ICANN69 | **Communi**ty Days Sessions - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board & GNSO Council
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 - 12:00 to 13:30 CEST

FRANCO CARRASCO: This session will now begin.

I.T., please start the recording.

[This meeting is being recorded]

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello and welcome everybody to the Joint Meeting between the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council on Tuesday, October 13th of 2020. My name is Franco Carrasco from the ICANN staff, and I will be your remote participation manager for this meeting.

Before we get started, I would like to provide some brief information. Please note that we are holding this meeting as a Zoom Webinar. Be advised that the floor of this session is reserved exclusively for interaction between the ICANN Board and the GNSO council members. We, therefore, have the members of both groups promoted to panelist today and are the only ones able to speak.

For our panelists, please raise your hand in Zoom in order to join the queue to participate. All panelists are muted by default, so

you may proceed to unmute yourself when you are given the floor. Before speaking, please ensure that you have all of your other app notifications muted and to clearly state your name and affiliation for the record. Bear in mind that the Board will only take questions from the constituency with whom they are in session. Consequently, the Q&A pod is disabled in this Webinar.

Note that this session includes realtime transcription, which you can view by clicking on the "closed caption" button in the Webinar tool bar. It also includes live interpretation services in English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic and Russian. Please see the session information regarding how to access officially on the schedule.

For all participants in this meeting, you may post comments in the chat. To do so, please use the drop-down menu in the chat box below and select "respond to all panelists and attendees." This will also allow everyone to see your comments. Note that private chats are only possible in Zoom Webinars amongst panelists. Therefore, any message sent by a panelist or standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by all other hosts, co-hosts, and panelists.

Please note that this meeting is being recorded and chat sessions are being archived.

Finally, we kindly ask everyone in this meeting to abide by the Expected ICANN Standards of Behavior. You may view this in the link provided in the Zoom chat.

Having said this, I will now give the floor to Maarten Botterman, chair of the ICANN Board.

Maarten, the floor is yours.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, Franco. And, Franco, actually, you are one of the few staff that actually is in Hamburg today. So thank you for welcoming us there.

And welcome to everybody, whether at night or in the morning or in the afternoon or even in the evening.

I'm fully cognizant of the fact that for some of you, it's the middle of the night, very early morning, in particular in the Americas. For others, this may be more convenient timing.

Please note in this that we recognize this would be the case for all community, organization, those people that support us make this possible, and the Board.

So next to missing the social interaction that we are used to during face-to-face meetings, I think to participate from all time

zones in the world is for sure a downside of the global virtual meetings. On the upside is that you don't have to leave your family behind and that you can join any session of interest without having to travel, even if it's just one or two sessions that you may have a key interest in. And it is what it is, so let's make the best of it together.

The Board is looking very forward to engage with the GNSO Council. This is the first of ten meetings with different parts of the community over the weeks to come and to be followed also by a public session with public forum. So these sessions are very important to us because they allow us to explore issues of interest in an open and interactive way.

And as Franco said, the chat is open but we won't take questions from that. We'll have the public session for that on the 23rd of October in the public forum.

So, Keith, again, happy to be here. And thank you for sharing a number of questions with the GNSO beforehand. I'm looking forward to an open, constructive discussion as always. And as suggested by you, we'll start with the question from the Board, which is about enhancing the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model, key issues and opportunities for acceleration, and the aspects that relate to that.

So, Keith, good to see you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Good to see you as well, Maarten. Thank you very much. And, hello, everybody. Welcome to the Joint Session of the ICANN Board with the GNSO Council for ICANN69. As Maarten noted, we have exchanged some topics for discussion. We have 90 minutes allocated and that we will just go ahead and jump right in.

But I should note that the GNSO Council very much appreciates the time and the engagement of the ICANN Board at these important sessions, previously face-to-face but now virtual. But I think that there's still tremendous value that we will all get from having this conversation.

As you'll see when we get to the agenda of questions, there are quite a few topics that are of interest both to the GNSO Council as the policy process manager for gTLD policy development as well as the ICANN Board, that the ongoing dialogue that we have and that we need to have is critically important and I think perhaps even more important now than ever before because of the remote and virtual nature and how dispersed we are all at this moment in time. I think these conversations are critically important, I think, to the smooth operation of ICANN and

making sure that the community, the Organization, and the Board are in sync.

So with that, let's jump to the first item. And the first item as Maarten noted was -- is going to be discussing the -- enhancing the efficiencies of the multistakeholder model. This was one of the topics that the Board put forward. And then we'll get to the rest. So thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Thanks for that, Keith. And, yeah, we were really interested also and very appreciative of what GNSO has done just thinking back of the sessions we had earlier and the contribution to this specifically also in terms of how policy processes are set up best like with PDP 3.0 initiative and the consensus playbook that has been developed.

But there is also things to do like prioritization and budgeting. ATRT has reacted on this. And we are very eager to hear from you where you think we stand and should go next.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Maarten. And today I will rely heavily on both of the GNSO Council's vice chairs, Rafik Dammak from the noncontracted party house, and Pam Little from the contracted

party house, as we work through our agenda today and other councilors as well as they want to weigh in.

But I will just tee this up perhaps before asking Rafik to speak maybe a little bit about PDP 3.0 that you mentioned.

And thank you, Maarten, for joining the Webinar that we conducted last month and for those who participated in that Webinar on our PDP 3.0 improvements.

But, clearly, over the last year or two, the topic of enhancing the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model has been, you know, sort of front and center for much of the community. This came out of some of the initiatives that took place early in 2019 around the Kobe meeting. There was some follow-on work. And now the question is what are we going to do to actually implement some of the suggested reforms and enhancements.

And the GNSO, as you noted, has gone through a process over about that same period of time, two or three years, of identifying the potential reforms and improvements related to our policy development process management, trying to come up with improvements and tools related to how can we do a better job and how can we set up the PDP working groups themselves to succeed and to be more efficient and effective ourselves.

So I think this is a really important topic. I think they're very much interrelated. And as, Maarten, you noted, there are some other dependencies or interrelation which with the ATRT3 report and, I think generally speaking on the last clause here, the work on prioritization and budgeting, this is something that is the GNSO Council is keenly aware of and the need for the work on prioritization. And I expect that the next council, once it's seated at the end of the AGM, this will be one of their top priorities, I would expect.

So, Rafik, if I could turn to you and see if you have anything you would like to add at this point on this particular topic and specifically on PDP 3.0 or any other reaction that you have on this one. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. So maybe just to add about the Webinar we had in September, the purpose was not to -- was not to present again the recommendation or improvement but to focus on what was deployed as a work product and area tackled by this work product and to show concrete examples how they were applied and deployed.

And so we can expect that the rest of those work product to be used when we initiate a new PDP. So starting with, let's say, the

full toolkit of PDP 3.0 improvements for PDP. And there are others. They can be initiated when needed and when there is something to handle.

So that's in terms I think of what was deployed and what you can expect in the future.

So we wanted to show a concrete case. I think we moved from just presenting the recommendation as this to indicate how they are applied, when they are applied, and where exactly.

So you can expect later on from the GNSO Council to continue the next steps for PDP 3.0 improvement, to continue development like the capacity management tool -- so that's something that should be in the pipeline -- and after to conduct a review of the PDP 3.0 implementation effectiveness. So it's not just about deploying them but also if you -- if they were useful, if they had the tool to help improve things or not, and after that make any necessary update to the GNSO operating procedure to include some of those work products.

So it's a continuous improvement process. I cannot speak for the next GNSO Council but I expect there will be more discussions and see how things can improve in other form or area. And probably the prioritization of one of them, taking into account what GNSO Council itself is finding when we are using

the new project management tools like the revised project list or the action decision right now, et cetera.

So we find more about the -- we know that we need to tackle more the issue of prioritization. I will stop here.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Rafik.

And, Maarten, I'll hand this back to you here momentarily, but I do want to note that I think this calendar year, the GNSO Council and working closely with the ICANN policy staff have, I think, taken a significant step forward in improving the tools and the tracking mechanisms and our ability to have visibility into future work and trying to figure out exactly when to slot that work in to an already very full funnel, and also to make sure that we understand the key dependencies between various work. And I think that that is an important component of being able to manage and to make sure that the multistakeholder model, at least in the GNSO policy development context, is something we can achieve. The effectiveness and efficiency. You know, if we don't have the appropriate visibility and the ability to program manage as well as project manage, it becomes much harder.

ICANN 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

So I do think that we've made significant strides as a Council, and particularly with the ICANN policy staff support, in taking significant strides forward there that will pay dividends later, next year. So I just wanted to note that.

So, Maarten, maybe if I can turn it back over to you and ask if the Board has any other thoughts for us to consider, any questions specifically or any recommendations. I see obviously, taking note of ATRT3 report and the work on prioritization and budgeting. Very, very important. There's a lot of moving parts here. I think we all recognize that.

So maybe I'll hand it back to you, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks, Keith. Basically, yes, this is ongoing work and more will be done within the Board. Mandla and Matthew have taken upon themselves to coordinate our activities with the full support of the entire Board and the full interest of the entire Board.

So I'd like to ask Mandla and Matthew to react on what you just heard from Rafik and Keith.

Please.

MATTHEW SHEARS:	Thanks, Maarten. Yeah, I'll just make a couple of comments and then turn to Mandla.

There is absolutely no doubt that -- and thanks, Rafik and Keith. It's a pleasure to be here.

There's actually no doubt that it's an impressive set of tools that you were describing, having now seen them over the past couple of months.

I think it may be useful just for me to kind of tell you where we are in terms of the specific project on enhancing the multistakeholder model that we have been going through the past year and a half or so and maybe put it in a broader context because it gets to some of the issues around scoping and prioritization that you mentioned.

So where we are at the moment. We concluded on the public comment, and we appreciate all the very valuable input from the community. The community that was out for comment is in the process of being finalized, and now we're moving into the implementation stage.

What's clear about this is that it sits within the broader basket of initiatives, work efforts to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model, and we're seeing this particular piece that Mandla and I have been shepherding as

something that will probably be -- will be implemented most likely over the period of the strategic plan. So over the five years of current strategic plan. And we're looking at it very much as being kind of a bringing additional and incremental benefits over that period of time.

At the same time, we need to develop an evaluation mechanism. We can't assess the degree to which the multistakeholder model is -- effectiveness is enhanced if we don't have some mechanism for actually -- or some methodology, I should say, for assessing how it is improving. And so that's one of the key work items that we're going to be looking at with org, is to figure out how to be able to do that to fully understand whether or not and to what degree we have achieved our objectives over this strategic plan.

There's no doubt -- Speaking of org, one of the issues that -- one of the partners to this, if you will, is the new implementation operations function that's being headed up by Xavier. And obviously a lot of this work and a lot of the other work, related work, is going to be a huge amount of prioritizing and implementation over these years.

When looking at this piece that we've been going through and have brought to fruition, it sits within a much broader basket, as I said, which the PDP 3.0 is one element, the ATRT3 recommendations is another. We have a whole set of issues

around streamlining of reviews and prioritization. And then we have the additional issue of implementation of all these outcomes and reviews and recommendations.

So all of this as a whole, really, is combined. When you look at it broadly, it's a huge amount of work. As you said, there are many, many moving parts. But it's all of this that lends itself to what we're looking to achieve, which is improving the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model, which is one of our strategic goals for this period.

So just wanted to put that in context. And specifically on this, we have elements in this multistakeholder evolution work that we did that addressed scoping and prioritization. So absolutely believe that those are two key elements in terms of how we progress the model going forward.

Thanks.

Mandla, I don't know if you just wanted to add or...

MANDLA MSIMANG: No, Matthew, I think you've covered everything sufficiently. But just I guess the only thing to add is we'll also just be looking at other projects and work streams that are under way and trying

to see where there's any gaps and trying to increase the efficiency in those kinds of areas.

So looking for where the gaps where nothing has been worked in and look at defining processes that will enhance those as well. So in addition to ATRT3 and streamlining and the things you already mentioned, there may be more -- more that we find in the process. But I think Matthew has really put the context quite -- quite well of the work we're doing.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you. Maarten, back to you, or Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much. Very helpful.

Maarten, do you want to take it from here or should we open to see if any councillors or board members would like to get in the queue?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please. Please raise your hand if you have additional remarks, questions, suggestions at this point. It's to be an open dialogue. We steal away from the tech question, tech answer and really

invite you to any question you may have or remark you may have at this moment.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Maarten.

So if any councilors would like to get in the queue and ask any questions or provide any feedback to this particular discussion topic, feel free.

I know that one of the other topics that the GNSO Council has focused on, in addition to the evolution of the multistakeholder model, is the Work Stream 2 items, the implementation of Work Stream 2 coming out of the IANA transition. And while not directly related, I think there's still some overlap of issues and overlap of, you know, I guess questions or concerns that folks may have.

But I guess on this particular topic, I don't see any additional hands right now on the evolution of the multistakeholder model.

So perhaps we can move on, and obviously if there are any follow-up questions, we can coordinate closely after the session. But in the interest of time, let's move on.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Well, particularly in work stream, Avri may want to provide an update how this also relates to this.

AVRI DORIA: Sure. Hi. Avri, speaking. So, yeah, the WS2, I mean, it has been a year. A lot of work has actually gone into it, but it hasn't been as visible yet as it will be with the reorganization or WS2 as implementation is being put in sort of very high-visibility status.

And so there's really very strong expectations that as this next budget is done and as, you know, various other processes get going, that there will be more and more visibility.

Again, though, the thing with WS2 is there is a lot of cooperation required between Org, between the various SOs and ACs, and the Board in terms of just making sure that the pieces are getting done by the people that, you know, made the decision to accept the WS2 and now have the sort of onus of implementing those parts that pertain to their piece.

So the work is actually gearing up, and it is becoming much more of a focus with this reorganization now. So I'm quite looking forward to that being something that has a lot of progress over the next year. I'm being optimistic about it very much.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Avri. That's very encouraging to hear.

Yeah, completely understand that the Work Stream 2 implementation is not single-threaded. It's not any one group in particular in its own silo or org being able to do any one thing, that there's quite a bit of overlap there.

So I think the community is very much focused and interested in wanting to see Work Stream 2 move forward. We also recognize there are a lot of review team recommendations that are out there. Obviously ATRT3 now, the report, is there. And, you know, as I noted earlier, there's a lot of moving parts here generally speaking.

But I think there's a community recognition that the Work Stream 2 track is particularly important because it was a component of the IANA transition and the accountability and transparency work that took place there.

So I think it was worth -- worth noting that in the context of this broader discussion on evolution of the multistakeholder model.

And I do see a hand now. James, over to you.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Keith. James for the record.

Yeah, I just wanted to note for the Board that council has actually started a small team as well working with Mary and Org staff to try and start working through the implementation of some of the Work Stream 2 items as well.

I think it would be great actually if the Board could get a report on that. I think it would be valuable for you to see the output of that.

When you start going down to the "well, who is accountable for actually implementing each of the recommendations," it was interesting for me as well to see, you know, the split between things that exist between all of the SO/ACs, which I think will be a slow process. You know, getting everybody on board with moving forward will be difficult. But, also, there was a good chunk of them as well that rested with Org and staff to implement.

And certainly I think from -- not to speak on behalf of the community, but I think from a community perspective, it would be nice to see progress with some of the staff-led items that are kind of within the boundaries of Org to move forward on. I think that would be a great starting point to see in the short-term because that will really show that we have traction and we are actually moving beyond the discussion phases.

KEITH DRAZEK: Go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, yeah, thanks. I was trying to get all the hand-raising stuff.

Yeah, I think that one of the things that I was sort of pointing at is that we need to do much more of a "how do we report on this stuff" and "how do we sort of increase the transparency" because there actually have been many things and the basis for many things that's been laid out in terms of things that the staff are working on.

And so, yes, getting those things much more visible using some of the tools we've got now, I think, is definitely one of the goals that we're going for so that all of our pieces can be tracked and, yes, so that we can see that something really is happening. And from my perspective, I think something really is happening; but we need to make it much more visible and trackable.

So, yeah, agree with you completely. But I think it's happening. We just need to make it visible.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Avri.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Let's focus on a lot having already happened as well. And I think the renewed focus on getting clarity on where we are and what can be done will help us all to move together forward from this important subject, so...

Well, thanks for that, for the question, James.

I guess -- any additional remarks, questions on this?

KEITH DRAZEK: Maarten, this is Keith. Yeah, I think we can probably move on to the next topic.

But I'm going to take the opportunity just for some administrative matters, just to remind everybody to state your full name when speaking and also to speak slowly because we are having transcription and translation. So if everybody could remember to state your name. I'm particularly bad at that, but I'll do my best. This is Keith Drazek.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. I think you and I have the pleasure of being exempt from that rule. This is Maarten Botterman.

[Laughter]

KEITH DRAZEK: So shall we move on?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, I think so, yeah.

KEITH DRAZEK: Next slide. Okay. So I can tee this one up, Maarten. And then I think some of the topics that the GNSO Council proposed for our discussion today were just, I think, preliminary conversations on three topics on this particular slide.

One is the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations. For everybody's benefit, the GNSO Council approved on September 24th the EPDP Phase 2 package of recommendations related to the Standardized System of Access and Disclosure.

And one of the Resolved clauses in that approval related to a desire of the GNSO Council to continue to engage with the ICANN Board on the questions of a cost-benefit analysis for the SSAD-related recommendations.

We noted the comments and the minority statements that were submitted around the EPDP Phase 2 report with many of the user groups or those who might be requesting access or using

the SSAD for requesting access to nonpublic registration data. There was a question as to whether the proposed cost or the projected cost of an SSAD system would be worth the return on investment.

And so I think now that the recommendation is final and will be delivered to the Board following our October 21st meeting, that, you know, at some point in the future -- and that doesn't have to happen today obviously and probably shouldn't because you haven't received the recommendations yet formally -- we just wanted to flag that this is a topic of interest of the GNSO Council, surely of the Board, and Org as well, and that we hope to have an ongoing dialogue with you about this question as it relates to the consensus policy recommendations on the SSAD.

So why don't I stop there and see if any feedback, any reaction, any comment from, Maarten, you or your team or the Board.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. No, for sure. As you know, it has our highest interest since in a way the planning of the temp specs sometime ago that led to all this.

The liaisons from the Board to help us organize our interaction are, as you know, Becky and Chris. So I'd like to ask Becky to give initial response on this one.

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you. Thank you, everybody. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Becky Burr for the record. I almost never remember to say my name for the record.

So thanks for that input and for these discussion items on EPDP Phase 2 and some of the Phase 1 issues.

In terms of the cost-benefit analysis, we understand that the recommendation from the GNSO Council, that the GNSO Council has adopted it and has -- and will be forwarding the Phase 2 recommendations to the Board and at the same time calling for discussions on cost-benefit analysis. And we're very much looking forward to understanding precisely what the council has in mind with respect to the cost-benefit analysis.

I think you've heard in terms of the work that's ongoing on the design phase of projects that we are hoping to have a much better understanding of -- to get a much better understanding of what will be required to implement any recommendations that very much involve the community and understanding that.

And so that seems to be a prerequisite of undertaking a cost-benefit analysis, is really understanding what the design

requirements are and the costs associated with those and obviously the benefit.

So I think there's still some more work to be done, and we look forward to working with the council, speaking with council on that.

In terms of the Priority 2 recommendations, it's our understanding that -- that the council is still working through some of those issues, how they will be addressed. And we'd be interested in hearing more on how that is likely to shake out and how we can make progress on those open issues.

KEITH DRAZEK: So thanks very much, Becky. And, yeah, thanks on the first point about the cost-benefit analysis.

Just to go back, I think it was during the EPDP work where -- on the SSAD where there was some very preliminary projections, I think, estimates, of what the cost might be to build an SSAD and then to annually operate an SSAD. But we recognize at the council level that those estimates were made before the finalization of the actual recommendations and that there could be a delta between the estimates -- from the initial estimates and what may be required now or, you know, what the implications might be. So I think there's an interest in having --

as ICANN Org and the Board conducts the operational design assessment, that we just want to make sure that we have open lines of communication and a dialogue to fully understand the cost implications and the complexity of the recommendations that we have been forwarded -- or will soon forward.

BECKY BURR: And just to be sure, we -- the initial projections were very rough initial projections based on incomplete policy work. So, you know, now is the time to dig in and really understand the implications.

And since that time, of course, more issues -- some more issues have come up that will need to be dealt with. So, for example, you know, what vehicle one uses for data transfers to provide adequate protection (indiscernible). The European Union has become a more complicated issue in the interim. So there are both policy and operational issues that we need to be in communication about.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Goran would also like to add to this. Goran?

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. Actually -- this is Goran Marby for the record. Becky actually said all those things that I was thinking of saying.

Yes, the first estimate we did was a very rough estimate. We don't really know what the cost will be until we designed it.

And I want to thank the GNSO Council for setting up the opportunity for the Board to have this conversation. But we need to do some work before that is possible to have that conversation and provide the GNSO Council and the Board with some answers.

Becky also mentioned that there are also legal issues that we have to -- have to look into in the proposal for the Board. International data transfers is one of them. Data minimization is another one of them. And basically there are some of the -- some of the questions we stated in the strawberry process also exist for the SSAD. So it will be not be something that we can provide to the Board in a couple of weeks. And it will take some time for us to deliver to go through that.

And as we mentioned before, we talked about something -- we introduced the concept we called the operational design phase, which is -- I think we're going to come back to it later. But the intention of that one is actually to help ourselves working with the GNSO Council especially so we make sure that the

assumptions that goes to the Board are the ones that is reflected in the recommendations.

This is something we always have done, but we have not always been transparent about it. So we are thinking it's something complex. We thought it was a good idea to open up that process as well.

But most important thing was actually said by Becky. We don't know the cost today, and there are some additional things that we have to look into. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Goran. And I do have a queue building, and I was actually going to hand it off to Rafik as the GNSO Council's liaison to the EPDP as well as its vice chair and (indiscernible) chair.

Rafik, you have the floor. And then we will go Michele and then to Phillippe. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So this is Rafik speaking. So, thanks, Keith.

First, I want just maybe to add about the dialogue suggestion we made and we had in our motion when we approved the final

report. I think it's coming from the previous experience for Phase 1, and the real intent here is to help the Board for the consideration of the recommendation. And if they have any clarifying question or anything they want to ask or to discuss, I think it's better to have that -- to start that and not just wait till they start considering the recommendation.

But also at the same time, we hope that this process won't take too long. I think we can acknowledge the complexity and different factors to take into account but also at the same time, I think we need to be aware about the timeliness and to get this done quickly.

This is first about the dialogue. I think that you asked about remaining Priority 2 items, next steps.

So that was discussed in GNSO Council meeting, at several GNSO Council meetings. Since June, we went through several iteration of what we are proposing shall the next steps, and now we have reached the stage where we should approve in our October GNSO Council meeting the next steps for -- to handle the three remaining topics. So I think -- I mean, I'm not going to go into detail what are the proposed next steps, but that's something we should -- the GNSO Council is expected to approve next week. So that's something to be done soon.

So that's for the next steps.

Regarding the cost, the cost of the system, I think it was helpful to have some rough estimation during deliberation of the EPDP team. And I want to remind because the EPDP team and the chair at the time asked ICANN org to come up with some (indiscernible) to help for deliberation.

And since Goran mentioned about the operational phase, and now that -- now we have this proposal, and it's good for input and feedback. My belief that if we are going to talk about design, estimation, et cetera, we should not wait when we are going to work on implementation and after the approval of the -- the policy recommendation. But that's a process that go through several iteration during the PDP Working Group lifecycle.

And so I know that it's something kind of somehow proposed in the paper, but I want that really should be the focus is how we can add that component in the process and how we can improve that step to do design, and also how we can improve the estimation. I think there was some concern maybe that if it's a rough estimation, that can be quite overblown to some extent. Even for those, like, working in I.T. field, the number can look a little bit too high. I can assure that's to be a cautious approach in term of estimation because there are still some unknown, like internal (indiscernible) model requirement and so on. But just

maybe to build on what James shared as a comment, those kind of systems are not too new; that people or groups that already did something similar. And in I.T. field in general, we are kind of use or learning from other experience. So I think that's possible and doable.

So I should stop here.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Rafik.

So next we have two more people in queue, Michele and Philippe, and then we should probably move on. So at that point I'll hand it back to Maarten and the Board for any other comments or questions related to this particular topic before we move to the next.

So Michele, and then Philippe.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Michele, for the record.

And this is speaking on my own behalf. And I would ask the Board to look at this very, very carefully.

The GNSO Council voted in favor of moving this forward, because as managers of the policy development process, we felt that we had -- that the policy process had been followed correctly. But I think quite a few of us, and quite a few people within our stakeholder groups, had deep concerns about signing off on a system that is going to cost so much money. Whether the -- whether the estimate is accurate or not, I think most of us can agree that the amount of money is significant. I mean, you could build -- you could build up a company and employ quite few people for that kind of money.

And the -- the impact that that kind of money could have on a small -- on a startup or even an established business is gigantic.

And the reason I mention this is this is what we're talking about. We're talking about a situation where you are signing a check of sorts. Where you are giving the green light to progress with the building of a system that, whether it's going to cost 9 million or 5 million, it's going to have recurring costs, and those costs have to come from somewhere.

And the real fundamental issue here is that the people who wanted the system have rejected it. So why build a system that is not going to be used? That the people who asked for it won't use?

From the GNSO Council perspective, we have to vote in favor of this because the process have been followed. But those who demanded this have rejected it.

So I would ask you to please don't look at this simply as a box-checking exercise nor as some kind of academic exercise, because the financial impact of this is really significant.

And part of that dialogue, the dialogue could end up being, hey, we've looked at this and it's just not worth spending the money on it. So let's just park that.

I won't be involved in those conversations, but I wish you all the best of luck with it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Michele.

Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: May be good to give, also to the earlier remarks, and maybe Rafik and Michele, you may not be on the Council but you will still be affected by whatever is happening here. So thank you for your remarks.

I think it's to reality check. And this is why this design planning phase seems to be so important. Because saying yes to it, what "it" exactly is is what we are to scope, what fits with the recommendations, what will respond to this.

And, yes, I think for the ICANN Board to give a blank "GNSO Council said yes so let's do it" without defining "it" would be irresponsible and, therefore, also in collision with our fiduciary obligation, which is ours.

So that's, I think, where we stand here. And I think there's a broad agreement that we should have a good understanding of what it is. The design planning phase would help there. And it shouldn't be there to change policy or whatever, but it's to really scope like what will we exactly mean, what makes sense, and how we are going to make this happen.

So for sure, I think we'll have more dialogue on this.

Will we first still go to Philippe or would you -- okay. I see Keith nodding. So, Philippe, please come in, and then we'll no doubt go on on this subject.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maarten. I hope you can hear me.

KEITH DRAZEK: Very well.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Philippe Fouquart speaking.

I'd like to come back onto the point we discussed earlier, that draft operational design phase that we circulated with our constituencies and stakeholder groups early last week, I believe. And I just wanted to know whether there was an intent -- to some extent, Goran and I think Becky addressed that, but just for clarifying. Is there an intent for this to sort of frame the discussions or the guidance, the elements that the Board will receive? Although that's a draft document and we've had some discussions with our -- with our constituencies, to frame the discussion on the financial sustainability that we will have on the SSAD and how that will be developed moving forward, bearing in mind that this may take some time for this guidance to be produced. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Good.

BECKY BURR: I think -- This is Becky. I think the answer is it is very much intended to help us understand what is required to move forward, so that the Board must approve Council recommendations unless two-thirds of the Board determine that the policy is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN. That's the bylaws standard. And in order to make that determination, we really do have to have a better understanding of both the cost and the benefit issues in the sense of, you know, will the intended users of the system use it and find value.

But I'm going to turn to Goran for details about the operational design phase itself.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you.

I mean, just to take a step back. So the operating design phase comes of the notion where we looked into a little bit what the future beholds, which is the -- and GDPR is one example.

And you know why it was promote -- sort of the idea became a little bit firmer when the GNSO Council asked for this meeting with the Board to discuss it before the Board makes the decision, which prompted us to think about yes, that's -- first of all, we think it's a great idea. It's sort of a recognition of something that

everybody knows that some things are complicated, and the best way in ICANN is to talk about them.

We also had a conversation with the -- with the sub pro PDP people about this -- this cost, how much money does it cost, how are we going to do this. Remember the Board and the org, when the GNSO has made a recommendation, it's really, all the machinery starts to work to make that recommendation happen. So we go into the mood of, okay, how do we practically make this happen.

And I think that some of the things that GNSO and the community has worked upon now is getting fairly complicated. It's a lot of bits and bolts and things that needs to be fitted together. And it's financials, it's systems, it's transparency, it's accountability, and it's all those things that is not easily done. It's not only about the policies itself.

And, Rafik, I totally to a hundred percent or if it's possible even more agree with you. We want as much of those things to be liberate (phonetic) in the PDP.

So when we started looking about what -- how can we create a process where we supposed to -- as an org, we are supposed to help the Board in deliberation (phonetic) or in the work to

prepare them. How to do that in a transparent manner and how do we make sure that we get it right as well?

So the operational side, which is really, by idea, is to open up a process that already exists, to make sure that you know how ICANN org is working together with the Board before the Board makes a decision. The idea is not to open it up for any further negotiations or, you know, last bites of the apple or in the middle bite of the Apple or something. It's really about creating a transparent process to that.

So I think it's the complexities of the things that GNSO Council has now decided upon that created a need for more open up of an already-existing process. And I hope that answers your questions about it.

It's done in good faith, to be honest. It's also done in good faith to say we don't always have the answers to some of the things that is there and the questions that is created by the recommendation itself.

I also actually think that it will create another positive thing, which as many people told me in the last two of weeks, which I didn't think about a hundred percent, which that it will help implementation to make -- some of the questions that after the Board makes a decisions, it will shorten the time for

implementation and actually maybe increase the transparency of that process as well.

So that was my comments about the operational design phase.

It's really there, it is emphasized in the paper to have this conversation also with the GNSO Council. And just to reinforce what I said before, and I think it was very -- the notion of the GNSO Council coming up with this request for the Board in direction was very much in line with our thought process there as well.

Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And thanks, Keith and Jeff and Philippe, for the comments in the chat. Makes a lot of sense.

Anybody else on this topic?

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. I don't see any other hands, Maarten, so perhaps we could move to the next topic on this slide, which is number 2 on the slide, which is discussion point on EPDP Phase 1, the IRT, the Implementation Review Team, and specifically the

Recommendation 7 and the inconsistencies with the preexisting thick WHOIS consensus policy.

I'm going to hand this one over to Pam Little and to Rafik, but first to Pam. I just want to note that in the early discussions at the Council level on this topic, I recused myself. As a Verisign employee, obviously the thick WHOIS transition policy impacts Verisign uniquely as a registry operator. It also impacts all of the registrars that engage in selling our -- the domains we have under management. But I recused myself from Council discussions on this topic. And Pam and Rafik have picked up the ball and have helped to coordinate this within Council, also working with Sebastien Ducos, the GNSO Council's liaison to the IRT.

So, Pam, if I can hand this one over to you, please.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. No problem.

Hi, everyone. Pam Little here.

For those who are not following the EPDP Phase 1 closely, just very quickly, this recommendation pertains to the transfer of registration data from registrars to registries. And so there is a Recommendation 7 in the final report, and as you know, the

Council actually adopted all the recommendations in the Phase 1 final report, and subsequently, the Board also adopted those recommendations but two of them. So Recommendation 7 was adopted by the Board. That was about May last year.

Our -- we -- The Council received the letter from Maarten, the chair of ICANN Board, back in March, and obviously took us a meeting or two to deal with that letter and agree on the next steps. And the Council decided then, back in May, to enlist the Council's liaison to the IRP, Sebastien Ducos, to help see if he can resolve this matter. And we very much at that time, the Council was sort of dealing with a novel, unique situation, and we had to consult the existing GNSO processes or guidelines or principles. And what we consulted was the Implementation Review Team, IRT, principles and guidelines, which sort of gave us some clue what to do in this sort of situation when there was disagreement within the IRT.

And Sebastien, I believe he worked really diligently to try to see if there could be a common ground or agreed approach within the IRT. But it was -- And that took a few months until in the September meeting, the last council meeting, Sebastien sort of concluded the impasse persists, and the parties views have not shifted.

ICANN
COMMUNITY DAYS 69

So at time (indiscernible) small team as we did when we wrote back to Maarten, your letter, back in May that was the work of a small team. And we would convene the small team to see if we now can deal with this -- how to deal with this issue. And then we again have to consult with what GNSO processes or policies are guiding us here, and we sort of referred to the -- the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework, which really, to us, the role for the Council to play in this juncture really is to provide guidance to the IRT about the intent of the recommendation and maybe the history or background.

And that's really to the extent that the -- the -- the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework provides. There isn't a lot of guidance as to other -- other role or steps the Council should do.

So the small team has been working diligently, and we have representation from all the stakeholder groups and constituency within the GNSO, I believe. But, however, as you may appreciate this, this is quite a complex issue. So we're trying to do things in this small team. One is to see whether we can agree on a guidance to provide to the IRT, because that's what this Consensus Policy Implementation Framework require us to do, to play that role.

And the other thing we hope to do within the small team is to see how to deal with the consensus policy; i.e., the thick WHOIS

transition policy that's impacted by the -- by Recommendation 7 to the extent it is impacted.

And there are different views within the small team at this point. So I'm not able to share with you what the conclusion is except saying it's still work in progress. So, obviously, the small team, we cannot agree.

Ultimately, council still has to make a decision and we may have to have a proposed motion and to see whether the council then need to vote on the motion.

At the moment, we are trying to work on a motion and that hopefully would be on the agenda for the council to discuss and our next council meeting which will be held on the 21st of October.

But, firstly, the small team would need to agree on the content of the motion. And we are working on that, and there will be another meeting held this week.

So that's where I hope to give you a sort of status update. We haven't forgotten, Maarten, you have since written back to us in July. And obviously once we have something to -- as a guidance for the IRT, we will write back and to inform the Board accordingly what the steps the council will be taking.

I'll pause there. Thank you, Keith. I'll hand it back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much, Pam.

Rafik, is there anything you'd like to add at this point?

I mean, I think in this particular case, the key message here is there's a lot of work going on sort of within council, within the small team, the engagement with the council liaisons, Sebastien, to the IRT itself. So this has certainly not been ignored in any way. It's just that there's still a little bit more work to be done, I think, for the council to be able to reach a view or a position that it can then share with the Board and with the IRT itself.

Rafik, is there anything you'd like to add at this point, or shall we kick it over to Maarten and the Board?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. Not so much to add to the overview from Pam. But I want maybe to add a question since we will move to the Board here.

I think regarding the impasse, a lot of the deliberation within the IRT is regarding what they heard from the Board representatives, if I'm not mistaken, earlier this year.

So I just wanted maybe to hear more clarification from the Board about kind of what instruction they gave to the staff or from GTS and IRT and maybe explain more because I think that the source or anything regarding Board instruction is in the scorecard. But there's disagreement or different interpretation about that. So a question to add, if possible.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Rafik.

With that, Maarten, I'll hand it back over to you. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. First, thanks also for the engagement in this. It's important and, yeah, it's new ground also how we can make this happen within the bylaws, et cetera. It's important to get it right. So appreciate you care and the questions.

Becky, can you respond also to Rafik on this?

BECKY BURR: Yes. Thank you so much. This is Becky Burr for the record.

I think that the Board's position on this is pretty simple and clear, notwithstanding the fact that this is very complicated and we understand there's a lot of work going on.

The Board was quite clear that it did not see the EPDP Phase 1 recommendation as repealing the thick WHOIS policy and that to the extent a contemptive policy was being modified, repealed, altered, that needed to be done through the bottom-up multistakeholder process and in a transparent and clearly articulated way.

So it really is up to the GNSO to make a determination about whether or not to modify or repeal thick WHOIS. But the Board does not feel that it is in a position or that it is -- it's its job to do that. So that really is exactly what the Board intended to convey.

I'm not quite sure what Rafik is asking regarding the instructions to Org involved in the IRT other than the fact that the Board does not believe that the thick WHOIS policy was repealed by the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations.

And I'm happy to -- I'm happy to expand on that if you help me out a little bit.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Becky. This is Keith. I see Pam has her hand up.

So, Pam, over to you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. Pam Little again.

                        Thank you, Becky.

                        I believe Rafik was probably referring to an exchange from staff --
                        or an email from Org staff to the council about instructions
                        from the Board. So, you know, in the implementation obviously
                        ICANN Org staff is doing a lot of drafting.

                        And the current language -- I will try to avoid not getting into the
                        weeds or really talking about substance.

                        I believe the current language in some -- from some members'
                        view or the IRT members' or even council members' view,
                        probably is not consistent with the intent of Recommendation 7.
                        So I guess it's in that exchange -- in the context of that exchange
                        that Org staff mentioned they simply -- they don't make policy
                        but they are just following instructions from the Board.

                        And, Becky, I would just add in the Board scorecard, there were
                        three points made by the Board. And one of the -- the first point
                        was the Board knows that the purpose contained in the final
                        report recommendation, "when provide a legal basis for
                        processing the aggregate minimum data."So I think there seems
                        to be a misunderstanding or different interpretations of what the
                        reference to the "aggregate minimum data" means.

And the Board also made another point about the comment from the Registry Stakeholder Group -- and actually what I just want to highlight is that the Board actually in the Board resolution requested that the EPDP Phase 2 team actually consider whether the suggested corrections contained in the Registry Stakeholder Group's comments and the accompanying chat in Appendix G more accurately reflect the Phase 1 consensus and should be adopted.

So to our understanding, that request from the Board was not -- was never communicated to the EPDP Phase 2. So needless to say, that was never even considered by the Phase 2.

So today as an update, one of the Registry Stakeholder Groups' councillors, Maxim, actually sent some clarification from the Registry Stakeholder Group, their particular comments.

And it appears from my reading of that clarification, the Board may have misunderstood or misinterpreted RySG's comments as well.

Becky, when you have a chance, please, can you, please, take a look at that clarification from the RySG to see whether that second point in the Board's scorecard still holds as it is or maybe you have a different view about that one.

But suffice to say, just that unfortunately that was an action on and, therefore, we are -- we end up kind of having some confusion or misunderstanding. Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Okay. Thank you. And are you going to share whatever it was that the Registry Stakeholder Group is putting forward, Maxim's paper? Maybe that would be useful to look at as well.

PAM LITTLE: No problem, Becky. I will post it in the chat. It was sent to the council members in chat. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Okay, great. Thanks. We will certainly take a look at it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Pam. Thanks, Becky.

I see Goran has his hand up. Goran.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. I just want to take the opportunity to say when the Board makes a resolution to the ICANN Org to go and implement, for instance, a GNSO Council recommendation, that

restarts the clock really for us because we are by that second bound to follow what the Board -- what the Board has decided. And I think most of you understand why it is so.

So that's why we over the years now, especially the last couple of years, sort of built in -- I mean, the ICANN Org is responsible for implementation with the help of the community. And we built into the process a couple of new things to make sure that is done in a transparent way.

For instance, we added this additional impasse. When we see that there is no agreement within the IRT, for instance, we go back to the Board and the Board goes back to the GNSO Council or makes an alternative decision, like we did with thick/thin WHOIS a long time ago.

But the notion is that it's really -- the ICANN Org staff should not involve themselves in this more than we have to implement what the Board has decided.

And during this one, especially, I think, we worked together with the Board, we asked more instructions from the Board. The Board officially has given us more instruction. The Board has also gone back to the GNSO Council because we shouldn't take sides.

And I know there was a -- one of the reasons why we sent this clarification to GNSO Council after the (indiscernible) report was to clarify that we don't take sides in the discussion between the contracted party house and the IPC or BC or anyone else from that matter. The only one side we take is actually the instruction given by the Board.

And I think that's very important for the integrity of the multistakeholder model and the integrity of the process, to understand that specifically. That's why we pointed it out. We're not trying to be -- to correct anyone. It is the way we try to work.

And if we fail, if we don't do it the right way, please criticize us and tell us wrong so we can learn from that experience.

But when it comes to this one, I think we've been trying to follow all the processes and having the discussions in the right places.

But ICANN Org, when it comes to implementation of this, should be neutral actually and follow the instructions from the Board. And the Board has the relationship with the GNSO Council to sort things out.

I have no other hopes or expectations that the GNSO Council would clear out anything in the future.

So thank you for giving me the time to explain that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Goran.

I see Pam has her hand up, and then we probably need to draw a line under this one and move on in the interest of time.

So, Pam, over to you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith.

I just want to very quickly respond to Goran.

Goran, I totally agree with you. The Org should be neutral, and so is the council. As we said many times, we are the manager of the PDP. We don't engage in policy discussion.

But we feel the council does have a role to make sure policy recommendations are implemented as intended. So we really were very much guided by the consensus policy implementation framework, which really sets out this role for council.

I'm not quite sure where -- where there is ambiguity about intent of a particular recommendation, whether it is the Board's role to clarify. I can't find any source document to say that. But that's --

consensus policy implementation framework only makes reference to council's role in those -- in this sort of situation.

But that is moot. And I am not saying I -- the Board doesn't have a role to play, but it's not completely clear to us.

But given that the CPIF does give council that role, then I think it's incumbent on council to provide guidance to the IRT to make sure the policy recommendation is implemented as intended. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Pam. This is Keith Drazek. Maarten, I'll hand back to you in a moment. I wanted to just summarize a bit in terms of next steps, just in terms of procedure.

So the GNSO Council small team is continuing to work. There's a meeting planned this week for further discussion. The Council will discuss this further at our meeting on October 21st, and that we look forward to further engagement with the Board, further conversations with the Board on this topic moving forward.

And of course after the 21st, it will be a brand-new Council, but this is obviously an important topic that -- you know, that needs to be resolved.

I do want to just flash back, though, to the exchange of letters that we had early in the year that did acknowledge -- the Council, the GNSO Council, did acknowledge the Board's view that the thick WHOIS consensus policy was not repealed by the new Recommendation 7 from the EPDP but that there are clear impacts and inconsistencies or things that need to be resolved.

And in that communication, the GNSO Council noted that it was expecting to and planning to initiate a follow-on policy effort to deal with this issue of the inconsistencies between the Rec 7 language and the thick WHOIS consensus policy.

So that is still the plan. That has always been the plan. I think the challenge that we're faced with here is that the current status within the IRT is that it appears that the language that has been put forward for publication in the public comment phase is inconsistent with the policy recommendations that were approved by the Council and by the Board. And so we've got to get to a situation, I think, where approved policy is implemented accurately and appropriately, and the follow-on policy work needs to be initiated. I think that's the direction that the Council is heading, but again, there's still further conversations that need to take place within the Council on this.

So I'll just stop there. I just wanted to sort of summarize the -- to -- in terms of process, what the current thinking is. I hope that's helpful.

And Maarten, with that, I'll hand it back to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. Makes a lot of sense. And thanks for this. I mean, it's clear that we need to resolve this together. More the GNSO councilors understand. (Indiscernible) the Board is trying to change or influence the policy. It's trying to make sense of it, and this is why we're here.

Goran, you had your hand up still on this topic or can we --

GORAN MARBY: I just want to ask -- say just a continuation on the chat saying that the Board has worked on a paper called "Guidelines for Implementation" which is a paper that goes from the Board to the org. And the Board has been planning to come out and ask the community for input about that paper before the Board makes it into effect.

We were planning to do that before ICANN69 when Titan (phonetic) disappeared, so after ICANN69, to continue the

discussion we're having on the chat with Pam and others. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And always to aim not to change policy but to see how we can responsibly and usefully implement it, to be very clear on that.

So with that, yeah, I guess you want to go into Recommendation 12? You've gotten more minutes.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, thanks, Maarten. Much appreciated. And thanks, everybody, for the good conversation around the last time.

Yeah, I think the Council is looking for any update, any status update on the Recommendation 12 supplemental recommendation. And just to sort of reiterate, Pam noted that in EPDP Phase 1, there were two recommendations that were not accepted in full, one of them being Recommendation 12. And there's supplemental recommendation anticipated or pending or I guess the question from Council is is there any update on this particular one.

And with that, I may actually turn back to Pam and Rafik to see if they have anything further -- anything they would like to add on

this particular one, unless a board member would like to take it on immediately.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Becky, should we ask --

BECKY BURR: I'm -- Yeah, I'm happy to provide an update.

We did receive the input from the Council regarding retention of -- retention of the information. We just have a -- we're just confused, basically, about one pretty straightforward issue, which is we think that -- we provided an example of a situation where a recommendation comes in or a registration comes in and the domain name is icann.org. For some reason, the registrant is listed as domain administrator and the organization is listed as ICANN, but you can't confirm the organization. So that field drops away and the registrar has a -- has the ability to actually delete that information entirely. I'm unclear whether that is actually going to happen, but in any case, this isn't about what is shown or redacted. This is really about what registration is maintained by the registrar.

Even if the -- we understand the Council solution was to say that contact information for the registrant will be maintained. In this

case the registrant was listed as domain administrator. Even if you can contact the domain administrator, how -- how do you avoid a situation where essentially the registration has been transferred or on paper it looks like it's been transferred from ICANN, the organization, to an individual? You know, because it may not be domain administrator. It could be, you know, whoever. Joe Smith at icann.org. And I guess what we're looking for is an understanding of how the decision to make sure that contact information for the registrant is maintained resolves that very narrow concern that the Board is focused on.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks for that, Becky. I hope that helps if you're -- I think, Goran, this is an old hand, right?

Okay. Then if Pam or Rafik want to come in on this, they're very welcome. Or anybody from the GNSO Council for that matter.

PAM LITTLE: Hi, Maarten. It's Pam Little speaking.

Thank you, Becky, for that. Basically, I think this item was just to catch up, sort of to see where the Board is at in terms of this recommendation because of our prior exchange, and just to let us know where that stands. So, Becky, thank you for that.

If you feel that it is necessary, maybe we can -- you can perhaps write to us or if you need more input from us, we're happy to provide.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Okay. Okay; fine.

I think this is a small issue that should be readily resolvable, but for some reason we just haven't gotten it resolved.

So we will put down our concerns in writing, and then maybe we can just have a conversation about it rather than exchanging email back and forth.

And I note Goran's comment. I am saying that it is a smallish but it is an important issue, obviously.

PAM LITTLE: Right. Thanks, Becky. We look forward to seeing that in writing, and obviously if we could get back to you quickly, we will.

BECKY BURR: All right. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Excellent.

Well, that sounds like -- I don't see any more hands. May be a good time to conclude this session, knowing our next session starts at the full hour with the SSAC.

Really appreciated the session and the dialogue. And I think we're getting towards more of a dialogue where it's really interactive, useful, as Becky said in her last comment as well. Exchanges like that are useful and important, and sometimes it's even more useful to talk with each other. And these are the occasions we use, but we can also create others.

I think you're all cognizant of the process and the importance of making the multistakeholder system work. Obey the bylaws, be cognizant of our roles, policies made by the community. And we're here to make sure that they're implemented well. And as a Board, to oversee that it's happening in a fiduciary responsible way.

And we are, step by step, moving on that, including with thinking of a design planning phase to better understand what it actually means and steps like that.

So appreciate very much the constructive attitude throughout, and look forward to the next steps.

Back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: So thank you very much, Maarten. And, yes, I think we can conclude the meeting. I just want to thank all the board members and the GNSO councilors and all of our attendees. I think we had over 200 people joining this call today. So thank you all very much for attending. As I said, the GNSO Council always appreciates the engagement and the dialogue with the ICANN Board, and I thought this was an excellent call.

So thank you all very much, and have a great ICANN69.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. And a good coffee, breakfast, dinner, wherever you are.

KEITH DRAZEK: Bye, all.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: See you in the hallways.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]

ICANN 69 COMMUNITY DAYS