
ICANN81 | AGM – GNSO: CPH Membership Work Session
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 TRT

SUE SCHULER: Hello and welcome to the CPH Membership Meeting. My name is Sue and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. 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 Heinemann.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much, Sue. This is Sam Demetriou, chair of the registries. Welcome. Thank you all for being here. To the folks who are dialed in remotely, thank you so much for joining us today. If we could get the agenda up, please. So, we've got a good bit of stuff to discuss this morning. We're going to lead off with-- Nope, we moved it to the end. Sorry.

We're going to quickly just go through our preparation for the topics with the ICANN Board. We meet with the Board immediately after this session, so that will be at 10:30 local time. And then we will have 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.

discussion on Domain Metrica. The registries have begun to review it and have some reactions and thoughts to share. And we were hoping to have a dialogue with our registrar colleagues around that. And then in the last few minutes of the call, we're going to do a bit to honor our 25th anniversary. And Zoe will inform everyone about the reception that's taking place later today. Any questions about the agenda? All right. Ashley, anything you want to say to open us up?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hi, guys. Welcome to Tuesday. And that's it. Let's get going.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Sorry. The room is very echoey, and so hearing the echo, I thought my microphone was indeed turned on. Okay. So, we have gotten a question from the ICANN Board, which is, as you can see on the screen here, given that the new CEO is coming on board in December, what does our group, our collective groups, think should his top three priorities should be and why?

We can walk through each of these and go into them in a little bit of depth. I would just welcome anyone else from the ExComm to pop a hand up and clarify this. But first off is understanding the budgeting and fiscal crisis that ICANN is currently dealing with, that the CEO's priority should be balancing ICANN's budget in a way that does not only resort to raising contracted party fees to fill shortcomings. It should be a much more holistic approach that looks at cost savings mechanisms,

how ICANN spends its money, why ICANN spends money on the things that it does, and really kind of goes across the board.

Second is continuing a lot of the good things, the positive progress that the existing leadership has put in place. That includes things like the CEO interactions with community leaders that take place around each ICANN meeting. I think we found them very valuable. We get information that we can report back to our membership. We can bring information or talking points from our membership into those conversations. I think it's really helped improve communication overall, and we'd like to see that continue. Other positive things, things like the work on the ethics policy, things like that.

And then finally, and this one's a bit of a big one, but it's enhancing ICANN's legitimacy in the face of the evolving Internet governance landscape, and there's a lot of subpoints under there that we're going to touch on. But really things like making sure that ICANN delivers results in an efficient and timely manner. There's sort of no point in defending the multistakeholder model if the multistakeholder model can't actually produce the things it's meant to produce. So, things like that.

Sorry, I'm just reviewing my notes here. And we can go into more detail about these. Does anyone have any questions about the three priorities or any feedback on what we've come up with so far? All right. Not seeing any in Zoom. Michele, thank you. Before you go, though, Michele, if folks could-- I know you just got here, but if folks could join

the Zoom room and use the Zoom hands, it's just a little bit easier to see.

MICHELE NEYLON: Morning. Michele for the record. Sorry, I'm still joining the Zoom. I think the emphasis on the ICANN budget is really, really important. I think we need to remind ICANN what their actual role is and remind them that they need to stick to their role and not kind of become something, this incredibly large, ever-growing beast, which they seem to have morphed into over the last few years. Back in 2007, when I first came to an ICANN meeting, I think they had about 50 staff, and they're now over 300, which is crazy. So, reminding them of that. Now, Curtis comes from a business background. He gets that, or he should do. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Michele. Good point. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Hi, it's Jonathan. Apologies, I'm not logged into the Zoom room. Can I just clarify, have these questions already been sent to the Board as they are?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: We sent them the topics that we're proposing, which we'll go into in a moment.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: The bullet point answers?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: No, we have not previewed the answers.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Because from my point of view, if you say does not only mean raising, it concedes the raising of the fees already. So, I would suggest does not focus or does not rely on raising CPPs. Alter the wording somehow, because that really does just concede that it's perfectly legitimate to raise the fees, which certainly I would. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Well, see, now that's a good thing that we didn't send it in advance. We'll make that note, and we'll adjust the wording accordingly. Appreciate that, Jonathan. Anyone else on these topics? Jeff, and then James.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Jeff Neuman for the record. And to just go back to little historical notes, one of the things that when Paul Twomey, at least for registries, started really emphasizing the variable rate, Paul said, and I think Kurt was there on the staff at that point, maybe. They said that we, ICANN, were going to tie themselves to the CPH, essentially. That when the CPH or when the industry did well, then ICANN would get more than what

they had in the budget, which they have almost every single year. And they said at that point in time, and when the industry is contracting, shrinking, that they would also have to tighten their belts.

The whole raising of fees cuts against the original notion of tying themselves to us, right? If the industry is contracting, that's the reason why ICANN is getting less fees, right? We're having a smaller base. So, by increasing their fees, they're, one, going against what they said they were going to do. But number two is they're squeezing us even more. Because the reason, again, the reason they're shrinking is because we're all having some issues. And to just try to squeeze more money out of us is actually hurting the industry a lot more and ultimately could spiral into them getting even less.

And so, part of this is to understand their long-term strategy. They increased the fees, but is that a yearly plan? What is their thinking long-term in this whole strategy? If it's just, oh, let's just raise fees and not well thought out, that's a problem. But if there's a long-term strategy, then they need to disclose that to us so we all can do our financial planning. And then the other point I was going to raise, at least for registries that have this annual minimum, regardless of your registrations, is that ICANN has to stop this approach where it treats everyone exactly the same with respect to fees because all of us are impacted differently, and they need to consider that in what they do, especially for registries that have that annual minimum.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jeff. And just for the sake of awareness, Jeff is going to be the lead on this bullet point when we get to that part in the Board mission. I have a queue of James, Ashley, and then Michele.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, James speaking. So, agreeing that it has to be a two-pronged approach, ICANN needs to both diversify its sources of funding but also aggressively cut costs. I think we can all point to not just staffing and headcount but also travel, and these meetings become more and more extravagant and burdensome. I'm even open to the idea that ICANN should charge an attendance fee to come to an ICANN meeting, and then if folks complain about that being a barrier to participation, then a waiver of that fee could be one of the sponsorships instead of travel and hotels and airplane tickets.

So, I think all of those things should be on the table. I think they should definitely look at country code contributions, the CCs. Some of the more popular and larger CCs, I think contribute at a much lower proportional rate versus some of our registry colleagues that are in the room that are commercially oriented, and I think all of those things should be up for discussion versus just attaching the fee structure to a CPI or some external index and just letting that ride. Thanks. Jeff, you got all that? Okay, good.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, James. Michele, and then Seb's next, and then over to Ashley.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Yeah, thanks. I think when it comes to this entire thing around cutting costs, we all have to cut our costs over the last few years. The price of energy went up several hundred percent. The cost of living went up by some insane percentage, and it didn't matter where you were in the world. You can ask my team over there, we had to cut a lot of costs internally.

And yes, ICANN instead of looking at cutting costs in a meaningful way and making clear statements about that, go through this kind of symbolic thing of sacrificing a few lambs. They may have done more, but they didn't articulate that clearly. I didn't see a clear statement saying that all senior exec salaries would be frozen for the next X number of years. But those of us in industry, that's what we've had to do. And this thing about the ICANN meetings costing so many million per year, okay, charge an entry fee. Maybe it's €100, maybe it's €200.

Most of us attend professional events throughout the year. ICANN is about the only one that we go to that does not actually have an entry fee. And I'm perfectly fine with paying 100, 200, 500 euro or dollars to attend a meeting. I'm going to turn up anyway. And it's not as if anybody who's here in person cannot afford to pay something like a couple of hundred dollars. Because realistically, that's going to be nothing compared to what they're going to end up paying for coffees, taxis, and all the other things, no matter what ICANN is actually funding.

So maybe it's time to actually have that conversation instead of avoiding it. So, this kind of talk of inclusion, et cetera, et cetera, it gets

a bit ridiculous. I would be very wary, however, about going after the ccTLDs. ICANN tried that once before. It did not end well.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Michele. Seb, over to you next.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, so my comment wasn't about finance. I just want to make sure the conversation is-- My comment is about the interaction with the community group. I don't want to prejudge the new CEO, but from the background, this is somebody who comes from a very technical part of the industry that is probably going to find his home more in the numbering and the SSACs and whatever. I just wanted to take the opportunity. He's probably going to be in D. C. in January whilst the Council has their SPS. And I think that the Council should invite him for a session, maybe outside of just a Board interaction because he'll be there too, just to explain exactly who we are, what we do, et cetera, because it's outside of his world. And I think it's a good opportunity to do that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks for the suggestion, Seb. Greg, make a note. I have Ashley and then Brian and then Jeff again.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Also continuing on different subjects. When we were discussing this as ExComm, I thought we had agreed to a different ordering of how we

were going to do this. I thought we were starting with the more positive. Fair enough. I just wanted to make sure that was still a plan. That's all. Okay. Cool.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Brian and then Jeff's placeholder for Jonathan.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Sam. I'm Brian. I appreciate the complexity and the sensitivity on the discussion around the fees. I'd be a little hesitant to suggest entry fees for ICANN meetings. One of the things, looking at one of the other topics, the ethics policy, we talked about transparency and trust and legitimacy of the multistakeholder process. I think there's already a sort of criticism that perhaps contracted parties have outsized influence.

If we then made it a higher barrier of entry for especially non-commercial users or ALAC, folks like that, made it harder for them to participate, I think that that could really help sort of accelerate any erosion of trust in the results from the multistakeholder process. So, I'd be hesitant to suggest entry fees that commercial organizations can easily absorb where individual participants, it would be much harder for them to participate.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Brian. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, thanks. I asked Jeff to put a placeholder in for me. It's Jonathan. So, I'm speaking with my own thoughts, my personal thoughts. But I think in terms of asking ICANN what the strategy is, which is something that Jeff meant, the budgeting strategy, and then saying because it would then allow us to budget, I think is, again, a concession too far at this stage.

My suggestion is that we go in robust, firm, not-- I'm not going to give a view on those other things like fees for entry and ccTLDs. I just, from our point of view, a CPH point of view, I think we should just be robust about saying ICANN should manage within its means and not concede any future changes at this stage. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jonathan. Reg, and then I'm going to draw a line under this one, wrap us up so we can get to our two topics, and then get to the rest of the agenda. Reg?

REG LEVY: Thanks. I had an interesting conversation yesterday with someone who recommended that we possibly have the Europe and North America meetings in a specific place that doesn't change, so that only other things change. It's still very important, I think, especially in the Global South, that we are having-- Like the Rwanda meeting attracted people from the area that wouldn't have shown up if it was just in Nairobi, for example. But I don't think that there's a substantive difference

between Vancouver or DC, or London and Paris, or what have you. Those are the sorts of meetings that we can just say, this is always here.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Reg. All right. So, we've had a pretty robust discussion here. I just do want to-- I think it's really great to get a lot of these thoughts out. I think there's going to be plenty of opportunities to make these suggestions really like kind of tactical suggestions. I know there's going to be lots of consultations with the community about how ICANN can change around the way it spends money in the future.

I think for the purpose of this interaction with the Board, keeping it very grounded in the core message, which is a holistic approach to getting ICANN's budgeting and financial issues back on track. And I think illustrating a couple of examples, but I don't think we need to go through a whole laundry list with the Board today, because the core message here is to keep the high-level priority. And that's what the CEO should be focusing on day one when he takes office. And Jeff, he's nodding, so I think he's got all this. I think we're in good shape.

So just to quickly go back to Ashley's question about the order, we'll open with a nice one. We'll tackle budgets, and then we'll end on kind of a nice one, just enhancing ICANN's legitimacy. The old compliment sandwich, as they say. We also have our two topics that we suggested for the Board. And speaking of order, I think in the session with the Board, we'll try to cover our topics first and then go into this one, the priorities for the CEO. Ashley's going to talk us through the two items that we're going to cover as CPH suggests the topics.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you. So, as you can see here, we have as the first topic, ICANN ethics policy. And I think what we first probably should decide is like are we going to cover this issue and the things that are going well with ICANN, or are we going to talk about it separately as its own distinct agenda item? Because I think it was mentioned in the previous roundup as well.

But basically there, I think we haven't really had a whole lot of time to talk about it as CPH, but I think it's fairly understood that we are supportive of the draft. If anybody thinks differently, let us know now, because that's what we intend to express to the Board, is that this is a really good first step and that we'll be looking at it as our respective groups and likely to submit comment. But just pretty much a nod that we appreciate the effort that they took and we'll be getting back in touch.

Second, being RDRS, we wanted to make sure that the Board understood where we stand on the issue, because I understand they are hearing quite a bit from the requester side of things. And so, we wanted just to let them know that many of us are continuing to participate in good faith, that many of us have seen good out of this effort, and that we stand ready to continue to participate and perhaps share some stories in response to our participation in RDRS. So, I will stop there and see if anybody has any thoughts, questions, or comments on those two topics. Seb, you got to get in Zoom, man. Seb, go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, this is Sebastien Ducos, who also happens to be the shepherd behind this RDRS thing. I just wanted to note, in the spirit of we're interested and we want to move, we're about to move into the next phase of this project where we're going to start drafting recommendations. And the registrars, led by Sarah, but the registrars, I seem to hear a lot of voices in there, have put a lot of input in this. They're the only group that have, and I just wanted to thank you guys. It's a very good move. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you very much, Seb. Any other questions, comments, concerns, input? I don't see any hands, so we can carry on. Oh, Mark, please go ahead.

MARK ANDERSON: This is Mark Anderson for the transcript. On the RDRS topic, I'm not sure this is for the Board, but maybe just general comments, sort of two things that are going to come up around RDRS. One is going from voluntary registrar participation to mandatory registrar participation. I think that's something we're going to hear as we move towards recommendations coming out of RDRS, so I just want to put that on everybody's radar so you're not surprised hearing that.

And the other thing I think that's not going to be a surprise to anyone, but that's the percentage of disclosure requests approved. If anybody was at the GAC session on RDRS, if anybody was at that, you might have heard Gabe Andrews, who's the PSWG representative to the RDRS

Standing Committee, talking about how of the number of lookups, only 3% of those are ultimately approved. And I know Sebastien, in his role as chair, has been very clear that that's outside of the scope of the pilot, but I think that's still something we're going to hear. And again, maybe not appropriate for the Board conversation, but something I want to take advantage of this to put on people's radar.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks for that, Mark. I think many, if not most, of us are aware of that challenge, that people seem to have lost sight of what the actual scope of this pilot was. I'm fairly confident that the Board's aware of that as well, but that might be something we just want to put on the record. I think something else we definitely want to ask is, what is the Board's thought on RDRS and its future? Because I do know that there are those in the requester community who think the pilot is done and want it to be done. I'm not sure what that means and what the plans of the Board are. So, I think getting some insight from them on that would be very helpful as well. And I see Michele's hand is up, so please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Ashley. Michele for the record. This thing around the RDRS is very, very worrying and very concerning. None of this surprises me. I wish it did, but maybe I'm just old and cynical. I think it doesn't hurt to remind people that we have to abide by the law and that it was never, ever, ever going to be a situation where a request equaled a disclosure and that some people just need to get past that. And maybe remind

some of these people that a lot of the ills on the internet can be solved without breaching people's privacy.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, and noted. Any other thoughts, questions, comments, concerns? If not, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. I think we're in pretty good shape for how we're going to have this conversation with the Board in an hour. We can go on maybe to the next agenda item. So, Domain Metrica. The registries in our Registry Stakeholder Group abuse working group started reviewing the Metrica pilot or the early rollout, whatever it was, and began discussing and reacting to some of the things that we saw in there. I'm looking around the room for Dennis, and I don't see him. So, Brian, do you mind if I put you on the spot to kind of recap some of the top line takeaways that we've shared with ICANN so far?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Sure. Thanks, Sam. So, we had a meeting, the CPH abuse working group had a meeting with ICANN to go over Metrica and some of the initial sort of encounters and findings that we had. The biggest was the inclusion of spam in DNS abuse for Metrica. This obviously came as a bit of a surprise to registries and registrars since we had just negotiated our contracts, which did not include spam in the definition of DNS abuse. Spam as a threat delivery or one of the other forms of DNS abuse, sure, but Metrica included spam just on its own.

So, we provided clear guidance and signals to ICANN that this was obviously problematic. And ICANN, actually, they deserve a lot of credit because they immediately said, you know what, we think that's probably right. As soon as we make our next changes to Metrica, that's the first thing on the list. We recognize that this doesn't jive with the new contractual amendments, so they are going to make the change. So Metrica actually does have quite a bit of potential. The initial fatal flaw was the inclusion of spam on its own as DNS abuse, but that is getting fixed. I'm not sure when that's getting fixed. Perhaps OCTO can provide us some updates on that.

The other sort of interesting bit, I don't know if it's a feature or a bug, is the breadth of detail that's available for Metrica. So, for me, for PIR, not only can I see my own TLDs, but I can see every TLDs. Registrars can see not only their own registrars, but every registrar. Again, maybe that's by design, maybe it's an oversight, but it's certainly something to note. So, as you're digging into Metrica and start playing around in it, you'll see that it's not just limited to your own credentials.

So, those were, in my book, the two biggest notes and findings that we shared back with ICANN. To my knowledge, I don't think they mentioned any plans to scale back the breadth of the information that's shared, but I'd welcome anyone else that was there to share their thoughts, especially if they disagreed with any of that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I see a hand from Catherine.

CATHERINE PALETTA:

Thanks. This is Catherine Paletta for the record. I think one of the things I heard during that session is that it's great that they are going to fix the spam issue, but I don't believe it's going to be fixed before it gets rolled out to the entire community. Currently, only registries and registrars have access, but that will be given to anybody with an ICANN account.

And my understanding was they are not going to be able to fix the spam issue before that. Which is very concerning, given that everyone in the community is going to be like, oh, my gosh, spam and then, oh, my gosh, where did all the spam go? Right? And I worry about people understanding the explanation for why the change happened. Is this some kind of conspiracy to lower spam numbers or something? Brian is saying that it is. So, can we get that in the record?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

I've got Reg and then Brian again.

REG LEVY:

Thanks. And I just want to underscore what Catherine just said. If they release it with spam to the whole community and then spam, that is a huge deal. This needs to be a threshold question. They've agreed to withdraw spam from Metrica. Great. Excellent. They also need to delay the public rollout of Metrica. They also need to delay the public rollout of Metrica because the data in it are just incorrect.

If you go on one screen, it says there's two domains of a certain type of bad stuff. And if you click through to actually view it as the person who runs that registrar, it does not tell you any domains. And it says actually there's zero. So, until the bugs have been worked out of it, it is not ready for primetime. I don't think it's even ready for primetime just within the contracted party. It was in beta. We provided feedback, and they made no changes before sending it out. It is still in beta. They just don't want to admit that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Sam. Just two quick points. One, there's no deadline for ICANN to roll this out. To my knowledge, it's not as though they said, well, we have to roll this out by X date. So, the notion that they couldn't make these changes before rolling it out, to Reg's point, I think we should push back on that because they've been cooperative to this point, making sure that, yes, spam will be removed. But if there's no true deadline, then just get it removed before you roll it out.

Second, I wanted to note that the issue with spam, it's not just a contractual issue, although as a lawyer that was kind of really got me my haunches raised that we just did this amendment and they included it. It more got to the point of it just drowned out any relevance of what the data was. When you include spam, it immediately becomes an issue of signal and noise, where there's just so much spam relative to the

amount of actual DNS abuse that then when you look at the total aggregate, you're like, oh, my gosh, look how much there is. And when you boil down to what's actually phishing, malware, botnets, or farming doesn't really fall into it, that it just completely upends what the narrative actually is.

So, it wasn't really just the issue with our contracts. It also became, to me almost, and I'm not a data scientist, but what I would say is a data quality issue because you look at the data as presented to you, you just can't trust 80% of it out of the bat.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Brian. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Okay. Thanks. Michele again. So, as we all expected prior to this meeting, there was the usual publication of various, I suppose blog posts is the word some might use, I'd say stream of consciousness, followed by wish lists from various parties within the broader ICANN community. We had a rather interesting exchange with the CSG over the weekend, and some of the things that they are asking for goes way beyond an issue of just including a bit of spam.

This is very much a case of them wanting to use the contracts with us to fix all the ills on the internet, cybercrime, child abuse material, and a whole load of other things. So, I think we really do need to push back very hard, and please stop being sub-diplomatic. You need to really say it as it is. I know that's hard. You're very diplomatic, Sam. I'm not.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Hey, great news. I'm not chair after tomorrow, so I don't speak for you guys anymore.

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, I'm sorry. And a belated happy birthday. I forgot to give you a happy birthday greeting yesterday.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Michele. Good thing your new chair is a real jerk. Anyone? Oh, no. Okay, my queue is clear. Anyone else want to get in on this topic? Yeah. Go ahead, Mukesh.

MUKESH CHULANI: Morning, everyone. It's Mukesh Chulani from ICANN Org. Just on the Domain Metrica point, this is the purpose of the pilot, and Samaneh and the rest of the team have noted and are really grateful for the participation. So, there will be a session tomorrow where they intend to cover this in much greater detail. I think it's 1:15 PM local time tomorrow. And we're aware. We know these issues. And, yeah, we look forward to continuing discussions on this.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Don't leave. Can you share what kind of preview that session is going to cover? How is it going to be characterized in light of the fact that there is still ongoing contract to party feedback?

MUKESH CHULANI:

Thanks, Sam. I don't want to speak on behalf of Samaneh for that because she's really the subject matter expert on it. It was purposeful that we had the pilot. We had 20 or so participants in the pilot, all different sizes. We wanted to make sure that things like this were uncovered. Well, we didn't expect this particular thing, but we wanted to uncover issues. Let's have Samaneh go through it in greater detail. I think I would do it a disservice to speak to that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Mukesh. Anyone else on this topic? Okay. Great. We have a tiny bit of extra time before we go to our last agenda item. And I'm going to ask our very helpful secretariats if we can do a slide switch because in an additional two minutes, I do just want to remind everyone in the CPH about the upcoming vote for the Board Seat 13 race.

So just as a recap, we had, I think, a really great candidate forum on Saturday. We used all the time we were allotted and had even some interest in asking additional questions and having more time to interact with the candidates. So 21st of November, that's a week from Thursday, we're going to do a call. It'll be over Zoom. It'll be a similar format, but less intro from the chairs, where all the candidates will be available and people can ask questions.

I want to remind everyone that if you are interested in submitting a question but can't make that call or just want to send it in advance, please feel free to do that over e-mail. Whatever questions we get in

advance, we will share with the candidates in advance so that we can kind of go through them quickly and maximize the time we have for additional questions. After that, the voting for the first round is going to open on December 4th and run through December 18th. So, it'll be kind of the last sprint before the holiday season.

Again, since we had an extra two minutes, I did just really want to make this clear. I wanted to remind everyone, please be planning for it. This is a really important vote. So please make sure that you're ready to participate. Anything you want to add? Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Sam. I'm just wondering when would we expect the results of round one to actually be announced? The next day or what are we thinking?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Yeah. I don't think it would be more than a couple of days. We'll have to obviously check the math and stuff, but yeah, pretty quick. Not instantaneous like the way we do on registry, for example, annual elections, but it will be a matter of days. Any other questions about Board Seat 13? Okay. We're actually running pretty well ahead of schedule. Any AOB before we do the anniversary stuff? Then we can hand it over to Brian and Michele. You ready? They'll be ready by the 50th anniversary, guys. It's all good.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Okay. So, obviously tonight we have the celebration, and I'm sure Sue and Zoe will share more information if you don't already know. Michele and I are both going to each briefly just say a few words about our respective stakeholder groups. Obviously, we're hitting a huge milestone. 25 years is, especially for the Internet, a very, very, very long time. So, I've never been a member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, so I'll just speak briefly to my experiences with the Registry Stakeholder Group.

I've only been really within the industry externally facing for about eight years, and in that time, I really want to take some time to highlight some of the excellent chairs that the Registry Stakeholder Group has had. The registrars have had amazing chairs as well. But from the registry perspective, I really just wanted to give special kudos to those registry chairs that I've had the pleasure of working with and have looked up to and are still active in our space. So, Keith Drazek with his diplomacy and statesmanship, Paul Diaz with his calm, confident presence, Donna Austin with her passion and her insightfulness, and Sam with her intelligence and her charm. And so, I'm very looking forward to Beth Bacon taking over as the next capable chair.

So, I really just wanted to thank the stakeholder group for everything you've done for the chairs, both the registries and the registrars that have navigated us through some pretty wavy waters, particularly GDPR timeframe on, but the entire time, and looking forward to raising a glass with everyone tonight. And with that, Michael, hand things over to you for the registrars.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Wow, it's a hard act to follow. Michele for the record, I suppose. I agree with most of what he said. Not all of it, but most of it. So, I suppose, look, from my perspective, it's been 20 years since my last confession. Sorry, no, that was the different thing. So, I've been coming to ICANN meetings since 2007, member of the stakeholder group since 2009.

Back then, it was John Nevis who was chair. And I remember asking him to explain acronyms to me off list because there was an exchange of emails, which was basically an acronym soup, and I had absolutely no idea what the hell they were talking about. It wasn't complicated, but there wasn't a single word of English in the entire exchange. It was literally a case of the PDP and the RDR and the XYZ was doing something with an IGO, and I don't know what. It was just ridiculous. It was probably INGO again or something.

So, if you look at the history back there, we've had an interesting range of chairs. I don't even know who some of them were. I mean, looking at that list, many of them have moved on to fresh pastures. Many of them are still around. Without the stakeholder group, our voice would not be heard. Over the last few years, we've had Madam Chair, Ashley, who has done an amazing job moving from her previous role on the other side of the table completely over in government to coming into being a diplomatic yet strong and measured voice for the registrars, both large and small.

And we appreciate you, Ashley, and I will miss you terribly. To be replaced by a lanky American lad who likes to run around on the streets

of Istanbul, which was an image I will have etched in my memory for a long time, and I'm hoping there's enough alcohol out there to drown that out. So, yeah, 25 years. I hope I won't be here in 25 years' time. If I am, please remind me to leave.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you so much for that, guys. So, Zoe and Sue did prepare some slides to recognize the past chairs of both stakeholder groups. I'm going to let them run through the slides up here on the screen and also on the Zoom, but I want to take a minute, because I still have the microphone, to really just-- Please go ahead and go through them. I'm not going to call out everyone one by one because I think Brian and Michele both did that.

What I did want to say, in addition to thank you for the very kind words and the compliments, is that it's really not about the chairs at all, right? It's really about the membership. And having now served as chair for four years, there's just no way that I could do what I do and represent the registries or speak on behalf of the registries without the amazing input and support and contributions of the members. So, whatever value that you guys get out of participating in this stakeholder group, I just want to say how much I appreciate the support that you've given to me and the trust that you've put in me to help guide that stakeholder group. You guys make this job really fun, and so really the appreciation goes back to you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

I'm not going to talk about my term because I'm going to save the blubbering for the Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting. But I will say that at least what I've seen in my very short tenure as both chair and my existence of the Registry Stakeholder Group, which is only four years, is I've seen us already come a long way in four years in terms of our ability to prove to the community that we're serious, we're responsible, we're accountable. I really like how the CPH itself gets along. I feel like we're generally very supportive of each other, particularly when it matters, and I really hope that continues.

I think COVID really put an interesting twist on things for the first two and a half years of at least our chairmanship, and I'm just really looking forward to sit back and watch our groups continue to blossom. But yeah, thanks to everybody for all of your support. I think if it wasn't for you guys, we wouldn't be as strong as we are. So just to echo what Sam said. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Jeff, did you want to make a comment?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. I think we should at this point in time also just try to remember some of the people we've lost in this industry. Whether it was Pam or Stefan or, for those of you that remember, Bob Connolly. There are a lot of people that gave so much of themselves to these stakeholder groups, and we should take some time to recognize the contributions they've made. I'd love to be able to document that more, and this is a

good start, because we really shouldn't forget those. There's very few people that are still around from those original days. I'm one of the few, and God help me, Michele, if I'm around in another 25 years here. Well, God help you, actually.

MICHELE NEYLON: You will never leave, Jeff. We've been hoping that you would.

JEFF NEUMAN: I know. Me too.

MICHELE NEYLON: And you define multi-stakeholder at the best of times by confusing us as to which bloody stakeholder you are. But, okay, that's fine. I really want people to leave. We need fresh blood. But don't worry, I intend to.

JEFF NEUMAN: And I completely agree. One of the things I hope I've done in my time is to try to welcome people in and give them different roles. I think there's a value for institutional knowledge, and I think that you're absolutely right, that newer players should come in, do the work, and become the leads and move on. I support that wholeheartedly. I know I am an officer, again, of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

That being said, one of the reasons there were not many volunteers, and certainly I would love to see more volunteers come

forward than from the largest registries, the largest registrars. I think while I certainly appreciate the largest registries and the registrars that have the resources, I think we really need to try to get leaders from all different sizes of registries and registrars.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Jeff. Michele, do you have another comment?

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah, I do. Just on this, I think the other thing, I agree with most of what Jeff said. I'm never going to agree with everything that Jeff says because that would just be a break with history. I think we should also take a moment to thank the support staff, both our own direct support staff and the ICANN support staff. I beg your pardon?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: You're front-running me?

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, I don't know because I haven't seen the slides. For a lot of us, this is not our full-time job. And while some of the larger companies might have people who work on policy and follow ICANN and other things as a full-time job, for a lot of us, it's one of many other things that we are doing. But one of the beautiful things is that it's not a pay-to-play setup.

If you look at some trade associations, Board seats are assigned to those who pay larger amounts, whereas within the ICANN space and the

stakeholder groups, you are rewarded or tortured by how much time you're willing to put in and how much effort you're able to put into that entire thing, which is why you end up sitting up the front there because you are taking one for the team.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Michele. Ashley?

AHSLEY HEINEMAN: And I just wanted to note, so putting these slides together, trying to remember everybody, it was a real struggle at times. I want to apologize for those that were left out, most notably Michael Bauland. My sincerest apologies that we somehow left you off the list of incoming. You are, of course, noted and love having you involved.

And to the point, there are so many people that we have lost over the last few years. I would hate to put a list. I was going to make a note, but I didn't want to let anybody-- I didn't want to leave off anyone. But Pam, in terms of contributions to ExComm, Pam Little has undoubtedly been such a force, and we miss her terribly. But we've also lost a number of many other colleagues, including some very close to GoDaddy as well. But I'll note the blubbing is going to start. So, I'll stop. I'll stop.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. So, you can see on the slide here, we're having a transition of leadership. I'd like to welcome Beth as our new chair. Catherine's going to be our new vice chair of policy. Jeff's the new vice chair of

administration. And before you thought you were rid of me, I'm moving over to Council, so I'll still be kicking around. And then Josu Walino is our new incoming NomCom rep. I'll give Ashley a sec before she wants to work through hers.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Sure. So, why don't I start with Michael, since he's not on this list. Michael Bauland will be coming in as treasurer, replacing Benny. So, apologies again to you there. Sarah Wyld, the very capable, the very wonderful, who is unfortunately not with us today, but she is actively participating from home, will be returning to her position as vice chair of policy. Roger Carney, lovely colleague, coming in as vice chair of Tech Ops. Eric Rokobauer, continuing as secretary. Greg DiBiase is going to continue his role as our Council rep, but also as chair of Council. Prudence, Council rep. Hong-Fu, Council rep. And Jothan is switching over as NomCom rep from his Tech Ops.

I am going away. No, not really. I will be just a regular schmo now in the Registrar Stakeholder Group, not taking on any new positions. But I want to thank the folks who are-- Oh, my gosh, where's Owen? Owen's not on here. Oh, Owen, he's at the top. He's in blue. I couldn't see it. That blue is very hard to see. Owen is stepping in his chair. He's going to do an amazing job filling my shoes. I think we all have incredible faith in him. But thanks to those of you who are no longer here. I'm trying to think. Who longer is not going to--? They're all coming back. Eric is still here. Is it just me that's going, stepping down? Geez. All right. I'm fine,

guys. But that's where we are on our newest ExComm and the continuing.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

All right. And then so just to close this portion of the agenda, thank you for the preview, Michele. We did want to take a moment as we're celebrating 25 years, as we're recognizing each other for the service and work that has gone into making the CPH the success that it is, we would be so remiss without shouting out and appreciating our wonderful support staff. Zoe and Sue, as well as all the other GNSO secretariats, but most especially Zoe and Sue, on a day-to-day, day-in, day-out basis.

I'd be lost without Sue. I wouldn't be able to do this job. And they really are they're just always available. They're constantly putting in a lot of work. They're constantly thinking ahead for ways to make the stakeholder groups better, ways to make us function more efficiently. I think, Ashley, you mentioned it, right? We've professionalized so much over recent years, and they're really the backbone of that. And I just I know we all see them, and I know you all get to chat with them and stuff. I just hope you take some time during this meeting to really express your appreciation for them if you have the opportunity to do so.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

And Zoe, I cannot say enough about you, Zoe. Amazing. She's either freezing, has allergies, or in this case has a cold, but she still manages to be the hardest-working person I've ever encountered. And I know I would be lost without you. I think the rest of the group will be lost

without you. I'm sure Owen is going to learn to appreciate you even more if that's possible. But thank you for standing with us and going through our journey and dealing with our crazy things.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: And with that, Zoe actually wants to share some logistics about tonight's celebration. And then we'll wrap. We will officially wrap up.

ZOE BONYTHON: Okay, yes. So, as you should know already, it's going to be at a place called the Balkan Restaurant and Bar. I don't know the exact name of the area, but if you know where Galata Tower is, if you've been there, it's not terribly far from that. It's a 10-minute ride in a taxi. The actual street that you have entrance to the place is a pedestrian-only small street. According to Google Maps, you can get a car pretty close to it, but it's not literally out front.

I will just say that there is only one lift that will take you up to the sixth floor, or you can take the six flights of stairs. So, I'm hoping that not all of you will arrive at exactly the same time and try to get into the eight-person lift. So just a warning, there might be a bit of a queue if you're planning to take the lift, or there are always the stairs to take. And just to note as well, there's another small set of stairs once you get to the sixth floor, just to get to the actual bar area. And I think that's it.

Okay. Sorry, no, there is one other thing. There's a metro station. It's super. I don't know if anyone's taken it. It's really easy to get the metro here. And there's a metro station. I'm going to completely wrongly

pronounce this, but if you're going to phonetically say it, it's like Şişhane. It's one stop down from Taksim. Super easy. Another good option to get there.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks very much, Zoe. And big thanks to Zoe and Sue for putting this party together. We're going to start off at 6:30 PM. We're going to go until 8:30. Really hope to see you all there. And I think with that, we'll wrap up for now. 30 minutes from now in the boardroom. See you guys there.

ZOE BONYTHON: Sorry, just another thing. This, of course, is an RSVP thing, so you should have all RSVP'd, and that's who is coming. We have a list. Thank you. You need to talk to me if that's not the case.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Bouncer, Zoe. All right. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]