that fact check. Thanks, Mike. Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks. So, I just wanted to also make sure that one of the other factors we wanted to make sure we got across today is that you all go home. We don't need to put board names today. In fact, please don't. But I think people need to recognize this is a full-time job. This is something that you need to talk. If people are interested or you're thinking of, like, somebody being good at it, they need to really think about their ability to do it, to go back, and if they have superiors within their organizational chain that they need to talk to, to make sure it's okay for them to do it, because this isn't something you can just do as 10% of your job.

And if that's all that candidate is willing to do, then they're probably not the best candidate to represent us. Because, again, Becky has done an amazing job. She's been absolutely incredibly vocal as a board member. And I think going into a next round in particular, a lot of our interests are going to be at stake. So, we need to make sure that, one, if at all possible, we don't have a conflicted member as well, because I know that depending on who you work for, you might have to not be able to participate in some conversations.

So, there's a lot of different factors that really need to be considered, and that process is going to take a lot of time too. We don't have a timeline for that, but folks who are thinking about it or think you have ideas for good candidates, talk about it, raise it now with those people or with yourself and your superiors, just to make sure it's actually something that's viable. So, anyway, thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, thanks very much for that really important point, Ashley. And you actually just, like, you gave me the idea. On the point about potential conflicts. I mean, one thing that we know is coming down the timeline is the next round of gTLD applications. And we know that the last time in 2012, obviously, with the new gTLD program committee that the board had put together, some members were conflicted.

So, I think, sorry, reset. On the agenda for the contracted party forum at ICANN80 should, I think, be a discussion about what items we see the board tackling over the term of that next board seat 13 candidate and what some of those areas might be so that we can air them and, like, and flag them and have them and have, like, a common understanding of what those might be. I think that's a really good idea. So, thank you for suggesting that. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Sam. And, Ashley, I agree with what you just said, just to address the point about conflict. Look, pretty much anyone who is in any way associated with the registry or registrar is going to get excluded from the new gTLD discussions. That's just going to happen. It doesn't matter. You know, it just will. And because the board takes a very conservative approach. I mean, last time around, Crocker had a sort of, like, really small contract with someone, I can't remember who it was, a registrar or registry to do some DNS work.

And we ended up having a special committee of the board that he wasn't on, even though he was the chair, because of that risk of conflict. So, I wouldn't worry too much about that, because it's not, it's just going to be a problem no matter what. It's one of those ones you just have to accept and then get on with everything else, I think. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Chris. I really appreciate that. And also, for anyone who may not be aware, Chris has a tiny bit of experience with the ICANN Board as well. So, Chris, we'll be, I think, tapping you also for your insight on what makes a good board candidate. Thanks in advance. All right. Any other, like, any questions about this process? Like I said, we will finalize the details and the dates as we take on other feedback and as we, get a little closer to when we initiate this. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah, thanks. I just remember, previously, we had kind of almost a tradition of, it was swapping it around between the registries and the registrars. So, is this being abandoned, that we're kind of now going to be choosing people based on their actual merits?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I don't know how to answer that question without sounding like a jerk.

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, you do work for the Axis of Evil, known as Verisign. So, I mean, you're doing pretty well.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Michele. On a personal note, I, of course, think we should be choosing someone based on their merits. I think the question of the swap back and forth, I mean, just from a purely procedural aspect, that's not hard-coded. It's not a hard and fast rule. I also think we should bear in mind that in the last nine years, well, it's been eight, it will be nine.

Since Becky took over, there have been a lot of changes to the industry, and I think the overlap between registries and registrars is higher than it has been in the past. Like, a lot of our companies have both. So, that's a question for membership. Like, ultimately, this is what the people want. We are still sort of a democracy in this Contracted Party House. So, I wouldn't say it's off the table, but I wouldn't say it's like a guiding rule at this point, maybe.

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, that's fine. I mean, look, I think the thing is that at various points over the past 15+. God, what year is this? This is 2020. My math is not doing very well, but okay. So, I've been involved in the circus in some shape or form for a bit too long, possibly. I think I need to find somewhere new to go and play. The kind of importance of the selection for that seat has varied. The level of engagement of the person in that seat with the rest of us has also varied massively. I think with the way things are moving in terms of all the regulatory stuff that's coming down the tracks, that there are a lot of challenges for the internet industry in the broader sense, not just domains.

Domains are just a sliver of this. So, I mean, the only concern I would have personally, is that you don't end up in a situation where we end up choosing somebody based on the perception that there isn't as much of a conflict or some other kind of arbitrary thing, because it is an important role. It is something that does require somebody with that kind of knowledge and the gravitas and all those other things. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Well said, Michele. Yeah, I think another-- I'm hoping what you guys take away from this and the thought we're trying to get put into it and the runway we're trying to provide for is how seriously we are taking this and kind of like our high expectations for what this candidate, the criteria this candidate will meet.

So, it's a big job. Think long and hard. Like I just said, think long and hard about who would be good at it and if you can take the heat. All right. Any other questions or feedback on this? All right. So, stay tuned for some updated information, and hopefully we can put together a good and productive discussion for the next ICANN meeting in June to cover a lot of this stuff. Okay. Time check. We're 11 minutes out from the end of this meeting. I think we did pretty good on the agenda. I think the last thing is just to wrap up, right? All right. Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I say we all rush off to the CSG session on RDRS.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Sam, you made the mistake of suggesting that there was time. So, I thought I'd help fill it. No, I suppose because this is the only opportunity that we meet as a group before May. I mean, the thing I'm just going to throw gently on the agenda is, the upcoming meeting in Paris. Does any thoughts on that?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. Yeah. Open floor. We've got the Contracted Party Summit coming up in May. It'll be two and a half days of sessions, and then they're also adding on a day of DNS abuse discussions that I believe is being kind of co-planned by ICANN and the DNS Abuse Institute. Sorry, it's two full days. There is not the half day as there has been in the past. So, two days of summit, one day of DNS abuse discussion. Thank you, Zoe, for correcting me on that. It'll be May 6th through 8th in Paris. Any-- Sorry, 6th to 9th?

MICHELE NEYLON: So, I think the reason this wasn't on the agenda is that Sam forgot it existed.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Listen, I just show up where they tell me to go. Okay. Ashley, bail me out.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: No, I was just going to say, like, add a few points to the great information Sam just provided with a couple of-- You mean you haven't memorized everything about the summit? Okay. So, yeah, a couple of other points to note. Well, first of all, we've had a team, working to develop the agenda for this. It's also going to be alongside a board workshop. So, the ICANN Board has been encouraged to stay and participate in the summit. Tripti is a huge supporter of the summit.

She attended the one in LA, and she thought it was incredibly helpful, and she thinks all board members should attend. So, this will hopefully be a good opportunity to with our board members. We've also been asked to brief the board before the summit. So, at least Sam and I will be working with you guys to put together a good presentation that is digestible, but also really explains how we work as an industry. It was noted that there was a presentation given to the board in Montreal, and apparently that was really good. That's like the one ICANN meeting I didn't go to, but we'll be using that as a basis. So, I think this is going to be a really good opportunity to engage with our board members, the short version so.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: We good?

MICHELE NEYLON: No, that's fine. I mean, I don't have anything to add. Oh, is it? Sorry. Well, I mean, I'm so sorry. I don't know how to operate Zoom.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: And I don't know how to operate a calendar. So, it's all good. Listen, we're all just doing the best we can. All right. Anything else before we wrap? It turns out that the discussion next door about the registration data request system is maybe getting a little spicy. So, if we want, we can wrap this up really quick in case anyone wants to pop in for the last five minutes of that. Be at the boardroom at 10:30, if you are speaking, if you're on the stage and are a topic lead, be at the boardroom five to ten minutes before that to take your seat, please. We'll see you all then. Thank you so much for the good conversation.

SUE SCHULER: We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]