
ICANN81 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and CPH
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 – 10:30 to 12:00 TRT

LISA SAULINO: Hello, my name is Lisa Saulino, I am the participation manager for this session. Welcome to the joint session with the ICANN Board and the Contracted Parties House. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic. Please state your name for the record and the language you'll speak if speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace. This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the CPH, therefore, we'll not be taking questions from the audience. With that, I hand over to the floor over to ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Lisa. Welcome, everyone, to the bilateral meeting between the Board and the Contracted Parties House. We hope to have a very candid discussion, and I don't want to add too many comments because we've got lots to discuss, so I'll turn it over to Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Tripti. This is Sam Demetriou, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Thank you, Anne, for having us, we also are looking forward to a pretty open and candid discussion. I think we have built a

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.

good track record of that between our two groups over the last handful of ICANN meetings. So I won't belabor the introduction too much. We have a couple of topics that we've suggested with the Board and Ashley is going to lead off on those. So if it's okay with you, I'll hand it over to Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Sam. Thank you, Tripti. Thank you everybody, as always, appreciate the opportunity to meet with you all. So we just wanted to start off with a couple of topics that we wanted to bring to the conversation, and we can spend as much or as little time as you would like. Starting off with the RDRS pilot, we know that you all have been hearing quite a bit about others' perspective, particularly from the requester side, and we just wanted to make sure that you are aware of where, at least the registrars stand on this issue. And I think most notably, we have been acting, those who are participating have been doing so in good faith, we continue to do so whether it's a pilot.

I'm curious to see if it gets to production, but overall, the experience, I mean, it's varied, but I think overall it's been positive from the registrar perspective. I know that at least a handful of registrars have been pleasantly surprised and happy with it and are actually, if this continues, are willing to build upon it and perhaps rely on it even more as a formal entry into requesting data. I know at least from GoDaddy's perspective, we are using it now for privacy proxy requests. If we get privacy proxy through that system, we will review it through the system.

And that's not a requirement, but that's just something that we've chosen to do.

And so I think in general, we're curious to hear where the Board is thinking on this. Do you think that the pilot will continue? Do you think it'll go to an operational phase? Is this it? But just getting an understanding from you all where things are going.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. And I'm gonna lead off on that. I think we see real value in RDRS. We're getting a lot of information about how it's working, we're pleased that the standing committee has been working to identify tweaks and the like. We are having a discussion in the Board about whether there's a need to continue the pilot for another year, or whether we've sort of learned what we're gonna learn from the pilot, and maybe we should think about the next steps, which I think probably would require some policy development to-- I think issues are the privacy and proxy thing, and I'm very grateful that you're experimenting with answering privacy proxy or responding to privacy and proxy requests through the system. There's also that should it be a policy that all registrars are required to participate in it?

Other things like what can we do with the system to ensure that the registrars are not having to double work? I mean, can it be integrated in a way that makes it seamless for you so that you're not duplicating systems that you already have in place? So the Board has been talking about that, and then I think without cutting off the Board's discussion about it as a general matter, we think we've learned most of what we're

gonna learn from a pilot and it's time to move forward on that. Anybody else want to..?

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks. This is Roger. I'm part of the RDRS committee, and I would say, I think you're probably right, I think we can move forward, but to your point of probably policy work to get to, and the one example you gave was making all registrars accountable for it or whatever. I don't know if we should stop the pilot because then people will quit using it. I think the pilot can continue until policy's done. Just a thought, so thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Absolutely. There's no contemplation of stopping the pilot, so it would be a seamless transition as we move through.

JAMES GALVIN:

Actually, I was gonna offer to call Maarten to speak about the RDRS engagement session that we had and speak about the results that came out of that. Maarten, if you'd like to say, he was the leader of that session during prep week.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Hi everybody, Maarten Botterman. I had the pleasure of, together with my colleague, sharing a session on RDRS in the prep week to which community participated so well beyond the Contracted Party House. And just the impressions that came very strongly across is like, oh, wow, we are halfway a two-year pilot that we started a year ago. So what did

we do? Realizing that the response rate is not as high as some people hoped, and it's like, how is that reflected?

But it's very well recognized that we are now in this pilot in the voluntary phase, a voluntary phase in which there's no obligations on how you respond. You can participate on a volunteer base, which covers most of the domains, but not all. And people that ask things to the system can't be sure they get an answer yet. So how to deal with that is a question that came up, and that I think is good to reflect upon that it helped to better understand what should be asked to be able to take action. Also recognize value already of the system today, and some of the things that came up is please let them stop this before there's something better or before it's improved. So these are the key takeaways we had from that session.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Maarten. And let me just say, notwithstanding the discussion about responses, I just want to reiterate that the Board is completely aware of the fact that RDRS is a request system, it is not a system for determining the responses. It is a system for processing requests, and we don't believe that there's a path to change that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Becky and Maarten. I think that's important to get on the record of today's conversation because at the end of the day, while we see a lot of positive constructive things coming through with the pilot, it was never going to change the law in terms of what we need to do.

But just to also note that we've been as transparent as I think we can be. We held a session in Kigali articulating what it is we consider when we get a request and try to explain what it is we need, what we need to hear, and what we're not getting. So we hope we can continue those conversations.

We've, I mean, surprisingly offered it up and it was not taken, that's fine. But we're here and we're willing to share our experiences and try to articulate to people what they need to do to get them that much closer to a positive response. But at the end of the day, we have to follow the law. But appreciate all the input. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, just to add one thing, indeed that point that the response is the responsibility of the registrar, not from the system, that the point had been clearly made and heard as well.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry, this is Greg DiBiase for the record. Becky, quick follow-up question on your comment the Board is thinking there may be policy development that could be warranted. I just want to clarify the first step is that this was a pilot to evaluate the SSAD recommendations, right? So I'm assuming the first step would be to use this data to evaluate those recommendations, but then I guess is that an implication that this

may inform additional policy or other policy beyond, I guess, the original scope of the pilot?

BECKY BURR:

So both of those things are true. I think we have to the extent we were gonna get information about demand and volume, we don't see that we're gonna get a lot of new or different information in another year. That does give us the information that we were looking for in terms of the SSAD. So the question was, do we use this system and build it into a permanent robust solution, or do we start building the SSAD, those conversations have to take place. And then once you get the answer to that, there are all of the other policy issues there. So it's not to the extent that the pilot was about getting data to understand demand, we think we're sort of there.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

If there's no other comments, I can move to the next. Okay. So we just wanted to also touch upon the recently published ethics policy that was provided, and just wanted to really thank the Board. Thank you, Tripti. Thank you, Sally.

We think this is a really positive step, and based on our initial reviews, we think it really hit the target in terms of what we were looking for. We are still reviewing that, we think there might be maybe a few knits. I'm not even sure that we see knits, but we do plan to review and to comment. But wanted to let you know in advance of that, that we're very grateful and it's a great indication that you're listening not just to

us, I know the GAC had very strong views as well. But thank you very much.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Ashley, for appreciating our work on this. Now, this is very important to the board and to Oregon. Actually, I'm gonna turn it over to Chris Chapman to add some more commentary on this.

CHRIS CHAPMAN:

Thanks, Tripti. Ashley, thank you for that because I think it's consistent with what's happening on a number of aspects at Board level with respect to all the things that might fit into the ethics bucket, whether it's conflict of interests at Board level, where we're doing a re-analysis from first principles to the new role of the ombudsman and behavior within the organization. And we had a very interesting session, very good session just before this one. So this recent policy is specifically with respect to the statement of interest. Its time has come, this is a very serious demonstration of the Board's view and attitudes.

We want to set the tone and let it percolate down, but we also want to underscore the fact that there's a responsibility for the relevant community group to take ownership and enforce under their own mechanisms. But you can be rest assured that this represents a very serious demonstration of the Board's necessity to attack this head on. It's drifted for too long, and we will welcome all the commentary that you bring forward because that will help us fine tune that. So thank you for what you said. And I'm gonna leave it there. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. if I could just add-- oh, Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG:

Yeah, I just, I guess want to add, because this is one of the things that is definitely dear to my heart. And I want to add a thank actually to the Contracted Party House because this was at least the Board's real action on this was sparked by our conversation in Hamburg when the council was going through that SOI discussion and you brought it to the Board's attention. So I just want to thank the Contracted Party House for doing that, actually.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. And we are getting, as Chris said, collecting comments. We hope to act on it quickly once we get the comments back, if tweaks are needed to take care of those and then have consideration in the first quarter of 2025 by the Board for adoption. So that's the current plan. In addition to what Edmund said about the views of the contracted parties, I think the call for a true ethics disclosure policy came from many parts of the community, and that was one of the things that's very important about it.

The GAC was absolutely focused on this as well. So I think it, it's a good cross community activity that we've got there and we're very pleased. I think that brings us to the end of your topic. So we seem to be going through this rather quickly, so we may get to some other issues, but as you know, our new CEO is going to be starting in the first part of

December. I hope some of you had the opportunity to meet with Curtis, chat with him, say hello.

He was here briefly. But as we prepare to onboard him, and he will be getting his feet on the ground and learning about this about the organization and what's needed, we'd like to provide him with as much input as folks as we can about where the community is coming from in terms of his priority, obviously. We want to hear from him about what those priorities are once he's gotten the opportunity to observe and learn about the organization from inside. But we're quite interested in hearing what the contracted parties think should be his top priorities. We've asked this question in our other sessions, so we're also interested in the variety of responses that we're getting from different parts of the community.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Becky. And this is Sam Demetriou, chair of the registries. I'm gonna kind of MC this one, but we have leads for each of the individual priorities that we've identified. So we've come up with a list of three as requested. And for the first one, we're actually gonna hand over to Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Sam, this is Greg. So the first one, we just want to note something that we'd like to build upon. Sally has done a tremendous job with engagement, and just in general, the Board, the CEO, and

ICANN Staff has been very accessible in a general sense and in specific things like setting the pre-ICANN meeting with leadership.

We've found that to be very helpful, we appreciate that, and we really hope that continues. So, kind of continuing on this theme of improved communication, that also feed into things like transparency, like Edmon mentioned, we saw that ethics policy and it really felt like this was a result of our increased in communication and that ICANN was really listening. So just want to note something that's been going well that Sally in particular has done extremely well, and we hope that continues.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. And let me say, I think the Board definitely shares that priority. We've been very happy with the improved engagement, the improved tone of the engagements over the, as what Sam said, the past several meetings. And we think we're getting more work done in a more efficient way. So that will definitely be a priority that the Board shares.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Yeah, thanks, Becky. I think that's really great to hear, and I think we've noticed a trend where it's become a bit easier to have conversations across different community groups as well. So continuing on that positive progress I think will be a good thing for him to focus on. So for our second priority, I'm gonna turn it over to Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. And as much as the love fest has been going on, I think we have-- this deals with something that we have an issue with as contracted parties, and it's related to the budget and fees. I was reminded that back in 2006, 2007, when we were really talking about having a variable fee rate with registries, Paul Toomey had said, we want to tie ourselves to the industry.

When the industry benefits, we benefit, we ICANN, benefits. When the industry has to tighten its belts, we ICANN have to tighten our belts. That's not really what's happening here. For many years, ICANN has received the benefit of a strong industry. Some years, in fact, ICANN earn tens of millions of dollars of revenue over its expenses. And it's not like the Contracted Party said, please give us money back. Again, because of the notion of we both benefit or we both tighten our belts. But now that the industry is contracting, meaning less registrations, ICANN is also getting less fees.

ICANN's solution was to exercise its right with the low hanging fruit of increasing pricing under the contracts without really considering the impact of the increase of pricing on registries or registrars. I think that, again, ICANN needs to think about the fact that, again, the reason they're getting less money is because we're getting less money and we're all tightening our belts, we're all making cuts to our budgets, we're all making cuts to our staff.

ICANN is now squeezing us even more with increasing the fees. And I want to give a little bit of a shout out here to the smaller registries in particular, there's over 600 TLDs with less than 2000 names, which

means they're paying the annual minimum that ICANN imposes of \$25,000, which means that these smaller registries under the existing fee structure are paying at least \$12.50 cents per name just to ICANN.

That's not for any operations, that's not for any of their own activities, \$12.50 cents at 2000 names. So there's a much larger impact on the smaller registries than there would be on, let's say, registries that have more than the minimum amount, because now they're really just paying a variable fee. And I don't believe that I can't consider that. One of the things turning this more into questions and priorities is we want to understand what ICANN's long-term strategy is and its holistic view on its budget and future expenses.

We want to know what other alternatives were considered, did ICANN consider, I'm not gonna mention specifics, but a bunch of them were discussed in the Contracted Parties House meeting, but did they consider other sources of funding for potentially like other services it provides that maybe it doesn't collect today funding for?

At the end of the day, the Contracted Parties House wants to ensure that ICANN manages within its means, that it takes, as I said, a holistic approach. And we want to understand is this a onetime thing, which by the way, happened in the middle of an ICANN fiscal year. Or is there some longer-term strategy with respect to fees or whatnot. And I guess I'll close with something my grandparents really instilled in me, which is just because you can do something or you have the right to do something doesn't mean you should do it, and that's with respect. Like

no one's here is arguing that you don't have a right under the contract to increase the fees, but that doesn't mean you should do it.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jeff. We're gonna start with Danko, the chair of our finance committee on this one.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: The outgoing chair of our finance committee. So Jeff, thank you for speaking clearly, openly, and plainly. I agree with your sentiment that ICANN need to share our everything with our communities, and that obviously includes contracted parties. But I don't agree with your understanding of what we are trying to do because we are not trying to send our increase cost your way. We are doing very important cost saving plans internally. So what I think is very obvious within our communities, we went through and we are still in the significant cost saving exercise that also included significant staff reduction.

And that is the first time ICANN have to go through that, and it's didn't impact our work, it'll not impact our mission, but it will create a significant cost savings that will balance our budget. So the discussion about the fees is not at all related to this financial stress. The discussion about fees is something that we need to do to ensure the future of the whole ecosystem that we have. And obviously, the inflation is something that was significant part of the reason for increased costs for all the businesses, including contracted parties and ICANN, and inflation is something that will also happen in the future.

And to relate to the wisdom of your parents, we definitely don't want to do something just because we can. And obviously, there are mechanisms for ICANN to increase the fees, but that mechanisms have existed for a number of years and we have not used them in the situation where we theoretically could have, and it'll be possibly even easier accepted because there was enough funds for us to execute on our mission.

But as any organization, and Sally is here, I'm sure she would like to add a little bit, ICANN has ways how to be more efficient and we are trying to do more in those ways and especially in the times when it's more needed. So I think, Sally, you can add a few words on that, and obviously your questions had a few potential add-ons, so I'll be happy to answer those also. But, Sally...

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. Very good points. Thank you, Danko. From the organization's perspective, we are about 60% of the way through implementing our cost saving reductions against the deficit. And we have identified the balance of the requirements before the end of this financial year and as soon as possible, which is what we have partnered with the board on.

So I'm very confident that we have those under-- we're addressing them, we know what we're going to do, Curtis is aware of them. So I don't think that the-- I want you to be reassured because I don't want there to be a perception that we aren't doing that or we don't know how

to do that. Should we call that sort of immediate situation as in inside FY25.

You also raised, I think a very good point and it's one that we've discussed a great deal inside the executive team with the Board and we will continue to do so. And again, as you know, Curtis was with us at the weekend, so it was an opportunity to involve him even though he's not officially here yet. He was an observer to this broader question, which we've also discussed with the wider community. And Sam and Ashley were with us, and this was several of you were with us actually because Greg was there as well, as were Danko and Chris on Friday when we had a very collaborative discussion with the SO/AC leadership group around the question of reviewing major areas of expenditure that affect the-- where the community and the organization are working partnership.

So there are several examples of that of which ICANN meetings is one, but there are others as well. And how do we use what Greg was talking about in his earlier comments, this improved partnership, this improved collaboration, this improved trust, I would go that far, to really lean in and say, you know, how do we change our culture longer term, not just inside the organization, although that is also important because of Danko's earlier comments are very relevant.

But as a group in our broader community, as we look into the future and say, how do we review some of the ways that we work, are the things that we still, that we perhaps we don't need to do anymore. And we had a very productive conversation, as you'll be aware through the summer. Your two communities were very active in participating in this, sharing

their ideas about some of the things that maybe we could stop doing or we could do more efficiently or we could streamline, not just meetings, although that did come up under discussion.

And I really wanted you to use this opportunity to thank you for that engagement and that contribution and to reassure you that that will be ongoing. Because clearly a lot of the way in which we spend money, and therefore the way in which we can make different decisions to spend less money is something we have to do in partnership, we can't do it unilaterally. So I hope that's helped for better explanation, but any more questions, obviously, happy to take them. Thank you, Danko.

BECKY BURR:

I think just before you go, Danko has something about--

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you. Just a two fingers to add that your comments and the small registries have been heard. Of course, the key to ICANN's mission is security, stability of the internet. That also means security and stability of the contracted parties. And this is important for us to recognize, but also financial security and stability is part of the system. So we heard you and we are thinking about that, and we will definitely especially take care about that issue.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, and on that, sorry, this is Jeff. I completely agree with you that we should be thinking first and foremost about the security stability of

the internet. And with smaller registries, if it's a choice, do we pay the backend provider to keep DNS up or do we pay ICANN? Which one impacts security and stability, right? Obviously, we're gonna pay the backend provider first because for our registrants, the security and stability for them is much more important than paying ICANN's fees.

To date, ICANN Org has not been willing to discuss differential pricing or any kind of waivers or any kind of program that would allow smaller registries to even discuss this issue With ICANN Org we would hope that there could be a direction from the board to Org to listen to these and to react to them and not just be dismissive. Because again, we all care about the security and stability of our registrants. And so if it's ICANN's fees that are putting us in jeopardy, there's a problem there. Like I said, there were a whole bunch of other ideas.

One of the other questions I don't think that was answered we'd love to be answered, is, what other sources of funding has ICANN considered in its approach? And or are there other sources of funding? So it doesn't have to be answered now, but these are the kinds of things that I know the Contracted Parties House is talking about, and we would love for you all to discuss and have a good collaborative conversation on that.

BECKY BURR:

So let me just say in closing, we're nothing's off the table in terms of what we're looking at in terms of cost savings, and we're taking a really holistic approach on that.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yeah, thanks for that, Becky. And Danko, thanks for the responses. I think really the key point here, the key message from our part to the new CEO is really to keep that focus very holistic. I mean, I think Jeff was making the point that like we understand the situation and the contract parties are very willing to contribute to conversations or contribute ideas to the extent that it is helpful to you. So please also mention to him that he could see us as a resource for some of those. But yeah, really appreciate taking that on board. Okay, so the last priority is a sweeping one with many subparts. I'm just warning you.

TRIPTI SINHA: That's how you got to three?

SAM DEMETRIOU: That's how we got to three. Okay. So the last priority for the CEO as he takes his new role is to focus on how to enhance ICANN's accountability in the face of an evolving internet governance landscape. And we have a few suggestions for how he can achieve that.

One is by keeping ICANN focused on its narrow, but very important mission. I think that's something that everyone at this table understands really well. I don't think we need to go into a whole lot of detail about that. But the importance of ICANN's mission is sort of tied to its narrow focus. So keeping that as the guiding star as leadership at ICANN has done historically.

Second, is by finding ways to support the community in order to be able to deliver results in an efficient and timely manner. And I think a lot of

that has to do with, from the CEO's perspective, understanding how to properly staff initiatives that go on in the community, provide the right level of support that helps us get the work done so that we can be producing outputs in a manner that is maybe a bit faster than has taken place recently.

I think again, we've talked about this a lot with the ICANN Board, the Contracted Parties House has, about our commitment to the multi-stakeholder model and the need for ICANN to be able to deliver. And so when the CEO is thinking about that in very, very broad terms, we think continuing to supply the great staff who supports, for example, policy development and things like that should be a focus.

So a third is by supporting and continuing to encourage the participation of both board members and high level ICANN staff in both policy development and policy implementation work. Again, building on themes that we've discussed quite a bit with the Board over the past few years is like the usefulness of the Board liaison role in policy development and implementation. And hopefully we believe making the recommendations that come out of PDPs a bit more ready for the Board to be able to adopt. Just kind of like shortening that timeframe from when a policy gets developed to when it can actually be implemented by removing barriers to understanding and all those kinds of things.

Next is bringing a fresh eye to how ICANN Org supports implementation and what kind of resources it provides and the information that it shares with the ICANN community in order to facilitate that work. I

think on the GNSO side and on the ICANN staff side, they're taking a sharp look at how to improve implementation processes. So kind of keeping that work going, supporting that work.

And then the last one is establishing ICANN as a leader in the broader internet governance space and coordinating with the other iStar organizations, again, especially timely in the year in which he's going to be taking his role, with all the WSIS+20 review and other conversations going on about ICANN globally, or sorry, I should say internet governance globally and the role that ICANN plays and how it fits into that. Also, I will just offer that if you would like us to put this in writing, I would be happy to do so.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. It would be helpful to put it in writing, but before I hand this over to Tripti, I want to say this is very thoughtful, very helpful, and quite validating of things that the Board is talking about.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Sam. Actually, I was gonna say, do you have that in writing? Please email it to us. Very, very useful input, and I couldn't agree more that we're using the word multi-stakeholder a lot lately because of what's going on in the landscape with internet governance discussions.

And the best thing we can do is to show that our model works, and the way we show that it works is to be more efficient, to get things done. And so everything you said falls right into that spot, and very good suggestions. And indeed, we need to tell a better story, we need to be

leaders, we need to be on the world stage, show people how things are done with such a diversity of opinions because we are a diverse community and how to get things done efficiently. So, thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Any other comments on that? So we have 20 minutes left to talk about anything we want. Do you want to talk about the-- go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE:

Well, since we have time, I know we closed the budget conversation, but I just wanted to add one thing. Jeff highlighted the strain on smaller operators. I also just want the Board to be cognizant of potential fees that are passed on to the registrants, right. And that can vary in geographies, but I think that's also a concern that we need to keep in mind that increased fees can make it harder for registrants to participate in this name space. So I think something we should always be keeping in the back of our mind.

BECKY BURR:

Absolutely. When it comes to fees, we know you guys don't print money. Do you want to talk about that?

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Yeah, I mean, it seems like we really aced the assignment on the priorities. So I think we can go onto to another topic if you'd like to, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG:

So I'll take this opportunity to bring your attention to the GPI framework, the Global Public Interest framework and checklist now that we circulated recently. But we've actually brought this to the attention of, obviously, the council as well as the Non-Contracted Party groups. But this is a work that's culminating from a good few years now. A little bit of background, this whole concept of a global public interest is a little bit elusive, but the framework itself tries to operationalize it focused on the bylaws of ICANN, and that's how we have structured it.

It has actually been piloted with the SubPro ODA and the SSAD ODA and the reports actually the pilot is published, and late last year, a framework, the final text of the framework was also published. This new checklist that circulated is intended to make it further operationalize it so that it's like looking at each particular relation to the bylaws, whether a particular policy recommendation or a particular work is in the global public interest, not in the global public interest or irrelevant based on certain aspects.

So I do encourage the contract parties to take a look at it and potentially including it into the Board readiness work that is ongoing at the council. And I guess circling back to Greg's point about effectiveness and Tripti's point about getting things done, this is an effort really to make it easier for us to come to understanding of what global public interest means, and also to get the policy recommendations in a form that the Board can understand that basically it's a bunch of checklists and if it checks through, then it will make, I believe it will make the process much more efficient.

So I understand that you probably haven't looked at it in detail, but do take a look at it. You could also take it apart, pull it back together, and put it into the PDP process in some way, shape, or form. The Board will start to look at it, use it with some of our resolutions as well, but this is a tool that I think would be useful.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Yeah. Thanks, Edmon. I'm just asking a quick follow up question, maybe very basic. Is the vision that the checklist is something that is used in the course of the PDP, and then again at the Board level so you can kind of match up responses?

EDMON CHUNG:

That would be an ideal situation. But the PDP process is with the council and, yeah, with the GNSO.

BECKY BURR:

And I don't think it's entirely limited to just PDP, so the Board would be applying it to other board actions to look at it, whether it's consistent. Go ahead, Chris.

CHRIS CHAPMAN:

Sam, I was listening intently to the priorities you were ascribing to the next CEO, all of which made sense, and thank you for that. The one that piqued my interest was the encouragement for the CEO/ICANN to have a laser-like focus on its mission. Now, I'm new to this game, but is that just done by a way of a reminder or is there a sense that something we

wandered off that laser-like focus, and I'm not sure you'll delegate to whoever you think, but I'd be just interested in given we've got a minute or two to hear what you think.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Yeah, and I'm happy to take a start. If anyone else wants to weigh in, please feel free to do so. We didn't draft that one up as a reaction or a correction for something that we see right now. I just think that whenever there is a change of leadership, a new leader puts their own spin on the culture. And so I think it was just a gentle reminder for the, like I said, kind like the guiding star going forward. Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Yes, thanks. And also just a recognition that the Board and ICANN are constantly under pressure to expand its mission. And I think I was yesterday or two days, I don't know, all the days blur together now, but a comment I made in response to one of those points of pressure was ICANN can't be everything for everyone. There are things that are appropriate for ICANN to do and there are things that aren't appropriate for ICANN to do. And I think people forget that sometimes and they want to make ICANN something that it's not and should not be. But we appreciate the constant upkeep of what you all do in terms of keeping us on the right track, so we just want it to continue. Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Ashley. I see Keith, we have Keith. Do we have a microphone for Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay, got it. Okay. Yeah, thanks very much. I'm gonna follow up on that question, Chris, thank you very much, and put a finer point on it with an example or two. So I sat in on the sessions that the Board had yesterday with the ALAC and I think the CSG, and there were specific calls for ICANN to be more involved in content. And I think that that is something that we as contracted parties clearly have concerns about, we feel like ICANN and the Board ended up in the right place, place on the PIC RVC issue. And thank you for that.

And Becky, you did obviously a fantastic job in explaining the picket fence and the history of the original bargain. And I think that on the content related issue, it's just critical that ICANN, the Board, contracted parties, we continue to remind the rest of the community or educate or inform the rest of the community on what is within the picket fence, what is outside the picket fence, and the importance of ICANN not getting involved in content moderation or content related issues.

So just to build on the comments that have already been mentioned, but Chris to respond to your point, it's not a specific concern about existing activity. I think we're in a good place, but I think there's a need for us to continue to educate, inform, and to remind the rest of the community about what is in ICANN's narrow remit. So thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Keith. And let me just say, obviously that where we came out on PICs and RVCs was informed very much by what we think we are legally able to do under the bylaws.

But the other thing that you're pointing to, and I think Sam alluded to and Chris, is that it's not simply sticking to our knitting, it's making sure that the rest of the world knows what our knitting is because if they don't, they'll be disappointed when we don't do something they want us to do. So I think it's a critical focus, not just internally focusing, but making sure we are clearly articulating what it is we do and what we're responsible for.

And then the other piece of this, your recommendation about participating and providing leadership in the iStar and the internet ecosystem, is identifying the other parts of the ecosystem that have responsibilities for some of these things. Okay. Other thoughts?

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Yeah, just to thank you for that, and kind of just observe that as the new CEO, Curtis will be the chief messenger in that regard, right? He really will be the face out there. So for him to be able to articulate that very clearly, for him to be able to kind of be the carrier of that mission, interactions, not just with the other internet governance organizations, but like interactions with world governments. And then as kind of Keith pointed out, knowing when to gently push back against the community itself and clarify the importance of sticking to the mission. I think that's really what we're urging him to do.

BECKY BURR:

Great. Other thoughts? Oh, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Becky. This is Chris Disspain. I just wanted to follow up on Keith's point and Chris's point with one other slight nuance, which is, some in the community think it's ICANN's job to tell the world that the multi-stakeholder model is the best way of doing everything. And it sort of builds on what Keith was saying about being very clear about what we do. It's not our job to go and tell everybody that they should solve all of the Internet's problems in a multi-stakeholder way. We choose to do our work, what we do, in a multi-stakeholder way, that does not mean that necessarily everything to do with internet governance can be solved in a multi-stakeholder way, because it can't be.

If you take child sexual abuse material, for example, you clearly can't solve that problem in a multi-stakeholder way, or you shouldn't try to, it's an issue and it needs to be dealt with by the right people in law enforcement. So it's just worth remembering that, I think. And when even though we talk about ICANN, and it was in one of Sam's goals that she read out for the CEO being a leader in internet governance, et cetera. That is very much in within our scope and within our remit and not anywhere else.

Steve Crocker used to say, he may probably still does, that if ICANN goes to an international event, be it an IGF or whatever it might be, its job is to stand at the back of the room, to listen to what's going on, to step forward occasionally if it's helpful, but it's not our job to be there to promote the wonderful multi-stakeholder model way of doing everything. Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Chris. Anybody want to respond to that? I think we'll take that and go ahead.

JOHN MCCABE: John McCabe, Who's Who Registry. I'd like to just make one comment with the next round coming up. I think that one of the big missed opportunities of the 2012 round is the ability to get ICANN's message out around the world to reduce, my observation of the world coverage, to 10 characters. It is dollar sign \$350 million. That swept across the world, that was the big news and information, and it was really embarrassing to me and a missed opportunity I felt that it didn't really touch very much on what ICANN does and what the mission is.

And I would like to see a really concerned effort made to take the opportunity of the new round to explain what ICANN does and what's purpose is. And I think that ICANN putting priority on that for this round is a really important aspect of what should be focused on. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Sally, where is Sally? Is Sally down there? I thought she was here. Oh, do you want to talk a little bit about just the engagement on the next round that you're involved in?

SALLY COSTERTON: Sorry. Yes, absolutely. So there's extensive engagement on the next round, and we've done a lot of work, particularly with the GAC and with At-Large and with the wider community, including talking to you and to

Sam and Ashley when we've had our regular updates, on how to make sure that to the best of our ability, we are addressing the community's requirements, that this round should serve as a mechanism to bring in the underrepresented communities and geographies in ICANN.

And the IRT are receiving regular monthly updates from the team. So there's an extended team inside the organization focused on this, a very major planning-- a different kind of outreach and engagement plan, learning from the last round to make sure that we are doing that in a much more targeted way. One of the most difficult things, as many of you will know in life, is going to find people who don't know what you do or why they might be interested in doing what you are doing in a place where they may be very difficult to reach in the first place.

But nonetheless, these are people who are underrepresented at ICANN, so we need to engage with different strategies to do that, and that requires partnership with each other and also reaching deep into our in-country communities and our in-region communities of wider internet and technical stakeholders as well as governments.

And an example of that, last couple of weeks ago in India, which is a major target market for this, I shouldn't say market, target region for this, we had a capacity building meeting, which was helped the Indian government and NIXI were very helpful in helping us put it together, and our incoming Board Director, Amitabh, was there as well, as our RALO Chair for the APAC region.

And we had over 50 completely new micro entrepreneurs and community groups coming together in a capacity development session.

So I would just like to tell everybody in this room that we will make those engagement updates public through the IRT reporting mechanism, and I'm very happy to take any involvement from this group as to further discussions on that or further briefings. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Sally. Edmon has one sentence, and then we'll go to Michele and we'll almost be at the end of the hour.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, so just point you to the outreach toolkit that ICANN has actually put together, which is feeding to the ALAC and GAC as Sally said. So there is a toolkit out there of how we are messaging it out. If you have any comments, please send us back.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Good morning, Michele from Black Knight. Always enjoy these sessions. It's rather hard to follow on after Chris comes up and articulates so beautifully many of the things that I would like to have said, but I'll do my best anyway. With speaking to the board and looking at the incoming chair, I think the message from us to you is that ICANN needs to stick to its knitting, you need to stick to the remit, you need to focus on that. Unfortunately, as you all know, many come to ICANN to

ask you to fix many of the ills on the internet because ICANN is seen in many respects, to be a kind of at the center of all this.

But a lot of these things are outside your remit, and people need to be politely told to get lost, that they cannot expect the contracted parties or ICANN to fix every form of cyber crime. The internet today is much more important to all of us than it was 25 years ago. 25 years ago, registrars and registries didn't really exist in their current form, but neither did the ability to send money to people on the other side of the globe in a couple of seconds from a mobile device.

There are many parts of the internet ecosystem, not all of them come here, not all of them will come here, and not all of them should come here. But expecting us to fix things like all forms of online crime, child abuse, all these kind of things, is too much. We need to stick to the things that we can fix and do that well. And it comes again to the things with the ICANN budget, smaller is better, don't try to do everything. Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Michele. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, I'm gonna go back to the-- sorry, it's Jeff Newman-- go back to the outreach and for the new gTLDs. I think the toolkit's great, I've looked at it. I do think though that there should be more of a focus or I should say it's great at educating what it's like to go through the ICANN process, the application process.

I think there should be more of a focus on what it's like to be a registry once you're done with that process, because I think while it's important to get them through the application process, what's really important is that they understand what they're getting into. And so to the extent you need our help, I'm sure there are many registries and registrars that would be happy to talk to you about that.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Could I just quickly respond to that, Jeff? It's such an important point, and we've discussed this extensively with you and with our team and with our community members. And there's a couple of points to make is one is this, you may know inside the applicant support process, which is launching next week. So we've done a lot of work up front. We've done a couple of things. Firstly, we are developing some business cases, so sort of case studies if you like, to show this is what it involves, this is not a small thing. You've gotta want to become a registry.

The second thing is that inside the ASP, we're offering ASP applicants what we call pro bono advice. And so we're communicating, we'll communicate further, and I'll make sure Jeff, that to the Contracted Parties House that we're sharing the links and the detail on how to become a pro bono at exactly to a point about where, how people can help.

And there's a very specific program to do that which we would love you to be part of, and we'll share those links with you after this meeting to make sure you can distribute them effectively. Hopefully you will know anyway, but let's double check belts and braces.

And then the final thing I'd say is that, we need to do everything we can to tell the story as people start to come into the process. So we have a specific team, again, these are big learnings from the last round. So there's a handover process, if you will, that once applicants start to, this is just through the ASP stage, once applicants start to express interest, awareness, interest, desire, action, I'm sure you're all familiar with that.

And then as we get into the desire stage, the interest stage, they move into a different team where they're being handhold by a specific group of people inside our staff team. And one of the key roles of that is exactly what you're saying is really walking them through and holding their hand about what does this involve, what kind of commitments does it involve, and how are you going to do that and how are you going to prepare for that? And that's where the partnership with the pro bono supporters from the community is really powerful. So taking that issue really seriously, thank you for raising it.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Sally. And I misspoke about the time. We are scheduled to go till noon, so we have plenty of time.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Just on the timing piece I think we've pretty well covered the points that we had previously discussed with the board. So I think we are in a good position to wrap up. I don't think anyone will be mad about an extra 20 minutes for lunch.

BECKY BURR: Indeed, we give you back 30 minutes of your life. Thanks, everybody. I think there's been a good-

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay, wait, we did have one more before we wrap. We just want to introduce our new incoming leadership

BECKY BURR: Please do.

SAM DEMETRIOU: So my term as chair will be coming to a close at the end of this ICANN meeting, and so I wanted to take this opportunity as we wrap up to introduce the new officers of the Stakeholder Group. Beth Bacon will be the new Chair of the registries, Catherine Paletta will be the new Vice Chair Of Policy. Jeff is the new vice chair of administration. And Karen Day, who's our treasurer, is continuing her term. And Ashley will do the registrar.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks. So yes, my term is ending at the end of the week as well. So I'm going to introduce just the incoming that the new people. We have a couple folks carrying over their terms. But first and foremost, replacing me will be Owen Smigelski right here. We also have Roger Carney who will be taking over the vice chair for tech. And I don't know if they're here in the audience, but we have Michael Bauland coming in to be our treasurer. Oh my gosh. Am I forgetting anyone else? I think

that's it. Those are the new ones, so thank you. I hope they have a great relationship with you just as much as we have.

TRIPTI SINHA:

So first I'd like to say on behalf of the board, thank you very much to both of you, Ashley and Sam, for your tenure. And you said our relationship has gotten better, and a lot of that is because of how you interacted with us. And so to all of you, big shoes to fill, and continue the good work and congratulations. Thank you.

LISA SAULINO:

Thank you. We could stop the recording please.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, everybody. Have a good week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]