
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO: RySG Membership Meeting 2 of 2 and Wrap-Up
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 AST

TERRI AGNEW:

Hello and welcome to the RySG Membership Meeting Part 2 and Wrap-Up. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. We will read questions or comments aloud during the time set by the chair or the moderator of this session.

If you would like to ask your question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN’s multistakeholder model we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I’ll hand the floor back over to Beth Bacon. Please begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

BETH BACON:

Hi, folks. This is Beth Bacon. I will be your vice chair in charge today. We're giving Sam a break. She has done a fantastic job leading us for the last 400 hours it feels like, so we're going to give her a break. So please deal with your lesser Sam.

We'll start quickly with a welcome to Vanda. Thank you very much for joining us. Vanda is going to be giving us a presentation from the NomCom outreach committee. And then we will quickly move down to some carryover items from our first session of the day and then close out with our standard public comment updates and some thoughts with regard to our meeting with the Board.

I will note a couple of additional carryover items. We wanted to make sure we had Seb flagged a request to talk about Ukraine and relief, so we'll add that into some of the carryover. And then I believe we have an AOB from Rick Wilhelm who wants to do 90 seconds, and we'll time him on our deck. So if we can just add those two or keep them in mind, we'll come back to that.

Does anyone have any other things they'd like to add? Things that we're missing? Okay, seeing no hands, why don't we just turn it right over to Vanda. Thanks so much for joining us and look forward to your presentation.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, thank you. It's a quick one. Not to waste your time. I believe you are very aware that we are looking for leaders in the NomCom. You can

change the slide because you already know that. Which kind of leaders we are looking for?

Three members for the Board. Next one.

One member for the PTI. That is quite important because it's not often that this happens to be open for new positions. So PTI. Next one.

Two for ALAC from the United States and also for Europe this time. Each year is a change between the Asia, Africa, and South America and Latin America. And this year is Europe and North America. So this year is for that.

So I would like you to remember that sometimes you heard about we need more women and so on. So I heard about the male, white, and older people that are a little afraid to apply because they are thinking that they will not be considered. It's not true. We are looking for people with a very strong background. So no matter if you are female, male, white, black, or Asian, Latin America, whatever, what is important is your profile. So go ahead. To ALAC.

One member for GNSO. You know that. and the other one.

One member for the ccNSO. Let's remember that the ccNSO also likes a lot to have people from the GNSO because they bring some outside view with other experience for adding value to the ccNSO. So go ahead.

So remember, three members for the Board, one member for PTI, two for ALAC (Europe and North America), one for GNSO, one for ccNSO. So everyone is welcome, and we read and consider carefully all the

applicants. So please, you have not much time. Go ahead one more slide.

The deadline is this Friday. Because what is the program? This time our General Assembly will be in September. So we need time to evaluate, approval, pass due diligence to sit in those more important positions. And this needs to be read before the Board Meeting that is normally end of August when the assembly is in September.

So that's all for me. Please, if you have applied, finalize your application because we have a lot of applicants that did not finish yet that application, and we will consider only the finished ones. So please do. For you that are more familiar with the ICANN, you have time. If you haven't applied, you have time to because you know all the questions, all the issues. So it will be easy to fill out the profile and [bet] on your chance to sit on those positions.

Thank you very much for your time and have a great meeting from now on. I will leave you, okay? Thank you.

BETH BACON: Thank you so much, Vanda. Really appreciate it.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

BETH BACON:

All right, folks. We'll just wait until we get the agenda back—there we go—because I can't remember from one second to the next what the next item is. So that was [inaudible] Vanda. Rush to your ballot box and go on and apply I think was the message there.

So we'll move to the carryover from our morning meeting and start with a transfer policy PDP update. I'm the alternate, and you'll see now we have Rick Wilhelm who is, as Sam updated, replacing Barbara. Big thanks to Barbara for all her hard work. She's a fantastic team member and is going to remain an observer, but we have Rick coming in as the other permanent report and I will remain the alternate.

In general the transfer PDP, it was a two-phase PDP to review the transfer policy and they're in phase one. They're tasked with determining if there are areas where we need to improve the ease or security and efficiency of the inter-registrar/inter-registrant transfers. Roger is ably leading that. And really I'm seeing in general it's really good progress. Very smooth and very organized. It's kind of what you want to see out of a PDP.

Rick, I think he has to Google the RDAP. RDAP is now Donna's rooster, Rick. That's the official name. Sorry, I'm getting distracted by the chat.

So in general that's what we're talking about with the transfer policy. Rick was very kind. He jumped in with both feet and started with today's meeting that was conflicting with our first registry meeting. So he's going to quickly give us an update on what they covered today.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks, Beth. I appreciate it. Rick Wilhelm, PIR. Key dates coming up for the transfer PDP. In mid-June is the target to submit the Phase 1A report for public comment. Phase 1A deals with the policy for change of registrar, inter-registrar transfer as we know it.

There is a Phase 1B as Beth mentioned. That focuses on change of registrant which a lot of times most of us might not think of as a transfer, but as it relates to this PDP Phase 1B is talking about change of registrant.

Then Phase 2—if there’s a Phase 1, there’s got to be a Phase 2—Phase 2 is going to deal with transfer disputes.

So the draft report is under discussion right now and working through various issues. For example, today about an hour of the discussion was focused on various reasons that the registrar may and may not deny. And those within earshot can obviously guess, a fair bit of this is getting the wording exactly right so that it captures all of the right things.

So for example, today there was how do we go about getting the wording right so that it would be possible and feasible to deny transfer if a name is involved in abuse but then not have that wording that captures that be a situation where a registrar was, let’s say, holding onto a domain unnecessarily. Those kinds of things.

So this transfer PDP is mostly composed of registrars. The registries are a relatively small group. But overall, as Beth said, it seems to be going very well. I’m happy to take any questions. Thanks.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Rick. Any—give you a second—questions? Alright, seeing none, thank you, Rick. Thanks for an update and for taking up the post of [inaudible]. Really appreciate it.

We'll move on. We have some additional GNSO updates, and that was going to focus on the GNSO small teams. So I believe I'm turning to Sebastien, but I'm not sure. Who wants to take it?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. So the three of us are chatting in the background and are not quite sure what is meant by this item. Is this the part where we discuss with the membership and try to pick up on your guidance and ideas on how we should behave on the small teams? Because the report on what we were doing on the small teams I believe that we've given. I'm happy to refresh memories, but I don't know exactly what the subject matter is.

BETH BACON: Yeah, so it was to...give us three seconds because we ended up not getting exactly to the end of that slide because we had some other discussion during this first session. So I think it's two seconds on what the teams are and then to [subsequently] discuss some of our positions if needed, okay?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So I can speak to one, two, and three. Yes, I can. So the EPDP Phase 2 Small Team, as I've said before, we've gone through the [information] gathering exercise. And we'll wait for staff to give us some

clarifications on the ODA. I'll go to the next, and then we'll ask the questions to [inaudible], I guess.

DNS abuse, this is even earlier days than the ODA is. We've met, I believe, twice again. And it took us that long just to find two co-chairs. It is my humble opinion that one of the co-chairs, Mark Datysgeld, who is a BC representative would like to push this into some kind of PDP. I'm not quite sure what his base is or what his direction is, but let's hear him. He wants to try to gather information from the community to lead there, or at least it's my feeling. But he seems to be also the only one on the small team.

The other co-chair who is Paul McGrady who used to be a representative of the IPC but is now a NomCom nominee and at least vocally seems to be independent from the IPC has said several times that he doesn't think that a PDP is a solution out here on this particular topic. But again, let's hear the arguments. We have heard very, very little from anybody.

On modifying the gTLD consensus policies, this is linked to the letter we received from Theresa Swinehart just before the previous ICANN if my memory serves me right. We met as a small team three or four times, three times maybe, and quickly decided—I don't know if, yeah, I see Chris on the call—but a great suggestion by Chris very quickly was to reach out to staff, the people that drafted this document. And we reached out first and got with them some more explanations on what they were seeking and then went back to the small team and decided to ask to sit at the same table together and try to figure out how to

untangle the problems they're seeing together rather than offering guesses as to what they want or what could be worked or what we want, etc.

I think it's a recurring theme on a number of aspects here. This needs, after two years of not seeing each other, there's need of recreating some kind of a hallway discussion and having more direct discussions and not waiting to have the interaction that we're having this at the more formal one is going to be important on a number of topics.

Now if anybody on those small teams wants to [intervene], comment, or anything on my very, very short brief here. I see Marc raising his hand.

BETH BACON:

Thanks. Marc, can I one second before you chime in? Thanks, Marc. Thanks, Sebastien, for the high-level view of what each of these are doing. Since Marc is in the queue, I think it might be good for each team to the extent they can flag what they most would like some input and guidance on right now and what's their most immediate need. So I'll turn it to Marc, and you can kick us off. And I think that's probably what you were going to do anyway, but that might be the most efficient way to drive us through this section. Thanks again.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Beth. Yeah, that's exactly what I had in mind, so excellent lead in. I think [as everybody is aware] I'm a registry representative to the EPDP small team through the SSAD ODA. Sebastien is sort of wearing his neutral chair hat in this capacity and has done an excellent job

herding cats so far. So that's been a rather challenging task I think for both of us, frankly.

I'd like to try and break down what we've done in this SSAD small team into four different parts so far. The first one is responding to the letter that the Board sent to the GNSO Council prior to actually the ODA even being released in which the Board raised some concerns and asked some questions. That was one of the reasons why this small group was put together.

After some discussion on that, Sebastien I believe with some help from staff suggested a response. And that response was agreed to by the group and then put together. So I think that initial task has come and gone.

One of the things that I thought was important in there was that, picking up on Sebastien's theme, we asked for continued communication and collaboration with the ICANN Board. We have Becky Burr as liaison to this group, but we requested additional communication and collaboration possibly with the ICANN Board GDPR Caucus, for example.

The second part of what we're doing is we're looking at clarifying questions. Are there places where the operational design assessment doesn't provide enough information or the information isn't clear in order to make an informed decision about what to do with the SSAD recommendations.

This follow-up could be for the Board actually or it could be for council action or given our proposed collaboration possibly both. I've submitted some clarifying questions as have some other people. I think this is fairly straightforward. Many of the questions deal with drilling down a little bit further onto the costs associated with the SSAD system. Here I drew a little bit from the briefings we've gotten from Kurt previously on this topic.

The next thing, switching topics, we had an opportunity to provide feedback on places where we don't think the ODA report got the recommendations quite right. I believe I submitted three different items on this one. There are a couple other submissions where ICANN Org didn't seem to capture exactly what the working group had in mind. Whether that's because the recommendations weren't clear or whether what was in the recommendations wasn't viable or some other reason isn't clear. But this was an opportunity for the SSAD small team to provide feedback on the ODA report where we didn't think that the ODA is quite in line with the recommendations.

This one I have to caveat that the group has submitted these to a Google doc, but we plan to have a discussion next time we meet. I believe Sebastien has indicated that we have this group tasked to review and agree with the positions there. So again, through there I think we're proceeding at a good clip.

This last task, however, is an area where to Beth's point I'd like input, direction, help, feedback. And that's the more broad question as to what makes sense to do next with the SSAD. We've heard I think just on

this ICANN meeting suggestions about doing a pilot, suggestions about doing just a ticketing system to potentially gauge interest in the SSAD. But just generally speaking what makes sense to do next? We've gotten this far along down the path and we have this ODA report. So now what?

And I've spoken to a number of people individually and I've spoken to people inside the stakeholder group, outside the stakeholder group, and opinions are all over the place from what I've seen. I don't feel like I have a good grasp on what a registry position is or should be, and so this is the one area where I would most like feedback and input.

So that's all. I've spoken plenty long enough, I'm sure, so I'll stop there.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Marc. Sebastien, your hand? Yeah, quickly, as Marc said, I am trying to keep a neutral hat here. I'm not sure if I'm herding or hurting cats but, anyway, I'm trying to do something. I want to make sure that we avoid the kneejerk reaction [that consists of saying], well, it's the Board's turn to play so let's see what the Board has to say and then we'll deal with it. And I'm trying to avoid it because it is my feeling that given the ODA the Board is going to say this doesn't work and go and fix it GNSO.

And so I'm [now] trying to preempt that, and this is particularly why I would like to sit with, as Marc said, with the GDPR Caucus to try to suss out what the direction is. But I'm [inaudible] that. So rather than wasting six months between the time that the Board scratches its head and then sends it back to us and then we scratch our head on the GNSO

side just to see what we're trying to do with this, what we should be doing with this, I'd like for us to take a bit of time and indeed to look at options.

Now if the group feels that the best option is indeed to throw it back to the Board, then I guess that's what Marc will have to go with and I'll, again, try to remain neutral. But as a herder here, I would like to avoid that. Thank you.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Sebastien. I put myself in the queue, so I'll go next. I had a question for Marc and then just a comment on Sebastien's. So the question is, what would we think the difference between a pilot program and a ticketing system would be? A small version of the SSAD sort of feels like a ticketing system, so maybe that's just me reading, bringing my old EPDP thoughts into it. So that clarification would be helpful.

And I do appreciate, Sebastien, your cautioning. I think this is actually a good outcome of an ODP where there is good back and forth and clarifying questions. As opposed to just kicking it back and forth, there's more resolution. So I think this is good, and I appreciate you guys dedicating the time to try this out as we test out the ODP in general.

Alan?

ALAN WOODS:

Thanks, Beth. What occurs to me kind of in a possible pilot as well is, can we isolate perhaps the LEA portion of it? Because of course under the SSAD the accreditation aspect which is the big part of it is to be done by the LEA themselves anyway. So it's not as if it's something that ICANN would need to create in order to have LEA test run what an SSAD would look like. So I put it out there as a potential easy path.

It's also something that we're building a bridge with the law enforcement specifically. I think instead of just bringing it down to just a simple ticketing system, say, well, yes, but we can test the proof of concept what was always going to be your own accreditation system anyway. Just a thought.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Alan. We have Kurt next.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks very much, Beth. I've been trying to think about this from an RySG perspective too, and I think there are two possible negative outcomes for registry operators. One is ICANN spending millions and millions of dollars and not getting something for it. So that's kind of a universal risk.

And the other risk is that with low uptake in order to generate the revenue to cover costs ICANN will flog the SSAD and try to drum up business for it. So the result would be that contracted parties might get many, many times more queries because ICANN's out there beating the

bushes sending people to SSAD to make data queries. So I think those are the two outcomes we want to avoid.

As far as next steps and making the process go faster, I think the clarifying questions are good. But I also think there's enough information in the ODA even if somewhat misguided that would indicate that the thing as designed is unfeasible. And there are many contributors to this, but the biggest one is that they overestimate I think the uptake ten times to a hundred times between what's reality and what their minimum values are.

I talk to some large registrars and they use terms like the projections are laughable or idiotic. Those are the terms they used. And so what can we do besides throwing it back to the Board? So I think the way to disprove some negative outcomes is to have some sort of pilot. We want to either have a pilot to measure the uptake and see if it's really what the ICANN projection says.

And we can have some sort of pilot to see if the costs are really what they are. A lot of people have stated that they think ICANN has overstated the cost. Well, let them do a partial implementation. That doesn't cost too much, and see if they find out it's really simpler than they think it was.

So anyway, I think we don't want to implement something where ICANN is beating the bushes trying to drum up business. And I think at the end we could do, for you guys to discuss, some sort of pilot program with two goals of seeing what the uptake is and seeing if the costs are as dear as ICANN really says. Thanks.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Kurt. I think that's interesting. We had two: support for a pilot and then also a targeted pilot for LEA which I think could get to some of the concerns. And I put in the chat that did come up in the GAC discussion today with [inaudible] and LEA access.

Maybe, Marc, to pull some of these thoughts together with regards to what Kurt was saying, is there an option for us to say here are our questions. We have some questions regarding our options going forward. How much do you think a pilot would cost versus a ticketing system? how much do you think it would be? Do you think it would be a reduction in cost if it were targeted to one specific group, specifically LEA? Because that could impact some of the estimated verification costs as users.

And then Rubens is posting in the chat something I wanted to flag. It is that Tucows recently posted a blog on the SSAD using some of their own internal numbers to compare up against the estimates in SSAD. So if anybody wants to take a look at that.

So I maybe want to draw a line under this one because we are getting to the end of this block, so I wanted to make sure that we do have some time to chat about the other two items quickly if there's anything folks need immediate input on. Marc, does that help you? When do you need this input by and maybe we can add it to a drop-in call to discuss more thoroughly.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, this is great input. Thank you, everyone, for contributing. I would love to get this added to a future drop-in call so we could dive a little deeper into this. A quick answer to your question, Beth, no decisions have been made. I think everything is on the table at this point. So I think the entire community is open and looking for ideas. So now is the time to have this conversation, I think.

BETH BACON: Okay, thank you. All right, so we'll move on to the next steps regarding DNS abuse. Sebastien, you noted that it's just starting. They've done some initial outreach. So I assume that you don't really need any particular input at the moment. But I will open up the floor for any questions and comments, if the works for you. Unless there's something you want to flag for specific input.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, that works for me. I had the general impression that we're not seeking to develop a long PDP on this, etc. So my understanding is to push back that we're doing already everything that should be done or a lot. But, yeah, if anybody has any specific guidance. I'm also turning to, Maxim. I understand it's very late right now in Moscow, but he's also in the group if he wanted to [inaudible]. And you have your hand up, Beth, so back to you.

BETH BACON: I did, but I was pausing for Maxim if he wanted to comment.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about modifying consensus policies, am I right?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, now we're talking about DNS abuse still.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Basically, we didn't have a lot of meetings and it's like framing of the frames of the frames. It's very beginning of very beginning. So it's not much to report, in my opinion.

BETH BACON: Okay, super. Thank you. I was just going to note that I think in general these small teams might be right for a drop-in call, Sebastien, once you guys are a few more steps down the road and we can have an actual discussion. I think there are things to discuss with regards to...it's not just, yes, we want to long PDP or no PDP. I think there's some more nuanced approaches that we can take with regards to DNS abuse and PDPs and any sort of some action there. You can shout at me if you think I'm speaking out of turn, but I think we'll put that also on for a drop-in.

And modifying consensus policies, I will, again, just Chris or...oh, sorry. I see Sam. Go for it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Beth, sorry to take you out of your flow there. I think that's a great idea that we'll continue to revisit these small teams as needed. Just a plea

to council. When the time comes and you do need input from the stakeholder group or if there's anything you want to run by the stakeholder group, just flag it so we can make sure we get it on agendas. In the course of all the other things that we need to get updates on, these I think have the potential to slip by just because they're a novel thing. So just keep the lines of communication open so we can make sure that we get you guys all the input or feedback that you need.

BETH BACON: Yeah, great point. Thanks, Sam. All right, so I will give Sebastien, Maxim, or Chris, if anybody wants to give two seconds on the consensus policies. Is there anything [pending]?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Actually, Chris, do you mind if you take this one? Because you're the one that had the [inaudible] things to say.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. No problem, Seb. It seems to me unless I'm out of date here we're waiting to hear back from them, right? We said to the GNSO you should go back to the...said to the council go back to the staff and say let's talk, and we've done that. So [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So we've done that, and Theresa has said, yeah, great idea. And we're sort of waiting to [inaudible].

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, we're waiting to hear [inaudible] schedule, exactly. So there's really nothing for us to do at this stage other than to wait for a time to talk. And then once we've started that conversation, we'll see what happens.

BETH BACON: All right, fantastic. All right, yeah, shout at us as Sam said whenever you need input or reaction. So we're happy to do that. Thank you guys very much for giving us the opportunity to summarize those and then talk about where you are.

Next on our list is, Sebastien, you added the Ukrainian support you wanted to flag from our first session. So I will give it to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, so on the registrar call a gentleman from Ukraine joined in. It turned out that he wasn't a member of the registrar group, so it took us a little bit to track him down. But essentially asking the registrar what to do about renewals in the case of when registrants are no longer able to connect to the Internet and are nowhere to be found, etc.

And Russ' blog answered some of those questions, not all. The registrars in general said, well, you need to go and see the registries and see [inaudible] with them. And so I just wanted to propose/offer to offer recommendations. And I don't know exactly what it is.

Now what I have done, and I'm going to show my screen if I can. No, I can't. If somebody can unlock me to share my screen, I just have a...

SUE SCHULER: Terri, can you please promote Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: An Excel sheet to show. I've gone back through public information, so the ICANN site, to have a list of registrars concerned. I'm trying not to open something else. Is this it? Yeah, that would be it. So getting the information from the ICANN site about registrars that are in Ukraine, registered from Ukraine. And then went to the latest available registry monthly report to see on the one hand what registrars are concerned and how many domains they have with how many TLDs, etc., and which TLDs.

You'll find actually there's probably only a handful of registry operators, backend or registry operators [concerned]. Obviously, [inaudible]. There is Donuts. There's a bit of GoDaddy registry too. The full list is here, and I'm ready to share it.

I have no solution to give, but it seemed to me that the gentleman in question, for example, didn't even understand the full implication of the auto renew. How that works. If that means that names are renewed automatically. And then it's just a discussion for us to have with them about billing end of month or not. All these discussions he was a bit...they weren't understanding all that.

So this is an invitation for those concerned, those that have a link to them to go and do that.

Now Russ was entering some questions in our earlier call I believe about this but I couldn't hear it because I had a four-year-old screaming in my other ear and I got a bit distracted so I missed that bit. But to me there is also a second problem which is linked to the same situation which is the problem of Russian and Belarussian registrars who very quickly find themselves not being able to pay bills. And so that's also possibly a discussion that needs to be had.

So I ran the exact same report on the same basis with those registrars here. Just to be clear, all this is public information. I put my sources here to make sure. I'm happy to share this with the group. It's mainly there for people to be aware that there might be problems here that they need to resolve. I will share it with my teams for those TLDs that are concerned. And I'm just letting everybody else handle it the way they see fit.

Now again, if somebody can help me with Russ' input, that would be fantastic. Because I don't quite know what ICANN is offering behind their blog. But apart from that, that's all I wanted to show.

BETH BACON:

Thank you, Seb, for digging into this and sharing all the information that you've dug out while you're trying to sift through your own questions. I see Russ in the chat that he's very happy to help, so maybe we can reach out there. I do also take to heart Chris' comment that this isn't going to be maybe the same reaction for every registry just because of jurisdictional issues and sanctions and where you may or may not be impacted by those.

So, yeah, it might be an individual business decision, but I'm going to go with let's encourage conversation on our list about this. And if we can get you connected with Russ to answer your specific questions, then maybe we can have a more comprehensive chat on the list and people can take or leave if it is an individual business choice. Does that work?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, absolutely. I just wanted to raise awareness.

BETH BACON: Yeah. No, I appreciate it. I think it's a needed conversation. Right thing to do. All right, thanks. Any other questions or comments with regards to Seb's information? Okay, seeing no hands, we will go to the public comment update. Oh, Russ, do you want to go ahead? I see your hand.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yeah, sure. Thanks, everyone. We realize this is a really tricky and challenging situation for registries to be in. And so there's not really a clause in the registry agreement that's particular to this. So the one thing, the tool at our disposal, the easiest at our disposal was that tool in the registrar agreement that we invoked. I think it's RAA 3.7.5.1. And I think registries and registrars are most positioned or best positioned to figure out how there might be tools at their disposal that can help with this.

I think in the past we've seen registries waive things like redemption fees and that sort of thing. But we certainly understand the sanctions and that sort of stuff will make certain situations complicated and payment processors and that sort of things not being able to function in certain regions.

I did see a question on the chat about whether Russia and Belarus were considered in scope for this, and I think from the ICANN perspective yes. We're giving the discretion to the industry here to help us identify where there's friction and where there are challenges and to apply their best business judgment to do the right thing and help people prevent from losing domain names that they shouldn't have lost for this.

So if there are questions, happy to work through them with you. Just really appreciate registries coming together and thinking about ways they can help here, and ICANN's here if we can be of assistance.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Russ. Really appreciate that. Any other hands? Any other questions or comments on this? We're a little bit behind the schedule, so I just want to zip us along if we can. Okay. And again, we can revisit this on the list and have more chats if we need to and would like to.

All right, so we'll just be moving to the public comments updates. Who doesn't like a nice, short public comment update? We have the NCAP study comments. Those are due next week on the 18th. We have a draft comment open and available. Jim Galvin has put in some comments. A very huge thank you for getting us started there, Jim. As per usual, it's

due on Friday so we'll close that on Wednesday and use Thursday to clean it up, of next week. So please go ahead and take a look if you would like to make some NCAP study comments.

And then there was the question from Karen. We had an SOI that we put out for comments. Sorry. Thanks. The SOI for the taskforce. We did ask for comments by the 10th, so that's the end of this week. If folks could go ahead and help Karen out and put any comments you might have in there. That's not an official comment. That's just helping out, helping Karen gather some registry views.

And then in April, we have a little more time on this, this was newly posted, is the UDRP policy status report. So we'll get this going and if need be, we can dig through this with a little more detail and get folks on a call because UDRP is always a fun topic for folks to comment on.

Any questions or comments with regards to open public comments? Does anyone have anything they particularly would like to flag that they'd comment on? If not now, reach out to Wim, Sue, myself at any time. Okay. I love it when public comments can get us back on schedule almost.

All right, so we'll move to the section reflections on the CPH meeting with the ICANN Board. As I'm sure everyone on this call was either there or knew about, we just in the past two hours had our joint call with the ICANN Board and the registrars.

Starting with I guess my own personal reflections, I thought it was very productive and collaborative in tone. There have been some meetings

in the past where we've had contention and concern and a little bit of a tension between our questions and ICANN response. I think there was a spirit of collaboration, and I think that the byword that I'm getting out of this whole meeting and the Board's interactions with everyone is we need to make this model and our work more efficient. We need to get things done. Everyone is on the same page. Things need to be prioritized and moved along.

So I think that message has made it through to the Board. And I think that we also, the Registry Stakeholder Group, I think they appreciated how organized we were with our priorities, so way to go, us, for our preparation. And I think those will serve us well going forward. But those are just kind of my initial takeaways as someone who was lurking the whole time.

I see Alan's hand is up, so go for it. And then anyone else.

ALAN WOODS:

The one thing I feel like I need to don a schoolteacher hat ever so slightly at this particular moment in time. One thing that springs to mind was something that Keith said in the chat earlier in the day. Specifically about the attribution of what people are going to be saying and who you're speaking for at a particular time.

I will say that I was rather dismayed that at least in two situations or two occasions during the meeting with the Board, which is a very important Board for the Registry Stakeholder Group, that people had to be queried specifically as to who they were representing and what

they were making statements on. Now if we were following our own rules, our own rules would never necessitate somebody asking that question.

So I think it is important for us to, again, ensure that if we are saying we are all welcome to raise our points, individuals [or employers] points or that of the Registry Stakeholder Group if it is the thoughts and the viewpoints of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

So I just wanted to reiterate, especially in just coming out of that meeting where there was a little bit of that back and forth, we need to be exceptionally clear in who we're speaking for at that particular time. Because every single word that we are saying is being minutely taken apart and is being listened to. As so it should be because we are here to represent very clear viewpoints. And I think we just need to take a moment, each one of us, to make sure that when we are interacting that we know who we are interacting on behalf and that that is clear.

I'm going to leave it there from my point of view, but I just think that it definitely was something that stood out to me because it became a bit of a distraction in the chat. So I just wanted to point that out.

BETH BACON:

Yeah, Alan, I appreciate that very much and really can't agree more. It was a bit of a distraction. And I think that it's a challenge when we're trying to, especially in that kind of Board CPH call where we are ostensibly representing our CPH and registry points of view, that's really important. Again, I agree very much. Have your own personal

opinions, your own business opinions. But if we are in a situation where we're representing registries or the CPH, I think that's a good thing to keep in mind.

Does anybody else have any comments or questions, takeaways? I did want to say, again, one of the good things that we discussed previously in our prep calls was just the distinction, kind of preservation of process and paying attention to items and efficiency, again, as we go forward. And I thought that was really picked up by the Board.

Sam, I saw your hand go up, and then you disappeared. I'm going to go to Chris, and you can put your hand back up if you want.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, go to Chris first.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Beth. Thank you, Sam. Just briefly, I think we should be really alive to what's happening at the moment. The Board is and I think Org is stepping in toward us, leaning in, to use that awful expression. And we should be really careful to ensure that our communication is clear and not dismissive and not off-putting. In other words, we should embrace the opportunity to, we should embrace their leaning in and work together to find solutions.

And I just want to...I'm not saying we haven't done that, but I just want to mark it as a thing. I think the last couple of weeks have been really, really important in taking steps toward operating, to bridging the gaps

that have grown over time. And my gut feeling, for what it's worth, is that we're going to have a significant opportunity assuming we do get to The Hague to actually do really good work on that. Not so much about the stuff but just the general feeling and the way we work together. Thanks.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Chris. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. And yeah, Chris, I fully agree with you. I think we are at a pretty key moment of being able to really hit the gas on some things. I think we're seeing a lot more energy out of the Board than maybe we have in the recent past. And I'm willing to blame everything on COVID and the pandemic, everything in this world that I don't like, but I think that's probably a factor and being stuck without that ability to interact face-to-face. So I think especially insofar as we may have that opportunity coming up soon, fingers crossed, that you're absolutely right, Chris. We should be taking full advantage of it. So I definitely just want to plus one that in a big way.

Also, just to come back to the point that Alan teed up here, I just also want to encourage members. We try to...I understand that it's not always a venue where everyone can be diving in and everyone can be talking at the same time. The meetings with the Board are challenging. But we do really try to make it as open of an environment as we can.

And if folks want to get in the queue and want to ask questions or something, we want to foster that.

That said, I know I've said this before and I'm going to just say it again, please be mindful of how you use the chat feature. The chat feature should be used to enhance the discussion that's going on in the larger room, and it should be used to support that. This tendency to have sidebar conversations that are only in the chat makes it very difficult for the folks who are engaging in the meeting to pay attention to both.

And I think in the same line as Alan was saying about needing to be clear about who we're representing and what views we're representing, let's also focus on the subject at hand. We had an opportunity to have a really great conversation with the Board about some really meaty topics, and I was a little disappointed to see that we kind of distracted from that.

So this is just my plea, especially as we are moving into other sessions. Now that we've gotten through our constituency day here at ICANN73, please just be mindful of that when you're in other sessions as well. Because it does reflect on us as the Registry Stakeholder Group and the contracted parties, but also just being a good meeting participant and a good ICANN citizen. So thanks for that.

BETH BACON:

All right, folks, thank you. I think that those are all great points. I think we are at an important time to buckle down and focus, so I thank you very much for being very candid and weighing in. Although there is a

divisive comment in the chat about limericks or not to limerick, so I don't know if we're getting through, guys.

I will open it up. Does anyone have any other final comments in the CPH interaction with the Board? Again, I thought it was a good one.

Okay, so we will move to wrap-up. Sam, what...I'm sorry. Not Sam. Sue, our next meeting is Wednesday, yes? And we are switching to the...it'll be noon for those of us changing time zones I believe on Wednesday. And we're just going to have a one-hour meeting. So keep that on your calendars. Make sure everything is updated. It should have come through from Sue.

I will open it up to any AOB. Last comments or questions. We could maybe let you out six minutes early. I know. Contain your excitement. All right, seeing no hands, I just want to say big thank you to Sam. You've done such a great job today. The Registry Stakeholder Group day is never a fun one, and you have been leading us very ably all day. So really, really thank you very much. Thanks to everybody who has contributed. I think we had a lot of really substantive and comprehensive good things to say to the Board. I think that we were well organized, and that's always great. So good work, team.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks so much, Beth. And thank you for chairing this last session. And honestly, I couldn't do what I do without the really great input of everyone here in the stakeholder group, so I owe it all to you guys. Thank you very much.

BETH BACON:

And if Sam doesn't have a cocktail offscreen, I'm going to drive one to her house. All right, so I think we can end the recording. Thanks so much and thanks again also especially to Sue and Evin and Terri and everyone who takes good care of us during all of our meetings, especially during busy ICANN.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]