ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and CPH
Thursday, October 28, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 PDT

AARON JIMENEZ: This session will now begin. Please start the recording.

[Recording in progress]

AARON JIMENEZ: Hello. My name is Aaron Jimenez. Welcome to the joint session with the ICANN Board and the Contracted Party House.

Please note that the session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for this session will include six U.N. languages: Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, and English. Click on the "Interpretation" icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during the session.

For our panelists, please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Before speaking, ensure you have the selected language

you will speak from the interpretation menu. Also, please be sure to mute all audible notifications, speak clearly and slowly for our interpreters.

This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the CPH; therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience. However, all participants may make comments in the chat.

Please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select "respond to all panelists and attendees." This will allow everyone to view your comment.

To view the real-time transcription, click on the "Closed Caption" button in the Zoom toolbar.

With that I will hand it over to the ICANN Board Chair, Maarten Botterman.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Aaron. Welcome, Donna. Welcome everybody from the Contracted Party House. I still remember when I was listening in to those meetings when I was with PIR, but it was some time ago. In the meanwhile, what we see is the world has progressed a lot, and so have we in multistakeholder model, and I'm really appreciative of these opportunities to have a frank and free

conversation with the parts of the community on matters of our common interest at ICANN as we have a mission to fulfill together.

So looking forward to the discussions. Looking forward to find ways forward, and always seeking ways to improve how we get things done together.

And with that, I'd like to ask Becky to moderate this session.

Becky, are you willing to take over?

BECKY BURR: No, absolutely (indiscernible).

Greetings to everybody. This is the last Board constituency day meeting, and I think it's worth noting that constituency day now takes three days, a week that is actually three weeks, so I guess that's appropriate.

Thank you all for being here. I hope you have had a good ICANN72. Much prefer to be in person in Seattle.

But without further ado, let's move into the conversation. I believe we have one question posed by the Board and one question posed by the Contracted Party House. And I think we'll

start with the CPH question, and so I'll turn it over to Ashley or Sam, or whoever is going to introduce this particular item.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Becky. This is Sam Demetriou. I'm chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group for those who are visiting the session today. I just want to thank you guys for taking the time. Very happy that we're continuing with the tradition of saving the best board meeting for last with the CPH.

And Donna Austin is going to tee up this topic on behalf of the CPH, so I will turn it over to Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam. Donna Austin for the record. And nice to see everybody here.

So I guess prioritization is something that has been front of mind for certainly the Registry Stakeholder Group, and perhaps registrars as well, in light of the conversations that Xavier and Becky have been having in the community on prioritization. And I appreciate Xavier and Becky have had some really difficult conversations with the community, and we have certainly been part of that. And I think some of the challenges that we're trying

to understand is how can we prioritize work that has already been done and whose role and responsibility is that.

So I think, you know, from our perspective, and I would say that the conversations have been difficult, one of the things that has come up within the Registry Stakeholder Group when we've had some discussions about this after, you know, the engagement with Xavier and Becky is that, and this is something that's pretty new, I think. We've talked a lot about volunteer burnout in the past. Within the community, we've recognized that the volunteer community do a lot of work. And more recently, that community has developed a lot of recommendations through the review teams and also through a number of PDPs that have kind of all collided and got to the Board at the same time.

What the conversations kind of revealed, you know, with Xavier and Becky is that we have heard a lot about volunteer burnout in the past, but what we're starting to hear a little bit more about is volunteers are feeling disempowered or discouraged because it's taking so long for the -- you know, the work that they have spent many, many, many hours, sometimes years developing to go to the Board aren't being implemented in a reasonable period of time. And I think the expectation for the community about, you know, the time frame for when, you know, if the PDP is approved by the GNSO Council and it goes to the Board, then according to

the ICANN bylaws, then that should be dealt with by the Board in a reasonable time period. And I think even with the review teams that are bylaws mandated reviews, there is an expectation that the Board will consider those within six months, I think it is. And that's also in the bylaws as well. So I think the community kind of has an expectation of how things will be dealt with, and that's kind of specified in the bylaws and what we've become accustomed to over the years.

So I think that there's a real concern that, you know, and we've had discussions internally that, you know, what's the consequence of not only volunteer burnout but volunteers feeling disempowered or discouraged in entering new work if, after they've spent a significant period of time, their action isn't actually taken in a reasonable period of time by the Board or implemented by Org.

So -- And we also have concerns that -- and I think from our perspective, we acknowledge that -- we want to be part of the solution and we want to be helpful in the discussion to understand, you know, how we can help more in -- I know a lot of work has been done in the past about scoping reviews so that, you know, you don't end up with a review that has a hundred recommendations or you don't have PDPs that have

EN

recommendations that are difficult to implement. So I know we're doing a lot of work on the -- you know, for future efforts.

And I know the GNSO, when I was there, did a lot of work on how we can improve PDP processes. So -- but I think what we're seeing now is because there is this significant backlog of recommendations that seem to be sitting with the Board, and now there seems to be an effort to prioritize those retrospectively, we are concerned about, you know, the credibility and legitimacy of ICANN externally, but also internally. So if we are, as a community, being discouraged because things take too long to get through that, what seems to be, a bottleneck at the moment of the Board, and then additional processes have been added that seem to happen before implementation, you know, then that has kind of a chilling effect on the community in doing their work.

So I think one of the -- one of the questions we'd like to start off with the Board is, you know, with that as context, has the Board given any thought to the concept of accountability for ICANN Org to implement recommendations within a reasonable time frame? We understand the challenges that, you know, many recommendations or recommendations that are difficult to -- may be difficult to implement, but is -- is there an issue here with how we -- the Board's obligation in terms of the bylaws and

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

community expectations that these things will happen much more quickly than they do at -- at the moment?

Thanks, Becky.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Thank you, Donna. And this is certainly a theme that, as Lori Schulman notes in the chat, has been running across the constituencies this week and something that is very important both to the Board and Org.

I'd like to ask Matthew to start on the -- give the sort of first Board response here, but also, Avri, if you are able, we have recently looked at the status on the review recommendations. And I think that information, in terms of the stats there, is relatively useful information to share with the group as well.

So, Matthew, why don't you start, and then, Avri, if you can jump in.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Becky, and thanks, Donna. In many ways, this doesn't come as a surprise. I think the entire community, Board, Org, and the community itself is feeling a number of challenges from the environment that we're now working in and the complexity and

the amount of work that's resulting in -- in these backlogs. So we are hearing from various parts of the community about, you know, what they perceive to be this backlog of work, including at the Board level, but not only, and that things do not seem to be moving as strong -- as fast as they should be, and implementation isn't happening as fast as it should be as well. So we understand the community frustration, particularly given, as you say, the amount of time that's been spent, the amount of effort that's been spent developing the recommendations.

And so what we're trying to think about here is how can we increase the amount of transparency that we provide as to what we're doing, and how we can give more information in terms of where things stand, in terms of actions the Board is taking vis-a-vis these recommendations.

We are very cognizant of the amount of work that's been put into -- in by the community, and we really do want to see us collectively move forward and take measures with, for example, the prioritization framework, that will help alleviate these challenges.

There is a lot of work that's going on at the board level. And maybe Avri or somebody else can touch on this, but, you know, that we have various Board caucus groups that have been looking

at all the review and new gTLD policy recommendations, we've got Board caucus groups that are involved in the SSAD and the ODP for the SSAD. So these things are ongoing. So it's -- while there is this perception, at the same time, we do a significant amount of work. But that doesn't alleviate in any way the necessity for us to provide more transparency about that work. And I think -- and I think -- I'll turn this over to somebody else, but I think that's one of our commitments and one of our realizations, is that we need to provide more of that so that you know, the community knows where we are on these various efforts. So maybe as a first comment.

And maybe kind of back to you, Becky or Avri?

BECKY BURR: I do think it would be worth, Avri, if you could just sort of provide some background on where we are on the backlog of recommendations. I think that would be useful.

AVRI DORIA: Certainly. This is Avri Doria. I didn't do a sound check so hopefully I can be heard.

Yeah, going through some of the figures that, you know, we've selected, and OEC -- that have been collected for us by the org

side, and the OEC is responsible for following through reviews and progress on and implementation.

So the total numbers of recommendations submitted to the Board for consideration, and this was from CCT, RDS, ATRT3, SSR2 and WS2, although I'll say something in a second about WS2, was 241. The total number that the Board approved was 166, which is 69%. The total number that the Board rejected was 18, which is 7%. The total number placed in pending is 44, is 18%. The remaining recommendations, 6% of the total, were passed on, and those are all still being worked on.

In terms of the pending status ones, so a lot of these are already in the implementation queue and that, but pretty much that those are the numbers there.

For the ones that were put into pending, and those are the ones that often concern people the most, the staff is working on identifying the issues, looking for, you know, what needs to be done to initiate a process, and so that the Board can make a final decision. The Org has been engaging with the implementation teams. This is especially SSR2. And, you know, then that will be taken into account.

The last thing I wanted to say on WS2 -- and I hope this is what you were looking for, Becky. The last thing is on the WS2, that was taken out of the queue. And while working on all this prioritization and the need for prioritization and the community having a say in how these things are prioritized, especially because that was what ATRT3, you know, recommended, and it's assumed that, you know, the community supports the ATRT3 recommendations, except where noted in, you know, opinions and comments otherwise; that the WS2 is basically pulled out and is being worked on, is a Board priority and everything for this year and the coming year in terms of trying to get that part completed as soon as possible.

The other item that we obviously pulled out of the queue to work on immediately was the whole ATRT3 recommendation. That we should prioritize working our way through the queue. Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Thanks.

I see Donna and Sam, and I have no idea which order they put their hands up on. So guys, go.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Donna, why don't you go ahead. I think were you first.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam.

Thanks, Avri for the stats. I think one of the frustrations that we have with the statistics is that they're just numbers, so they don't provide substance on, you know, when you say something will be implemented, well, how long will that take? And I guess what resources have been applied to it. If it goes over time to implement, then what's the -- what's the recourse of action?

So I think that's one of the concerns we have with the stats. We certainly appreciate that there's a lot of recommendations, but what we don't understand is, you know, how long will it take to implement those things and, you know, what are some of the challenges that might be in the way of implementing?

And, Matthew, I just wanted to pick up on, you know, something that you said. I think one of the -- you know, just from a practical perspective that we struggled with the prioritization that Xavier is doing is that I -- is it really the community's responsibility to prioritize if it's that have been sitting out there for, you know, maybe two or three years? You know, I don't know how the community can actually retrospectively prioritize those efforts. I think it's really a resource management issue and something that is the responsibility of Board and Org.

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

And I think that kind of comes back to our accountability question, is, you know, who's responsibility is that and who is being held accountable to try to do these things in a reasonable time frame?

Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Just before I turn to Sam and then Göran, I just want to say that, in fact, one of the things that was done was that org reorganized to create a planning department to tackle this issue specifically. I think with respect to these 241 recommendations, it's a number that doesn't have a lot of precedent in terms of the volume of recommendations that we got from reviews in the past. And so I think particularly starting with CCT, we realized that there was an issue and that we were never going to be able to get through all of these recommendations, particularly when they're overlapping and sometimes conflicting.

So just in terms of accountability, org did take steps to create a planning department to bring this to the front of the -- to sort of top of mind and top of priority. And the Board has been focused very much on monitoring those activities here. I'm not saying everybody should be satisfied with the progress. I just want to point out that this is something that both the Board and org are

aware of and have taken steps to address. Unfortunately, it is taking longer than any of us would like to address them.

Sam and then Göran.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Becky.

And this is Sam Demetriou for the transcript.

I appreciate that insight, Becky, about the way org has made changes and made strides to try to tackle these outstanding review team recommendations.

I think the review team recommendations is something we have had a lot of conversations about in the past amongst this group and also more one-off conversations. And I think it's also a systemic issue not just between the Board and the org but the community that conducts the reviews, right?

So I think we're starting to see, albeit a little bit slowly, turning in a better direction on the topic of reviews, right? I think that each new review team needs to understand that their scope should maybe be a bit narrower. They should be a bit more focused. I think the Board's actions on the SSR2 recommendations and kind

of noting some places where those recommendations can't be accepted or can't approved because they bleed into policy development, I think all of those are positive steps. And I think we're seeing even more positive steps with some of the recommendations that the ATRT3 made with how reviews should be conducted in the future.

I did want to also, though, ask about -- and I appreciate those statistics that Avri shared. I think it's very illuminating to see things in terms of raw numbers and data in a lot of ways.

But I did want to also take this opportunity to ask about the PDP recommendations, right, because I think that's another key area that we especially as contracted parties are interested in. And I know that there are a handful of PDP recommendations that are still also out there. I think the one that we have seen cited a number of times is the rights protection mechanisms, the RPM review, Phase 1 recommendations that have been approved by the council earlier this year and have not been taken up yet by the Board.

So if anyone from the Board could comment on that aspect of the outstanding work as well, I think that would be really appreciated.

Thank you, guys.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Sam.

Göran?

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. I really want to make this into a positive discussion and not a blame game, who is responsible for what, because I really think -- and I talked about this before -- that we're in this.

I mean, I've been talking to you, and the Board has been talking to you, for one and a half years about we're going to reach this point. There is a catch-up effect when it comes to recommendations and PDPs. We have talked about this.

And as Becky said, I reorganized to prepare as much as I can. The Board reorganized itself and talked about it.

But this is hard. I mean, this is a bottom-up, multistakeholder model with a lot of different agendas and viewpoints.

Just to give you a little bit of insight, right now in the GAC, they are discussing that the Board should -- in advice prioritize

implementation of SSR2 in the GAC advice, which is definitely then not in conflict in addition to the discussion we're having right here. Different parts of the community have different viewpoints.

And I believe that we need to be better in many things.

You mentioned recommendations. Yes, we have an enormous amount of recommendations. And it takes just for the Board to be able to make the deliberation about any individual recommendations, it's not like someone sits in a corner and comes up with the deliberation. The org prepares those recommendations to the Board. The Board then has to talk about every individual recommendation by itself before it can proceed. The amount of time that takes just to get to that point is immense.

And I agree with you. We also see recommendations that has potential to break our bylaws, if accepted. They are conflicting with policy. But we still have to honor and deal with them individually.

And coming to the PDPs, I think that -- and I think that this is something we -- and I said this before. We have seen some policy recommendations where we had a lot of discussions also, for instance, with the GNSO Council. Actually have to handle them

because they are new, they are innovative, but they sometimes lack the sort of process how to do it. If you look at Phase 1 recommendations Rec 7 and Rec 12, it takes some time also. And because we want to be transparent, we engage in conversations with the GNSO Council and the implementation team because we don't think it's in accordance with the bylaws for the Board to make those decisions.

Coming back to my final point, one thing I learned is that we need to figure out earlier work. Look at the SSAD. I think the SSAD shows the importance of having an ODP. I know there are people -- it's just that is an added layer on everything else we do.

Just the SSAD ODP, which I think has an additional Webinar with the community about some of the complexities -- I'm lost when it comes to ICANN meetings right now. But right now, after a couple, it shows how complex it is to implement the community policies. And that is better that we do that, have that conversation before it comes to the Board.

You know in the next round of SubPro. You've seen the scoping. You've seen all the questions that has been taken into account. And I think you criticized us, and I think rightfully, because the Board has taken action and told the org that we cannot do the next round the same way we did it before. It has to be more

transparent. The Board wants to know more about the effects of that before we actually do make the decision. And we want to make sure that the GNSO Council in its role for making policies are involved if there are questions.

I always claim that the PDP did a fantastic job, but a lot of that is operational. I think you also know that there are dependencies that still is out there we have to look into. Name collision is just one of them.

And we need to work with the community. And I think that a good outcome of this -- it's hard to say anything else. You know, last thing I want to mention, the budget. For so many years, one of the most stringent things from this group is why are there so many people. And you have been putting -- and I think that was rightful as well. You said why are there so many people. Look at the money. Look at the money.

We are expanding ICANN org with all the things we're doing. To find people is another thing.

I'm really proud of the work my staff does, and I'm really proud of the work the Board does. But I also say -- and there are always things we can improve.

EN

Matthew talked about, yes, we would look over how to be more transparent and give more information. Also remembering that being more transparent and producing more reports will take time because it will take more time to produce more.

But I think -- I hear the comments, and I think we can definitely improve. But I also think we have a greater discussion with the reviews, the scoping of the reviews, the implementation of the reviews also from the community side.

Work Stream 2 is an excellent example because many of those outstanding issues are actually belonging to the community.

So if we -- I'm -- I think this is such a positive discussion. I think that we should have this as a positive discussion. But I think we should also have a discussion about the input as well as the output and the way the transparency of ICANN after the decision with the new bylaws and the role of the Board has changed again.

And if you think the Board should take more decisions, then we probably have to look into the bylaws as well. But I'm really afraid we end up "I want to have this, therefore, you should prioritize this" without the community interaction. I think we need that dialogue.

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

Right now, we have -- we have done -- we supported more than 4,000 calls. We have prepared the Board for hundreds of recommendations, while we are implementing them. At the same time, we are increasing the amount of people inside the ICANN org to be able to do this output.

I think we're in this together. So it's -- I just don't want to have a blame game. We work on this together.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Göran. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, no, thank you. Thank you for raising this. I mean, if this is the concern in the community, this is what you need to voice, and this is the platform to voice it. So appreciate that.

But, indeed, just to strengthen what has been said before -- and Sam also referred to that -- it's about how we do things better together because it's clear that we need to prioritize. We are where we are. Things need to happen.

And just to say, well, this is the oldest, first in, first out doesn't work. It wouldn't serve us best. We strongly feel this is why we engage in prioritization.

And we also recognized that where we found ways to agree on recommendations, on PDP recommendations, taking them off the list is a different thing. And that may be something we need to be better at as well.

So really important that we engage in this way and as was explained within org, it's been reorganized to set up to serve this role and to be able to facilitate this role. And within the Board, we are following up on all these topics as well in dinner focuses, not only the community but also the work. And also the Board has had more Zoom hours than we would normally have had face-to-face hours over the last two years.

But importantly, we don't want to move towards a top-down model unless the community says that's the way forward. And we don't believe that should be because it's a multistakeholder bottom-up model that serves us so well.

And also, indeed, as was suggested, we have what we have. Going forward, we need to make sure that we do better in adding to the pile as well. And ATRT does give some advance to that.

Specifically on the RPM, this is currently in preparation in our SubPro caucus.

Maybe, Avri, you could say something specific about that because Sam asked for it.

AVRI DORIA: Sure. Thank you.

Yeah, the SubPro process, even though -- caucus, even though I'm well aware that it has wider scope than just the new gTLDs, it's very closely tied in with them. So it is in the SubPro caucus. It's now our task to start preparing a recommendation and a motion to the Board so that it can make a decision on acceptance or not.

I admit it got caught in the queue behind getting the ODP started and such. And so if there is fault to be apportioned, it's probably partly mine. And I'm happy to take that.

But now it's basically we've had it enough presentations, and we're going to be moving forward on getting that to the Board as soon as we can and then it will go on from there. So that's pretty much where it's at, at the moment.

BECKY BURR: Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes, hello, everybody. Ashley Heineman here, chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

I just wanted to maybe take a couple steps back and maybe clear a little bit of the air here. We've never used words like "fault" or "blame." And this has been a conversation that we raised a number of times over the last year or so. And I just want to make it painfully clear, we want this to be a constructive dialogue. We want this to be a conversation that involves all of us.

And I think -- let's maybe put aside the question of whose fault it is and let's move forward. Let's figure out a way.

I think what's of most concern right now is the backlog. I think what we're happy to see is that there is a plan to move forward so we cannot have the situation moving forward and that is in the form of the prioritization framework. That is a great initiative.

But I don't think that's going to help us in the near term. I think we all understand that.

So is there a way that we can talk through how to see things through that are already there before us?

What can we do to help? Are there things that we can do to get things moving forward? Because, quite frankly, I am worried. I'm very worried. I'm known to be a Nervous Nellie so no shocker here, I suppose.

I am concerned about how people are looking at this model.

I am concerned by NIS2. I am concerned by other governments' efforts to try and deal what they perceive as a problem not getting fixed elsewhere, and sometimes it's problems not getting addressed as they see quickly enough here.

I understand the complexities involved.   We all know the complexities involved and that these aren't easy issues.   But we've got to figure out a way forward. And I think that's where we want to be, how can we have that conversation, recognizing we all have a role to play here.

And I think we're all kind of asking the same questions, how do we do it. So let's just sit down and figure out a way to do it.

I'm also concerned about other things that are happening outside of ICANN, (indiscernible), what we do, and how we do it. Getting to another round is going to be hard, but I would hate to see all of

our efforts to be upended by alternative efforts that are happening out there that could really change and realign things.

So thank you all, again, so much for taking the time to talk with us. This is really helpful. It sounds like we recognize there are issues. How can we get through them? Prioritization is one way. But how about where we're at right now? So I just want to pose that to the group, if anybody has some good ideas. Can we work more closely with you? How can we cancel out some of these IRTs and move on? I will stop there because I'm just starting to repeat myself now. So thanks for listening.

BECKY BURR: Göran, your hand is up. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

GÖRAN MARBY: It was an old hand. But let me say to Ashley, my intention was not to say that you are bringing on a negative connotation to the discussion. I was just saying that -- what I said was should be seen in light of not creating a negative discussion because I know sometimes it's hard. We sometimes polarize ourselves by listening to certain things in a certain way.

So, Ashley, if my comment was made saying that you were negative, you are never negative, Ashley.

I like your new hairstyle, by the way.

BECKY BURR: Thanks.

So, Ashley, I think you bring up a good point in terms of clearing off some things that are sort of on endless hold in terms of some of the IRT things now.

We have made some recent decisions that we think are going to help move forward with EPDP Phase 1 in terms of Recommendation 12 and Recommendation 7 which is going to clear the way forward on that.

One question -- and this is meant to be provocative -- is: What do we think the role of the Board is in terms of pushing the community.

We have an ODP under way on the SSAD. I think that we are hearing from -- that was a recommendation that came to us with the full support of the GNSO Council. And I think the Board assumes that that means -- and the bylaws say that unless we have a really, really good public policy reason to say this can't go forward, it should go forward and that's the way it should move.

But at the same time, we have a lot of parts of the community saying either it's going to be too expensive to use or it's not going to deliver what's wanted.

And so one question, one important question, I think, that led us to feel like an ODP was necessary was to really understand what's involved here and why it can't work and what it's going to cost and give the Board the tools that it needs to make this decision.

But I guess the question is, you know, are there places where we should be taking a pause and say, okay, did we get -- like, did we get this right? Is this where we -- do we want to be moving down this path right now? Do we need to take a break? That is meant to be a provocative statement. But I do think that it is part of this complicated prioritization conversation that we're having, which is -- and it goes a little bit to Donna's point about who should be making these calls.

We don't think it's the Board that is empowered to make the calls. But the question is: Does the Board have more of a responsibility to be irritating when we need to provoke a conversation in the community?

Donna and then Sam.

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky, and I think that's a -- it's a really good question. And I think, you know, this is -- this is very much a personal perspective.

ICANN's processes aren't complementary. They actually create friction, which -- so there's no -- there's no real way to find a clean path forward with some of the questions that you're asking.

We, as a community, are very -- we have a very adversarial relationship with the Board. We have adversarial relationships, you know, with different parts of the community.

So while we talk about multistakeholder, bottom-up, consensus model-based model, I think it worked for a time and it worked pretty well for a time, but -- and we had many of these conversations in the GNSO when we talked about 3.0, there's now a lot of friction in the community. There are people turning up that are paid to turn up at ICANN, and we've lost sight of that model.

So I think, you know, my thought is it's going to take a lot of courage from the community and the Board to rethink what it is we do and what's really important. You know, the idea that the community is losing faith in the model is a real concern, right?

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

Because there's credibility and legitimacy. How can we promote the model externally to ICANN if we don't believe in it internally?

So I kind of think there's a courageous conversation that we need to have as a community, and perhaps the Board can facilitate that conversation, about do we -- do we really believe in this model and can we live up to this model, or are we just going to continue to pay lip service to it and use it, you know, when it suits us?

So for me, it's a -- it's a courageous discussion that has to happen within the community. And I think the Brian Cute effort was an attempt at that, but it kind of broke down because we settled into our corners and weren't prepared to compromise. But I really think it's a really courageous -- courageous conversation that the community has to have, and I'd like to see the Board lead it.

Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Donna. Sam, and I gather we have Kurt in the queue.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Becky. Let me just start out by saying that I believe in this model, right? And I think the reason that all of us are here today

and the reason we all keep showing up is because we do believe in this model.

You know, I think Donna makes a good point that the ongoing viability of the model requires constant attention, right? I think that is absolutely true. I think these are difficult conversations that we need to keep having.

I don't know that I necessarily agree that friction or disagreement is bad for the model, right? I think it's those diverse viewpoints that give legitimacy to this form of governance, right? I think if you didn't have -- if everyone just agreed on everything, like what would be the point, right?

And I am sort of forgetting why I raised my hand in the first place. It was something that Becky had prompted. Oh, and I just remembered what it was. So apologies for that little brain cloud there.

Becky, you asked about the Board's role in how we can maybe have conversations about whether things are going off the rails or maybe not going in the best direction a little bit earlier. And I think that's a really good question to be asking ourselves, and it's very much in the vein of, like, how does the multistakeholder model continue to function well, right?

EN

I think what we're seeing is that maybe everything being so sequenced -- you know, one group works on one thing, it goes to the next group, it goes to the third group -- is maybe not the best way of approaching work when the topics and the subject matter are so complex and have implications for the organization or for the community that we maybe aren't all capable of seeing all the time.

And, you know, Göran brought this question or this topic up earlier today as well, which is does earlier engagement make sense? And not to be overly simplistic, I certainly don't think this is the only answer or this will solve everything, but we have a structure in place where the Board now appoints liaisons to PDPs and to I think review teams. And I almost wonder if that's a mechanism that we can look to and try to build out a little bit more or, you know, increase that responsibility a bit so that understanding that the Board isn't there to influence the outcome of policy, is there more room for board members to raise concerns or, you know, at least flag when things -- when policy discussions may be going in a direction that could be very difficult to implement?

I'm not saying, you know, direct the outcome in any way, but it's worth knowing. For the volunteers who participate in PDPs, it's worth knowing if the thing that you've been working on isn't

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

going to get off the ground, right? I think that is helpful to the conversation.

So I would maybe suggestion that this is a place where we could explore in trying to address this issue.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Sam. And I think that's a really good point. The Board has been looking at and working on sort of what the appropriate role of the Board liaisons is in light of the fact that the role is not to, you know, influence outcome of it but to be helpful. And Sarah has been leading the charge on that. I think it's worth maybe taking a look at that and see if we've gotten it right.

I think sometimes, though, it's not just a question of going off the rails. I would say in the con- -- in connection with the conversation about the SSAD, maybe we didn't stop long enough once the transition was made from UAM to SSAD to make sure everyone in the community understood that, you know, once there was a determination that the decision about release would need to remain with the contracted party, what were the consequences of that decision, which was an analysis of what was possible under the law, and was the SSAD going to be delivered with the rest of the (indiscernible) was looking for.

I just think totally in retrospect that maybe we should have had a clear conversation at that point to make sure everybody in the community understood what the decision, what the implications of that decision were, and maybe it would have saved some disappointment and confusion down the road. But that's just my own personal view.

Maarten, go ahead, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, no, I think that's a good point. And thank you for referring and noting the liaison report. Basically, we can only send liaisons when invited to do so as well, but we do propose that. And the report really is for us, also, a way to make it transparent. This is what we believe the role could be and how we want to exchange, both for board members, new board members, but also for the community, what to expect.

So we have invited input, and input continues to be welcome and say if you think that should change or improve or here's opportunities to make it even sharper or more useful.

At the same time, what I also very much appreciate, I think, as a clear improvement is that we don't only see a community go to Board, a Board going back to another part of the community, and

that the Board is the point everybody's talking to. I now also see more and more engagement between communities at an earlier stage. And here you save some steps by getting a sense for what the input from an SO or another SO or an AC may be in the process.

So I think to build out this liaison network in a sensible way across the community may be a way of helping to sharpen the discussion and ensure that once it comes to the Board, we don't need to push it back or give it back or pass it on to other parts of the community. So that may be a good way forward.

I think ATRT gave us some good guidance, some good tips that we may benefit from going forward, and I look forward to further implementing that.

And with regards to the multistakeholder model evolution that we engage with, and this is a very personal opinion, but I feel that when we would have continued to meet face to face, that would have progressed faster because it was really about feeling and learning from each other about how things work best, and that framework we keep on handling. But, indeed, that we say is deprioritized because people already spent so many hours behind a Zoom room to do business, why would you want to spend more time in improving business or helping others to

improve their business. Yes, there's reasons for it but it takes a lot of commitment already. So that's another part. I hope that helps.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Maarten.

Kurt, I hope you are able to speak.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah, thanks very much, Becky. I'm sorry you can't see me, but probably not you.

I wanted to answer your question with some specificity. I think, you know, Sam and Donna answered it at a higher level, which is probably a better approach. But as to where the Board should insert itself more, and particularly with regard to SSAD, from a Council perspective, we said, you know, we approve SSAD but the team or the Council does not have the wherewithal. We realize there's high cost involved, and the Council or the team does not have the wherewithal to do this cost/benefit analysis so we can recommend it for sure. And so what the Council told the Board was can you please do this cost/benefit analysis before approving it? And that was the midwife of SSAD -- of the ODP, I think. And each iteration of the ODP that came out, members of the Council continually said, you know, it's about a cost/benefit analysis.

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

So for SSAD, we're -- I think the Council and I think the community is looking for the Board to say, you know, approve it because we've done this analysis, or we don't think it's good. So we're actually looking for some operational role there that you might assign to staff or somewhere else. On -- on SubPro we said here it is, go. So we weren't -- we weren't looking for the Board to, you know, come back to the community for anything. We're looking for the Board to go ahead and consider it and approve the recommendations and according to the bylaws. Where else could the Board insert itself? You know, why is the -- why are the RDS negotiations taking so long? You know, WHOIS should have been sunset maybe a year ago. Why is this taking so long? Why is -- why is the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations essentially still in negotiation even two years after we thought they would be done? Why is that still going on?

So those sorts implementation discussions that seem to go on and on and on and give rise to so much frustration, that would be a place for the Board to say why is this taking so long.

Thanks. Thanks for letting me talk, everyone.

BECKY BURR: Thank you.

Is there anybody else in the queue? I see Göran, but is there anybody else who I'm not seeing? I just want to make sure.

Okay, Göran, go.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you, Kurt, and thank you, everybody. I was just thinking that Becky was a little bit provocative earlier, so maybe I should be as well.

So we talked a lot about the recommendations as well, and we hear that from many parts of the community. And one of the things that we have, I think actually what this group once talked about was that when a recommendation -- when a review team is set up, when it's this kind of reviews that should be a scoping document acknowledged by the SOs and ACs but also the end result, because one of the problems that all of you have mentioned is that you disagree many times with the review recommendations. And then you also believe it's out of scope.

And actually to have the SOs and ACs as a part of that exercise to ratify would actually help the Board shorten the process. Because it also becomes a little bit hard for the Board sometimes, for instance, with the question about SSR2 which we know is very much debated within the community. Has debated right now, I

think, in the GAC. So to simplify some of the processes I think is a really good thing.   I actually think the process is not (indiscernible) to what we do. I actually think a well defined process that we agree upon could actually make it much faster.

But coming back to the -- if you remember the Hubba-Bubba Project we did a couple of years ago that we went through all the process that leads up to a PDP, we have a lot of complexities in the way we set it up and I'm the first one to agree that there are some things that we probably should look over together. But we have to do it together.

So I think that everybody has proposals for it. And I agree, it was -- the project that the Board started together with Brian Cute is a very important one. Yes, we sort of downgraded it. We also had actually a fair amount of criticism for that project at that time, also from this group, that it was something that we didn't have time to do. And I agree. I mean, we all agreed that and said that we don't prioritize it, because of input from -- also from, you know, people are very strong parts of this.

We are trying to establish, I think together, that we have to do prioritization together. We have so much on our plates, the community, the Board and the Org. Prioritization makes it.

What I don't want to do is to make sure that the Board or the Org sits in a position that we make decisions not according to the bottom-up process. But that was a concrete proposal when it comes to recommendations, maybe have the SOs and ACs agree upon them before they actually go to the Board.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Other comments? I don't see any other hands.

I think this is a very important topic and something that we're going to be talking about, but hopefully acting on quickly as we go through this.

I just wanted to add that to someone's point earlier, I think maybe Maxim and James suggested that, you know, maybe we should take a pause and not take on new stuff until we work through what's already on our plate. And I think that is a fair -- that is fairly within the scope of what is involved in prioritization. So I just wanted to take a moment to acknowledge that that's got to be part of the conversation as well.

Have we exhausted that topic, Sam and Ashley?

Donna, I...

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, Becky. Just quickly, and you can answer this later, but I just wonder whether that suggestion would help the Board in its current workload.

BECKY BURR: Well, I think it's definitely -- it's definitely on the table, but it's part of the conversation, I think, with Xavier and Becky and that team.

                       Avri.

AVRI DORIA: You mean the suggestion on having approval on review recommendations? If you do -- oh, this is Avri speaking. If you do, then yes, because basically we get to a point now where we have the review recommendations.   There is an expectation of approval.   And yet we have to deal with the fact that does stakeholder group X actually really agree with them?   What problems do we see in them? What do we have to deal with? And that starts a chain of discussions, checks, possibly, you know, comments, clarifications on comments, et cetera. Whereas, for example, with WS2, it is easier to say, yes, everybody bought into those, in general. There may be details to be discussed. There

may be, you know, specific factors that need to be discussed further. But by and large, we know that all of the SOs and ACs bought into them, so we must move.

With the others, it's we've got these, but does everybody accept them? We know that all the reviewers were put in with the blessings of their, you know, stakeholder groups and, therefore, are empowered by them. But is the product they came out with at the end a product that the stakeholder groups accept? And if not, then we really have to spend time doing that determination based on the evidence we've got in tea leaves. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Okay. I think Donna's question was related to, you know, does the stop all -- would the Board consider the stop all new work to address the work that is in queue? And Jeff points out that implementation of existing policies in progress does not count as new work.

I think -- you know, I think that's true, although we're just dealing with so many moving targets here. I think that it's not as if -- as we have seen with many of the things that came up in connection with EPDP that implicated a lot of policies that were sort of in flight. And there's some complexity there.

So should we move to the Board's question or no? Brian is -- well...

When is the Board going to restart PPSAI? I believe that that work was on hold for a while, while it was being -- while several issues were being resolved with respect to the SSAD and I think that there is work that is ongoing to restart that. But, of course, that is also tied up with ODP as well.

All right. Moving on to this -- the Board's discussion topic on how you think we could efficiently identify and work more closely with governments globally as well as sort of informing, helping, build capacity and interaction when it comes to geopolitical issues relating to ICANN's mission.

Maarten, do you want to (indiscernible) for us for a bit and then we'll move on to the discussion?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think it's clear that this fourth area on the strategic plan, this geopolitical situation, those affect our ability to fulfill our mission as well. It's really a matter of globalizing all wisdom and access that we have as an ecosystem to get best out of this.

Göran is leading a tremendous exercise, as you've seen from his report. As well, you have seen what's happening in terms of outreach. The fact that we have the GAC with more than 170 governments signed up to be interested and to contribute to ICANN is an important asset, I would say, for us.

Yet, pressure will only go up, so we need to organize ourselves even better here, get the best out of it. And obviously this is also directly in the interest of legitimacy and ICANN being successful in fulfilling its mission.

Yeah. The question is what else you think we could do or how could you help. I hope that puts a bit of context around it.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes, thank you. And if it's time for us to jump in, this is Ashley, chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

I have been tasked to take the lead on this one. So I think, first of all -- I think you guys are doing a really good job. And I'd like to point to Elena Plexida. She does an amazing job in engaging with the Europeans and knowing where things are with respect to draft legislation coming out. And I know that you all have done quite a bit in terms of educational Webinars and that sort of thing. So kudos there. I mean, information from Elena is invaluable.

I think continuing that, it could be replicated, I think, in other regions outside of Europe. I mean, lots of stuff going on everywhere.

I think it's also important to empower the GAC, build off of the GAC, having a group of folks in the ICANN process is really, really helpful for us because -- for better or worse, there aren't ministries out there dedicated specifically to the domain name system. This isn't always something people want to jump into when you're a government.

So I think building them up, keeping them up to speed, along with the rest of us need to be kept up to speed as well, I think is really in everybody's interest. Continuing with your ministerial dialogues so their bosses know that these are important critical issues, the opportunities to educate them.

But I think keeping with your existing mission, continuing with education is incredibly important. And I think we have a number of questions for you all so we can better understand what you're trying to achieve. And perhaps we can build off of those responses with some more helpful feedback.

So questions being -- and take them just for what they are and not necessarily understanding.

You know, why is this a priority now? I could guess. A lot of legislation flying around. But if there's other factors that are encouraging you all to make this a priority.

Also, where does ICANN see challenges and gaps in your ability to effectively engage? Do you see problems in how you're currently doing your work?

And what do you see as a desired outcome of your engagement with governments? And maybe us better understanding your responses to these questions, we can be more helpful in our response back to you. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Ashley. Your hand is still up. Okay.

I'll dive in, and I'm just going to dive in while everybody on the Board thinks about how to respond to those questions, which I think are very good questions. And I know Göran has much to offer on this.

But I think one of the things that we have to think about is, you know, we have just recently seen what appears to be legislative responses to, you know, unhappiness about the way a policy development process, and specifically the EPDP Phase 2(a) stuff,

was going.   And so I think that's an important thing to pay attention to.

When the inclination becomes turn to national or regional legislation if the policy development process isn't going your way, how do we interact better with governments to make sure that that's not a -- that that's not going to impact our ability to make policy in the appropriate setting. So I will just say that's one thing that is driving my concern about this.

But let me turn to Göran and then Matthew.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. As you've seen on page 65 and onwards in the CEO report, which I've been marketing it all week -- and I hope you all have read it now -- is we do a lot of work when it comes to legislatures and governments around the world.

And, yes, we are blessed actually to have a vibrant GAC active within us as a part of the community. They are often not from the legislative arm of any government. And we know that they report back, but we also need to have a conversation with the actual legislators.

You all heard me before, so I'm trying to figure out something new to say.

Every interaction we do with governments are in the -- accordance with the charter we presented now, I think, three years ago. And someone can help me and post that in the chat. I would be grateful. So we are only talking from a technical perspective.

To answer your last question, what is the purpose, my purpose is, as always, and our purpose, to preserve the multistakeholder model and the ability for ICANN community to make decisions. And we see legislative proposals that either have an impact on that -- GDPR is a good example -- or actually have a direct impact on people's ability to connect to one open Internet. We see them as well.

I think we're doing -- thank you very much for your compliments to Elena and the rest of the team. You've seen we're not only focusing on the E.U. We have -- we are engaging in our knowledge about many of those legislations around the world. You see, for instance, in the country papers that we present and send out to the Board where we actually go through legislation. I think there is a new one coming out about China. We have done it. There was one in Netherlands. We have done it. Several with Russia. And

several countries we actually write down what's happening in them.

What I think that we need to accept is that governments around the world -- I'm not saying that this is wrong, the Internet has proven to a very important part of any society around the world. That's your fault. Which means that elected officials around the world is, of course, not only looking at the benefits, but they're also looking at the negative.

And I'm not going to say that they are completely wrong in looking in some of those things. But one thing that's apparent for most of us is that they don't know how the Internet actually works, the difference between the underlying technology that we represent or the platforms, which is one of those things that we often talk to them about.

What I do really think is that we need to put this as we have to accept this is happening and also put front and center a better discussion within the ICANN community about those things. That's why we have proposed that for every ICANN meeting there should be at least a 90-minute session where we can talk about geographical issues, what we hear happening in the U.N., what's happening in the other IGOs around the world, the discussion that's happening.

EN

You know as well as I do that right now there is a -- there are countries who have a platform about taking over not only ICANN but also making the government decisions about the RIRs, the IETF, the country code operators. And I hope I'm not forgetting an acronym in this.

I think that everybody that's active in ICANN are actually interested in that conversation. So this is a way -- and I do -- which I said before, I do -- we are five years in the transition.

During COVID, you see as well as I do a polarized discussion about this around the world. I think that we need to have that discussion within ICANN. That's why we're raising it. We see an increased threat to the multistakeholder model and the role of ICANN and the other ones in the ecosystem. But I also think that we should be better of communicating and talk okay to each other.

Together with our volunteers around the world, in many different countries, we are a very strong voice. And to get that better, coordinated, working together, also respecting the different parts of the ICANN community will never agree on certain things like privacy, roles of law enforcement, and other ones but still have conversations so we can share what we know is happening.

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

As you've seen my goals as well, you will see the Board has given me assignments when it comes to actually increasing the work of a better coordination when it comes to legal initiatives around the world, also working with governments. We also want to be more transparent in what we do, more than page 65 and onwards in the ICANN CEO report. Thank you.

I hope that answers your questions, Ashley.

BECKY BURR: Thank you, Göran. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Ashley. It's a great question. And Göran's team is doing a fantastic job in reaching out to governments and informing them about ICANN.

I think one of the big challenges that we recognize now is that cyber sovereignty, digital sovereignty, whatever kind of name you want to put on it, has increasing scope and increasing ability to impact ICANN and the interoperable Internet. So it's the worry that whether it's by design or by default that measures that are taken on encryption, the measures that have taken on cybersecurity could have the kind of unintended consequences even among governments that are sensitive in understanding of

ICANN. And so we have to take -- we have to be very careful about that evolving environment.

So informing working with governments, increasing intelligence about what's coming down the pike and things like that. It's all part of this, I'd say, reinforcing the need to focus on these things, particularly in the run-up, as Göran said, in some of the meetings that are coming up in the next two to five years. Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Matthew.

Others? Sam, go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU: I just popped my hand up because I think Beth is in the queue, but you can't see her hand. Sorry, Beth.

BETH BACON: Sam, do you want to go or were you a proxy hand?

SAM DEMETRIOU: I was a proxy hand.

BETH BACON: Thank you very much. This is Beth Bacon. I appreciate the question and also Becky's and Göran's different takes.

But I wanted to note that I sort of hear two different problems or issues being articulated in the question and then also in Göran's reaction.

It sounds like from Göran, your perspective, maybe you want more community -- communication with or amongst the community to understand and communicate issues and coordinate. And I think certainly that's something that's worth talking about. But it seems like a different or separate task from how ICANN can more effectively engage with governments, which I think is also important.

And, again, we'll just call this the Elena love-fest show. She has been incredibly helpful. I think she does a fantastic job. She really communicates ICANN's issues and scope and does a really great job educating governments and helping us quite a bit as well.

But I do think it's valuable to say that we do have a resource, understanding that the GAC -- it has its role and its scope, and it may not be the exact legislators or the people we want to talk to. But as a person who formerly worked in the GAC, it's a great

resource to go back and say, hey, We'd really like to talk about these things. Who amongst your colleagues can we speak to? Who can we prepare information for?

I think that ICANN and the GAC could have more robust educational and resource tool discussion, provide information, provide things that the GAC can then send back to their colleagues who are maybe the appropriate folks that really support the multistakeholder model and show that we're working, show the things that we're getting done, and not just sort of saying, hey, the GAC is not maybe the right people.

I think the GAC and ICANN Board, of course, have very formal discussions with regards to advice and communiques and all that fun stuff. But I do think there's value in having a more casual discussion with them and saying how can we help you help everyone else. So thanks very much. Appreciate the discussion and all your efforts on this.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Beth.

GÖRAN MARBY: May I? We work very much with individual GAC members. And we are often grateful for their help. When we engage the

governments, we often include the GAC members as well in those discussions, sometimes to the surprise of the governments. But we make sure that we do that.

And we do briefings to the GAC, both collectively and individually.

With that said, Beth, I agree with you, there are a lot of things -- we actually talked to the GAC yesterday about this. And they ended up asking us for more briefings, especially about the particular things.

I also asked -- I don't remember who said that during an ICANN meeting. I think it was something from the contracted party house. Maybe it was you, Beth who asked why doesn't -- no, maybe it was Reg -- that said why don't you ask the GAC members to come to the GAC and present legislations that might have an effect on ICANN's ability to make policies for the interoperability. So we asked that.

You also know that every country is sovereign in themselves, which means that they are elected members of a government by their people which means that they have a responsibility back to their own home countries. And that's where the decisions are made when it comes to parliamentary and things and the interaction with other governments about local laws, specifics

itself. I can understand that not all governments would like to go and do that.

With that said, I would like to compliment the European Commission that actually went to the ICANN community to give presentations about the NIS2. They just didn't do it in the GAC.

So I think there's a lot of room for improvement. I agree with that. And that's why we are bringing it to sort of everybody's attention that we believe there are improvements that has to be made. And we are looking for inputs like this to learn and enhance.

Thank you, Beth. I think most of the time I actually agree with you, also about Elena. But I also want to point out we are blessed with a real good team. Depending on where you are in the value chain or what you do, needs more or less, we have an excellent team.

And we are expanding Elena's team. We also work in the U.S. on the Hill, of course, with our friends at NTIA. We work with Brussels. We work in many different places. And not leaving out the work we do with the U.N. which we also presented papers about, which is now becoming one of those places where the role of ICANN is discussed.

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky. Donna Austin.

                        Göran, just to pick up on your suggestion of briefing to the
                        community.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, Becky. Donna Austin.

                        So, Göran, just to pick up on your discussion of, you know, a
                        briefing to the community three times a year, I think it's a great
                        idea. And I think it would be welcome by the community and well
                        attended. So I think any sharing of information, particularly at
                        times where we struggle now to have interaction face to face, I
                        think is a terrific idea.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. Are you still on the planning committee from the -- for
                        the community for meetings?

EN

DONNA AUSTIN: (Shakes head.)

GÖRAN MARBY: Oh, because that's the decision-makers about this.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think it is -- it's certainly something that our representatives on the planning committee could take forward to the planning committee and suggest that perhaps a plenary session at each meeting from ICANN Org to focus on certain things would be a good thing to consider. And I think at one point there was an agreement within the planning committee that the opportunity be given to ICANN Org to host a plenary session.

GÖRAN MARBY: I'm not debating. I'm just, you know, looking for -- I think that a lot of people agreed on this is a good idea, and, therefore, I'm -- but we are not the decision-maker about it. It's actually the planning committee that makes the final decision about it.

BECKY BURR: Other thoughts on this?

I'm not seeing any hands, so if there are hands I'm missing, please let me know.

Okay. I think we've exhausted that topic.
 Should we go back to prioritization? No. Just a joke. We could (laughing). We could.

Any other thoughts on any other subject that anybody would like to bring up?

There is a very lively conversation in the chat going on here that I think is -- is well worth pursuing in another venue.

Okay. Having said that, I guess we've got eight minutes to give back to everybody. Thank you all very much for the conversation.

Wait. I'm sorry. Somebody is saying, "No, wait."

Okay. Anyway, when are we going back to face to face? And that's what Ashley wants to ask about. And Chris wants to go to the bar. I'm good for all of those things. Yes, go ahead, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Becky. This is Sam again. I just figured since we have a few minutes I will make a plug for actually, obviously, ask when

we go back face to face. I know we don't have an answer to that yet, but I will just make a plug that in the future, if we have these sessions between the CPH and the ICANN Board, if there's any way we can leave the Zoom Webinar format and use the regular Zoom room, I think that our members would greatly appreciate it.

So I just request. I appreciate there are other concerns at play, but I think that would go a long way to making these a little bit more interactive. I think we have done a pretty good job in keeping the discussion lively in the remote setting, but just my regular plug for the format change. So thank you guys for considering.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Yes, we heard that. And I always think that we've made a change, but somehow we're not there.

Okay.

Thanks, everybody, for a very good, very lively discussion.

GÖRAN MARBY: Becky? Becky?

BECKY BURR: Yes.

GÖRAN MARBY: I haven't spoken enough. So there's one thing. I would like to thank the registrars and registries for reaching an agreement with us when it comes to the addition of the information into the DAAR system. Sometimes I hear people complain that ICANN doesn't do anything, or the contracted parties doesn't do anything to fight abuse. And sometimes I hear ICANN Org never comes up with suggestions that we can improve how we do things. And I -- of course there are things we can do differently and better, and I'm not saying this is the end answer, but this shows that through good conversations and improving one of the systems we have and changing actually a contract with the registries was something that I -- I want to give a compliment to you guys for this. And I think that you deserve that compliment for showing that you take the DNS question seriously and you're also willing to engage in conversation how to improve things.

So for -- maybe for once, or maybe for the first time, I don't know, I really want to thank you for a good cooperation and good discussions. And I hope that you will also get credit from the other parts of the ICANN community for doing this, because it's well deserved. It's not the end of the solution. It's not the final

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

solution. Not everything is going to be fine. But at least it shows the commitment.

So thank you. Thank you very much.

BECKY BURR: Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks. Yeah, just quickly to respond to Göran. I'm very -- like thank you so much for those kind words. I hope that others in the community take it like a display of our commitments to working on DNS abuse, working on security issues. We are taking it very seriously. Like the whole subject matter, right? We have our working group, the registrars have their working group, and those folks have been working really hard to, you know, put out good documents, do some great work that the community can be looking at exam considering because we are very committed to the topic of DNS abuse. So I'm very happy to hear that this hopefully is a good marker of that and a good demonstration of that for the wider community.

So very much appreciate it, Göran. And looking forward to getting that one wrapped up.

BECKY BURR: Great. Well, thanks, everybody, as I said, and we'll see you at the ODP webinar.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, everybody, for a good discussion, and thanks, Becky, for excellent moderation. Really appreciate it.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, everybody.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: See you later.

BECKY BURR: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]