
ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: CPH Membership Meeting
Monday, September 19, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. Hello and welcome to the Contracted Party House Membership Meeting. 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 be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to ask a 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 and your affiliation 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 multi-stakeholder 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 will hand the floor over to Samantha Demetriou.

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.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Sue, and hello, everyone. For those in the room, welcome. Welcome to Kuala Lumpur. I know many of us have been here for a few days but thank you for being here. And for those of us joining remotely, thank you all for dialing in.

So if we want to go to the next slide, we can take a look at the agenda that we have put together here today. We're just going to open with some welcome. We'll get an update on the Council Small Team on DNS Abuse, followed by some discussion about the work that's coming out of that team. Then we'll go into a bit of a preview of two of the key topics or a few of the key topics that we're going to cover at the Contracted Party Summit later this year. Finally, we'll get an update on the DPS negotiations before we quickly touch base on the meeting that we're going to have with the ICANN Board tomorrow morning.

With that, I'll hand it to Ashley for any opening remarks, and then we can go ahead and just dig right in.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hello, welcome. That's all I got.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Cool. Then, Greg, you want to take it away? Or anybody?

GREG DIBIASE:

Sure. Hey, everybody. So earlier this year, the GNSO Council responded to kind of repeated calls in the community to address DNS Abuse. But there's kind of a question like what exactly does this mean? The scope is kind of large. Like, how do we handle this? So the small team came up with an idea of starting with gathering input from members of the community: the SGs, ACs, and ICANN Compliance just getting different perspectives as a starting point. So we reached out to these different teams, got their perspectives, and then summarized that into feedback and came up with some preliminary recommendations that will be brought back to the Council.

The first recommendation, I think something really positive, a lot of people mentioned the good work that's happening outside of the PDP process efforts like guides for reporting abuse in the DNSAI Institute. So the first recommendation is just kind of this blanket encouragement to continue working with those actors and encouraging further output.

The next recommendation was regarding bulk registrations. This is one thing that came up in a couple of people's comments. And when the small team discussed bulk registrations, there was kind of an acknowledgment that while maybe in some instances bulk registrations could be used for DNS abuse, there are also legitimate uses for bulk registrations. So the recommendation

will be to investigate this further and potentially outreach to contracted parties, probably registrars, kind of asking questions and to understand the issue better.

The next and possibly most interesting development that came out of this effort is the small team had asked Compliance about how they interpreted the existing contracts in relation to abuse. And they said something that was kind of interesting to the small team specific to the registrars. They were asked about the obligation to respond appropriately to abuse and their position was—I'll read an exact quote here. "While they can request responses to abuse reports in line with the registrar's terms of service, the RAA does not require registrars to take any specific action on the domain names that are subject to abuse reports." And obviously this is their interpretation, right? I think some people could argue that that language would mean that, but we're taking it for what it is of kind of what compliance's response is there.

And then other people on the small team kind of noted that these provisions around abuse are a little vague. And then on the registry side, there was a conversation about the provision to include anti-abuse provisions in their contracts that also could be looked into further. So the recommendation flowing from this is nothing prescriptive, but the small team is basically going to write a letter to the contracted party saying, hey, we talked to

Compliance, they had this feedback that they haven't had before, right? To my knowledge, this is the first time Compliance has ever said anything as definite with regards to their interpretation of the client, the contracts what do you think about this? You know, is this something that needs to be addressed? And if so, let's have a dialogue. So that's the third recommendation.

And then the fourth one regards kind of this idea of a tightly scoped PDP. And kind of one of the interesting things in the feedback was there was a general agreement that people didn't want to open up kind of this an unbounded really long PDP. But if we did a PDP to focus on a tightly scoped effort that addressed things that are clearly within ICANN's remit, namely phishing, malware, and botnets. And then the recommendation is phrased in the report as after this outreach and discussing with contracted partys things raised in this report if further action is needed, the Council should consider proceeding with a tightly-scoped PDP. So it's not overly prescriptive, but just kind of raising these issues and really starting a dialogue about what the small team discovered when gathering this feedback from the community.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you. And sorry.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE: That report is in the very final stages. I think it will go to the Council either in the next meeting or the meeting after that, I think certainly by the end of October and then the next step would be for the Council to consider their recommendations and then possibly organize outreach as recommended in the report.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Greg. I appreciate this update as well as we had a very lengthy update and The Hague as well at ICANN7... I don't know which number it is anymore. ICANN74. And I think this is going down a path that is good. And I'm happy to hear that there's this kind of coalesce around the idea that if there is going to be a PDP that it needs to be narrowly tailored because I think there's, at least I suspect, agreement in the room that trying to boil the ocean on all things, DNS abuse is not going to be helpful for anyone. So that's helpful to see.

But I do want to thank you, Greg, for keeping us apprised of what is happening and what is going on. I want to open it up to the floor for questions, but before, I'm going to take my prerogative here to ask one question of Greg and that is: when do you anticipate that such a letter would be directed to the registrars in particular so that we can be prepared in terms of figuring out what our response to that letter would be? Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah. So I mean, the Council will have to accept that recommendation, which I think they will—I would assume in the next month or two, certainly by the end of the year. I don't have an exact date, but relatively soon, I guess, is my final answer.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. Do we have any questions in the room or abroad as I can say? Yes, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Has either registry or registrar leadership reached out and had any discussions with ICANN Org regarding the scoping of this potential narrowly remitted PDP?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Not in the context of the small group report. I think we've had general conversations in a number of different, like, areas and opportunities that we would not support a PDP that was broad, overly broad, and that it would need to be narrowly tailored. Does that help?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Could you perhaps expand upon what those discussions or dialogue was about?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Well, and in my particular example, it was a one-on-one I had with Göran—I'll turn it over to Samantha.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, I mean, I think it's not necessarily for the contracted parties to have a dialogue with ICANN Org about what the scope of a PDP would be. Like, that's obviously a conversation that's going to have to take place at the community level, at Council, and like with our councilors to bring that to an issues report, a charter and things like that. So I think this also plays in here. But I think James has his hand up as well.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Sam, and thanks, Greg. Really appreciate your work on the small team. This is James Bladel, for the record. I just want to note the characterization of the language of the RAA in particular as being ambiguous. And I think, and I want to be careful. Obviously, I haven't seen the report yet, but that we're not characterizing this as some sort of oversight or an accident. A lot of good ideas were brought to the table during the 2013 negotiations and the drafting of the new RAA. And that was essentially—the watered-down result is the result of a compromise that we arrived at.

And I think that context should inform the next phase, especially as we get into scoping some sort of potential future PDP is it's very, very difficult to arrive at language that everyone agrees on when you start talking about prescriptive or obligatory responses to abuse reports. It gets very tricky very quickly and so we—it's neither here nor there but the context is that the language wasn't an oversight; it's not like we forgot to put something more in there. We struggled with it for months, and that was all we could really land on. Thanks.

SUE SCHULER: Just a quick reminder, before we go on, please state your name and your affiliation before you begin speaking. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: And that was James Bladel registrar GoDaddy.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, James Bladel. This is Ashley Heineman, Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. No, I appreciate that. And just for the record, I think it should be noted that what happened in 2013 was a considerable effort. And I don't suspect that this is intended as a criticism of those who negotiated that text, but I think it is pretty clear that the language that is there has been interpreted as a requirement to simply respond to the report. And I think

that's what's being driven at. I see Greg has his hand up. Please, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, I was just going to respond to James. I think you said it right, Ashley, it's not that the contract language is, quote-unquote, ambiguous. That's subjective. It's that we asked Compliance this specific question, they gave this specific answer that, to my knowledge, hasn't been said before, small team took note and thought it might be worth discussing further with contracted parties, is how I'd phrase it.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Greg. Maxim, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. In my opinion, because I participated in those conversations, that there is a notion that our contracts should be interpreted the particular way. I underlined few times that due to freedom of contract; each party has the right to interpret the contract the way [inaudible]. And if someone tries to force contracted parties to interpret it the particular way, most probably it would cause some, yeah, issues on the anti-monopoly level because if a third party forces your company to

do something in particular where it's not prescribed in contract or in law, it's a bad idea.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Maxim. I have Sebastian in the queue. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So this is Sebastien Ducos, Registry Stakeholder Group and GoDaddy Registry, for the record. I just wanted to—thank you, Greg. The report was very accurate and reflected worldly discussion. I just want to point to the fact, I think that more towards the end—if in the beginning the group was sort of enthusiastic about light PDPs, very focused PDPs, the more the discussions went and the more we focused on the fact that should we be able—we CPH—be able to find something that works in terms of contracting or others—and it might not be contracts. It might be best practices that are documented and agreed upon with Compliance or something like that. But the more we're able to go that path, the less the path of the PDP becomes appealing for everybody. Because everybody does realize that the PDP is going to be, as James said about the contract, is going to be extremely difficult to achieve, even if it's super narrow, even if it's very, very bordered, finding agreement is going to be difficult.

And so I just want to stress that the old [inaudible] we'll say yes, we'll do all the effort in terms of contracting and then they will

organize a PDP on us for everything that we haven't agreed in contract, that's also possible, it's part of the strategy. But I just want focus that the group was very much of the view that the more we're able to do before a PDP in order to avoid it, the better it is because everybody is indeed very, very clear that the PDP is going to be a very difficult exercise, whatever the shape and form it might take.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Seb. And I think we can all certainly appreciate that based on our most recent past experiences with PDPs. I see—oh, Owen did have no piece. He took himself out of the queue. Anybody else have any questions or comments? Volker, please.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. So just going back to the ambiguity that's mentioned here, referenced here. I don't think it was the ambiguity. I mean, during the 2013 RAA negotiations, we were tackling a totally different problem. The problem was that many registrars weren't even answering to complaints and therefore the respond commitment was actually meant to mean exactly what it means, to send an email back about what we are doing and that we have received the email. It does not mean what people wanted to mean. And to call that ambiguity is I think mischaracterizing the actual intent of the 2013 RAA language that was put there intentionally. I mean,

we wordsmithed the hell out of that thing when we were in the negotiation room and every word was intended with a certain meaning, and this was no exception.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Volker. And use of the word "ambiguity" aside, I think it is still a fair point to say that, referring to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, there is not much in that agreement that gives ICANN Compliance the ability to enforce the taking of action. And I think that's what the focal point is in that response from Compliance. So next. Owen's back. So, Owen, please.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hi, this is Owen Smigelski for the transcript and I stepped out of the queue and then Volker brought me back in. So what kind of happened is I know you guys wordsmithed that, but when I was in ICANN at the time, I led the 2013 RAA compliance and Legal got involved and they said, "Oh, well, we don't care what people said during it, but legally the word 'respond' can mean send an email or can mean take an action." And so that's why they kind of put that ambiguity in there. And it was kind of in the registrars' favor, I think, but that's led to the consequences and everything we've seen since then. So, for them, they were looking at it, if we were to take this to arbitration and force a registrar to do something,

we need a black and white definition and it wasn't as black and white as they had wanted. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Owen. Any other hands in Zoom, in the room? I see Brian, I believe, is down there.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Ashley. Brian Cimboric, PIR. Greg, I just wanted to say, I think that the approach that the small team took that seems to be very practical-minded, and, to Ashley's point, intentionally not boiling the ocean actually does give sort of the best path for success on this. So I think it's just great work all around. So I just wanted to note that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Any other thoughts or comments? Oh, I see—is that you Greg going back on?

GREG DIBIASE: I was just going to—also note that Seb and Maxim were key players as well, so just because I'm giving the summary doesn't mean I'm –

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: We'll stop thanking you, Greg. Thank you, Seb. And thank you, Maxim. Any other thoughts or questions? Just to wrap up, I think what's going to be necessary now as we go back to our individual stakeholder groups and wait for said letter to arrive and then we have to discuss how we want to respond. So unless there's any other comments, questions, I will not thank Greg, and we can go to the next agenda item.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. So next up we have a bit of a preview of the upcoming Contracted Party Summit. We learned from ICANN that we finally got confirmation of the date—oh, sorry, not the date, the actual location, the venue for this. And so that's all going to be available on ICANN site. We can drop that in the chat for folks. But this is going to take place November 1st through 4th, I believe, are the dates. So a little later in the year as opposed to the usual kind of like May timeframe that we've done them in in the past.

The planning group has had, I think, a handful of meetings, at this point, and it started to work on developing the agenda for that three-and-a-half-day meeting. So we put up a slide here that covers the high-level topics that we're planning to go through during the days that we'll work together. And today, we're going to dive into a bit of a preview of two of those topics. I think we're leading off with the AGP limits topic. And for that one, I'm going to hand it over to Owen.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Thank you, Sam. So one thing that the registrars have been discussing internally—and, again, this is just a proposal at this point, we haven't really fully put it forward—is making a change to the AGP limits policy. So for those who aren't familiar with it, it was created in 2009 in response to domain tasting—that would be when somebody would register a domain name, check for traffic, and then dump it within five days of registration and they could get their money back.

I don't recall specifically the numbers but at one point it was something like 90 plus percent of domain names were being returned via this method, which was somewhat disruptive as you can imagine. And so the AGP limit was put in place to prevent this, meaning if there was a certain limit that was exceeded by the registrar then they may not qualify for refunds from a registry operator. Also, in addition, they put the ICANN \$0.18 fee in there non-refundable to make that.

So that really almost immediately stopped domain tasting. However, as the Internet has evolved, what we're finding a lot now is that maliciously registered domain names are often done via fraudulent payment methods, credit card, etc. So registrars often find out about these right away. And so then they need to refund the money as well as that get rid of the domain name, delete it. The concern is, though, is that some registrars are

exceeding their AGP limits and thus not qualifying for refunds, which can sometimes, depending upon the size of the registrar, be a significant amount or even for smaller registrars, that could be a big impact on that.

So the proposal is that we're trying to, and this is the way it is now, is this disincentivizes a registrar from taking quick and prompt action to get rid of a bad name that was registered fraudulently because of the AGP. So the proposal is to exempt maliciously registered domain names from the AGP as well as the refund of the ICANN fee as well, too. So that way registrars are encouraged to identify and delete malicious domain names quickly in a way that does not penalize them financially. So thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks very much for that overview, Owen. We do have a few minutes for discussion if anyone has any questions about this topic. I mean, obviously it's something that we're going to dig into a lot more with a lot more time at the summit that's coming up in a month or so, two months. But if anyone has questions or some initial thoughts that we want to share now, we definitely have this space in today's agenda to do so. So especially if anyone has any, like, early reactions to the proposal Owen mentioned, or just like the topic of AGP limits and abusive fraudulent domains to begin with.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: James, you want to go ahead?

JAMES BLADEL: Yeah. Thanks, Owen. And, yeah, Sam, early reactions are really the only kind of reactions that I have anymore. But I really appreciate that this is tabled for the summit. I think we should have a fulsome discussion there, particularly because it is something that I know GoDaddy's encountering quite a bit, is this problem of the bearing the financial costs of being aggressive on abusive domain names. I think that we need to talk about safeguards around making sure that people just don't go back to tasting the way it was and calling it to abusive.

And additionally whether or not it requires a modification to the PDP or whether there can be just simply some guidance, registries do have a lot of discretion on whether or not they will accept or—sorry, grant exceptions to AGP limits. And maybe it's just an agreement between registries and registrars that if the registrar could demonstrate they're over the limit because of AGP deletions on anti-abuse or abuse mitigation efforts, that the registry would be more permissive in those situations. But I'm glad to see that we're tabling it. I think that we have to put a lot of safeguards around it and then ultimately determine if it's just

a commercial agreement between registries and registrars, or if we have to go back and revisit that AGP PDP.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, James. I noted that just to make sure that's part of those discussions going forward. Thanks. Next, we've got Jeff Neuman.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So thanks. Jeff Neuman.

Sorry. Excuse me. So there is, in the policy, it does say that the registrars have the ability to seek exemptions. It says for extraordinary circumstances. So I guess what you're saying is that registrars have been applying to registries and registries have been denying that as not being extraordinary?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Jeff, this is Owen, again. Yeah, it's extraordinary is that means out of the ordinary. And this is a common, regular monthly occurrence for at least I know Namecheap has seen it before. We also do sometimes see ongoing attacks or campaigns that will span over the course of a month. So April and then May, so that'll be two months and that might not be deemed extraordinary. So I'm just trying to make it so that there's a more flexibility for the registrar to take that action. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: All right. We have a little bit of a queue. So I've got Alan, Crystal, Greg, and then Mike number four.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much. Alan Woods, Identity Digital, for the record. Just obviously coming from a registry point of view, I think just to possibly expand a little bit more on what Jeff was saying there. The key thing when I'm looking at exemptions—and I've raised this with many of the registrars that I've dealt with in the past when it comes to AGP exemption requests, the wording that's specifically the problem is that the deletes must not be known to the registrar at the time of delete. And if the registrar themselves are the ones that have deleted it, it's very hard to argue that as well.

So there are a few quirks and tweaks to the language regarding exemptions that would be very helpful because, obviously the last thing a registry also wants to do is to disincentivize the anti-abuse actions. So that seems to be a prudent thing for discussion definitely at this point even from our point of view.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Alan. Crystal, you're up next.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks. Crystal Ondo, Google. And I just wanted to point out that I would support not opening up the policy itself, but looking more towards like a Spec 11(3)(b) guidance. You know, ICANN issued that before. Let's get together as contracted parties and try to sort out what we can do within the policy. Because I did put it in chat, but I mean, some types of fraudulent domain registrations are specifically stated to be exempt. It just isn't clear in the actual policy how to do that. And I think we can put our heads together and reach a standardization across registries or a shared understanding so that registrars aren't having to make different arguments with different registries, and that would just make our processes much more fluid.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Crystal. Graeme, looks like you're next.

GRAEME BUNTON: I thought there were more people in the queue. This is Graeme for the transcript. This might be an opportunity to take this to the CPH DNS abuse group for—maybe dedicate a call to this particular topic because I think there's a lot to chew through here.

Overlap of combating fraud and combating abuse, especially at the time of registration, I think, is really interesting to me. Also sort of not in that list here is that deleting domain names is also, especially for abusive ones, not the right answer because they become registerable again right away and then we just end up in registrar hopping. And so, I think we need to spend some time thinking about the behavior we're trying to incent and encourage and allow the things we want to stop and be aware of like tasting and see if we can come up with a couple different ways to try and solve these particular problems. And it's going to require a bunch of thinking and work and time and perhaps the CPH DNS abuse group is a good place for that. Thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Graeme. Jeff, is that an old hand? Okay, just checking. I'm sorry, what? Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Michael?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. I guess a question, Owen—question to you Owen and James: with regard to this abuse that you're seeing that is not falling out of the request limits that registries are honoring, is it happening across one particular registrant or multiple registrants? And is there something that your existing KYC requirements could do to help mitigate that?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: This is Owen Smigelski for the transcript. I don't have as much detail on that, but it's my understanding this is just one other vector that's being taken on by these participants. Sometimes it's new accounts, dormant accounts, old accounts. I'm not sure specifically on that, but I do know that it is pervasive across a number of TLDs and the like.

GREG DIBIASE: If I could respond to Mike's question, I think it's one registrant, it's multiple registrants—it's multiple registrants setting up multiple resellers. It's like spam, okay? At this point, it's never ending and it's a constant arms race to stay one step ahead of this problem.

MICHAEL PALAGE: As outgoing Accuracy Data Chair, any accuracy data there? Sorry, just had to get that in there.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: If I can respond—Oh, the data appears accurate.

GREG DIBIASE: Well, hang on a second. Can I?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Yeah, go ahead, James.

JAMES BLADEL: You know, we have, I believe seven days to verify that and our processes can sometimes use that entire window, but now we're already outside of the five-day AGP. So there's a mismatch there between how long it takes to verify and do that verification process versus how long we have to delete that name safely before—So, I mean, we're trying to be as aggressive as possible and get in front of that, but then knowing that that's putting us over our limit by the end of the month.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, James. Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah. Thank you. Jothan Frakes, for the record. Yeah, so there's a variety of profiles of registrars out there. And for some, when you see this activity, it can be quite heavy amount of registrations and it's quite lumpy. I think not just in whether it's an individual registrant or if it's a group of registrars, it's going through resellers or in whatever profile it's going to look like, there is also something having to do with volume.

And the way that the AGB limits are right now, this is set up such that you do have sort of a threshold that you can work within. So we're talking about things where you have these bursts that

happen of bad activity. And what we're asking for here is to really create something that creates an incentive for us to take prompt action, and to have the collaboration, and financial incentive to do so with the registries rather than having to eat a rather large loss as part of combating this. And having to kind of grovel or beg under extraordinary circumstances each time is disincentive to take prompt action. If you heard James say that it takes often as long as seven days, even when you're validating a registrant. Often everything looks normal when somebody is submitting fake credit card information, they've gone to great lengths to do that.

So we are then in position of criminally gained funds, as is the registry. And in some cases where you've got publicly traded companies, you may not want to be in possession of that criminally gained funds. So we're trying to do things across the board to help the entire solution space. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Thanks, Jothan. In the interest of time, I'm going to close the queue on this one so that we can go to other things and we can bring all the stuff to the Contract—whatever the acronym is. I hate it when ICANN keeps changing them, especially when they are confusing to begin with. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. First of all, I would like to say that I support this conversation. I would like to raise two questions, however, that might be a bit controversial, just that we also think about them. First question: are we incentivizing the right thing? In many cases, we found that suspending a domain name is much more effective than deleting it because that takes that domain name out of circulation for a year. And the second part is: are we binding ourselves to the five-day timeframe? Because in many cases, we see the fraudulent registration pop back when the credit card chargeback happens, and that is weeks after the registration. Do we also get a recourse for that? Because that is the moment that most of us really recognize that the domain has been regularly registered by criminals. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Volker. And with that, I will pass it on to whoever is next. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Owen, and everyone. Really great discussion. I think that gives us a lot to dig into both at the summit and plenty to have follow-on conversations in the working groups afterwards because I think even the dedicated time at the summit is only going to scratch the surface of a topic that is actually richer and more detailed, as Graeme pointed out, and as Volker just kind of

teed up as well. So next, Catherine's going to lead us through a preview of the discussions on enhancing, improving the RRA negotiation process. And I got that acronym right finally.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Hi there. This is Catherine Merdinger, for the record, Name.com. So as I hope most of you know, when a registry wants to change their Registry-Registrar Agreement, the RRA, they have to go through a process whereby they submit the RRA to ICANN, and ICANN submits it to the Registrar Stakeholder Group. So the process has existed. There's about six of us in the RrSG that are paying attention to this. Generally speaking, registries only care about it when it's their RRA.

And so we wanted to use this time where we're all going to be together to talk about ways we can improve this process. And the goal is to have a conversation between registries, registrars, and the ICANN team who are managing this to say: hey, what is the process? What are the obligations? What is everyone's role?

On the registrar side: what are we looking for when we review it? Why do we need this documentation or to see this piece of it? And how can we work this process better? It's a weird process. Why? I mean, registrars don't get to negotiate RRAs but it's also weird that ICANN has to—that ICANN reviews them as in their role in the industry. And so we want to look at ways we can work more

collaboratively, have more maybe information exchange. And so we know we've seen a lot of RAA amendments come through this year, and so we'd love to encourage registries to come with pain points. This is what really sucked about working with the registrars, or ICANN, why do you do things this way? And we're hoping to figure out and kind of iron out some of these issues that maybe we can help overcome, or at least better understand the roles of each party and what we look at as important. So I'm not sure—oh, we've got a queue. So people have thoughts. Great. I'll turn to Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Yes. Thank you. I think this is a very interesting topic as well and probably also part of a larger discussion since in many circumstances, it always feels as a registrar that we are holding the short end of the stick. The registries have most of the negotiation powers and we have the power to approve whatever they put before us as a group. We don't have really negotiation powers. Why not? Should we have that? Should we have the ability to say you want this? Well, then you have to give us that.

I think why I say this is part of a larger negotiation and larger discussion, it's also—it's not just the RAA that affects the registrar-registry relationship. When a registry changes its backend, we have to suck it up as a registrar. We have to invest into our systems to match the new backend, to transform our databases

to work with that registry. Therefore, I think there should be an upside for the registrar as well, not just for the registry when they change the backends. Should we add that to the discussion here as well? Because it is an adjacent topic. Thank you.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Thank you. Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah, I just wanted to give an example of why it'd be helpful to have ICANN in the room. And while it hasn't happened recently, probably because it's such a well-oiled machine, now that Catherine's involved. But there have been cases in the somewhat recent past where things got complicated and the agreement had to go back and it got really unclear as to who was holding the ball. Was ICANN in charge? Was it back with the registry? The registry thought it was with the registrar. So nobody really knew where things were in the process.

So having something like a tracker that just shows who's holding one of the documents at that time, it could be something because for those registries, they want to get this thing done quickly. And sometimes they have timelines that they have to adhere to. So there's just lots of little weird things that could be improved. And that's just one of like, I think, a number.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Thank you. Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, thank you. So I also want to praise Catherine for her leadership and stepping up to volunteer to help lead this group. We have quite a lot as registrars that happens when we have backend provider changes and as well as some of the changes and evolutions that happen when RRA amendments come through. Some of the things that take longer to review are where we see big, whole cloth changes in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement—I'm sorry, the RRA.

So when you are submitting changes, if you can go through and redline specific elements, that's much easier for us to take and review. We also look closely at where there is price changes or price modifications and notice periods. And we are also watching very closely for obligations that are saddled upon the registrar for what our obligations might be that are being added as you're going through.

We are starting to see common patterns in what we have, and it looks like many of the changes that come through where consolidation in our industry is people at registries are wanting to kind of make what I call homogeneity of the agreement across all the different TLDs that they manage. So we really appreciate all

the efforts of the registries to make it easier for us to review. There is a small team that Catherine leads and within the registrars, we hope to have more of you where we take and review the RRAs. And many registrars are on their own to do that and should appropriately do that because your business is different, but we are often trying to just highlight to our members some of the things that they can comment on as part of the work that we do.

But it's a great team of people. We do want more of you as registrars to help participate in that. And registries, we're trying to make it go fast. We're trying to be as efficient as possible as we do this because we know you want to get along with your business. So thank you.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Thanks, Jothan. Michael.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Did the Internet hear that? Were we offline for a minute?

CATHERINE MERDINGER: I think they can hear us. Go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Mike Palage, FTLD. Two data points on this particular topic that FTLD has experienced over the last several years. One

of our frustrations or concerns is when we have submitted proposed amendments and registrars that are not offering our TLD object. Kind of bizarre. So that would be data point one. We'd like to make note.

The other point of concern—and this is directed towards ICANN—we've had situations where proposed language regarding our data processing agreement were rejected. And that seems to be inconsistent with ICANN's non-data controller role or whatever its current issue regarding controllership is. And that is frustrating to say the least. So those would be the two points that hopefully could contribute to this session.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Thank you. We definitely try and look at when we're reviewing RRAs of the magnitude or the number of registrars, number of [inaudible], because, unfortunately, that is a real... Like, I'm blanking on the word for it.

Also, this is Catherine Merdinger, Name.com. But it's things like if .com changes its RRA, it's through a different process, but that's going to impact a lot more registrars and a lot more registrants. And it's important to remember that when we review these RRAs, we're not just reviewing for the impacts to our businesses and the way we operate, but also to our customers. So if previously our customers were guaranteed a year in advance of price changes,

and now they're only guaranteed six months, well, that might not impact registrars that much given that everyone has to give us six months' notice. Our customers might really care. And so we're reviewing it also on that input.

So I'm hoping to dive into that kind of conversation of like, these are the things we're looking at and how we kind of balance these things of like, oh, this is a TLD with three registrars; none of whom maybe are in the RrSG and there's 100 registrants or something. And we try and keep that in mind. But we also know that it's our job to look out for all of them as well. And so if you have registrars that maybe don't mind about your RRA changes, we encourage them to participate because, otherwise, you are kind of stuck with whoever volunteers. And that's what we're looking at. That's why there's like six of us. It's the funnest group. Registrars, join. We don't –

MICHAEL PALAGE: And, Catherine, the word, [if you look at Alan,] proportionality of the comment is probably the word you were looking for.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: That's totally right. Thank you. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. Jeff Neuman. The other reason it's good to have ICANN there is an issue we've faced where there's required language by ICANN for data protection. And recently we've had as a registry, a registrar will come and say, well, we want you to update your data privacy to reflect the new UK rules and regulations. And, of course, the registries are put into a position saying, well, even if we wanted to, that's not in the model language provided by ICANN. And so having ICANN part of this discussion, perhaps we can understand better what is in bounds and out of bounds for making some of these very reasonable changes. It's just registries don't want to do it because it puts you in conflict with the ICANN template language that they gave you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: That's a really great point and something we've tried to hit on with every registry is consider adding the UK—not SCCs. I don't remember what they're called. Registrars would really like that and we will be happy to approve it. And I'm going to close the queue now so we can move on, but we'll go to Pam and Volker.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Catherine. Pam Little, for the record. I just have a silly question about this process. And I agree with Catherine, when I first looked at this, it really looks very weird the whole process in that folks will recall for legacy TLDs, the RRA is part of the registry

agreement between ICANN and the registry. For new gTLDs, it is not. So it is up to all registrars to sign up with this new gTLD registry operators. And we have so many in the 2012 round.

So it become very voluminous and a cumbersome process and burdensome for registrars. And in the future, we're going to have subsequent procedures. And presumably, I don't know how many new ones, maybe a couple thousand.

So I was just wondering, maybe folks understand this better in the history or the 2012 background. How do we end up having this arrangement where the RRA is no longer part of the RA, but then ICANN is still in a process? And is there a way of maybe making this RRA a standardized form? Therefore, potential new registry operators in the future can adopt the standard ones like the data protection template ICANN developed and then you don't have to go through that approval-reviewing process, sort of try to streamline. Maybe we can think about that even for the future round because I will hate to think we have to then review the future round another 2,000 new gTLD RRAs. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, Pam, that's a really good point. I have talked with the ICANN team about exactly that as we look for the next round and we are not thinking we're going to be able to cover that necessarily at the, whatever GDD is now called. But we are hoping to, in the

future, have those conversations about—okay, if we have a whole bunch of new TLDs, do they follow the same process? Do we have a new process? Do we harmonize the processes? How does it work? So thank you, Pam. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Yes, two points. First point to Pam's question. I've never really understood why ICANN never has to approve the initial RRA when it is first signed, but has to approve every amendment of that. That somehow does not make any legal or logical sense to me.

The second point, however, that was with regards to some arguments that I heard in the past with changes that are similar or identical to previous changes that we have accepted. Why are they taking so long? Why are you not accepting the same changes that you have accepted for another TLD? Well, not all TLDs are the same. Some TLDs are different. Some TLDs have very different customer circles and maybe a change to a .fun is of less importance than the same change to .bank or .limited or whatever. So there might be very good reasons why previously approved changes may not be approvable for other TLDs. Thank you.

CATHERINE MERDINGER:

Yep. And we're hoping to cover that at this meeting. So bring your thoughts and feelings, please.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah. For everyone who's continuing to be confused by the name, it's actually called the thoughts and feelings summit. It's going to be great, guys. I'm going to cry at least twice. I'm kidding. It's going to be called the Contracted Party Summit. We'll get there. We'll remember it at some point.

I'll also note—Karla can correct me if I'm wrong, but this year's summit is taking place in November because of both the kind of carryover from the Pandemic, and also the timing of this final meeting. But starting in 2023, we're looking to get back on the May, like kind of middle spring-ish schedule. So we're in a kind of cool position, an advantageous position where we will have two summits, not an entire year or more apart, or like we're hoping to. It's looking good. I'm getting the thumbs up on that.

So for all these items that we're seeing where we're going to start a conversation and dig into a conversation, but there's going to need to be a lot of carryover, at least we're going to have that opportunity. And we can look for ways to try to keep these conversations going in that six-ish-month period in between so that we don't lose momentum. Because a lot of these things we've been, I think, building up as needing to talk about for many months now. So the leadership and the planning committee will try to look for ways to keep things going in the interim because I

think these are really interesting and obviously lots of items to consider.

All right. Thank you guys both very much—Owen, and Catherine—for leading us through those previews. Thanks to everyone else for the good input. Next topic, we're going to hand it over to Beth for an update on the ongoing negotiations around the data processing specification.

BETH BACON:

Hi, folk. This is Beth Bacon from PIR. Just really quick update. We talked a little bit about this last meeting and we had noted that we hoped to be completed by this ICANN, and, shockingly, we are not. That never happens, right? We had some scheduling issues but we are looking to meet at the first week of October. We were trying to meet at this ICANN meeting, unfortunately a few people couldn't travel because they were ill, hoping they're feeling better.

But as a reminder, the DPS that we're discussing is simply the legal mechanism to transfer data. And it comes between registries, registrars, and ICANN, and it comes out of the EPDP Phase 1 requirements. So we were just simply trying to fulfill those requirements.

The negotiating team did hold meetings at ICANN74. And, again, as I said, we were aiming to get something done at this ICANN, but

we don't have all the appropriate folks in town and we're looking towards the first week of October. Currently, a small number of issues are outstanding. ICANN has made a proposal. We're looking to our registrar friends to consider that before we come back together as a team and move forward and respond to ICANN and I can just gently look at Catherine a little bit, who will cover that, I think, with the registrars. But we'll just take questions if you—Catherine, feel free, if you would like.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Catherine Merdinger, Name.com. I'll give a mini spiele. Basically, ICANN has proposed that we think we can set aside one issue on the registry side and potentially get a final version on the registrar side. And because there's kind of one big outstanding issue, that's just a question for the registries and we can get into more detail about that. And it's kind of a question of registrars. Are we comfortable with that? Do we want to do that? Is it strategically a good idea? So I think it's on the agenda for our membership meeting tomorrow and we can dig more into the details then and take questions about the—I forgot what it's called. DPS.

BETH BACON: DPS. I'm having such challenges.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: CPS and DPS. I've been mixing them up.

BETH BACON: Yeah. We're happy to take questions. Contracted Party Summit, Sam. Happy to take questions. I know this has been kind of a long complicated process and, again, we're just trying to close out the EPDP Phase1 recommendations, and as you guys know, it's after comment, get excited.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks, Beth and Catherine. Any questions or follow-up? Like Catherine said, this is going to be on the agenda in the registrar side for tomorrow in the registries. I'm sure we'll either get to it during our meetings here this week or during our next biweekly membership meeting—membership call following this meeting.

All right. I think that brings us to our last item for today. And that is just quickly kind of running through and doing a bit of a preview of our meeting that we have with the Board tomorrow. So what you'll see here on the screen, and I think we've each discussed this with the stakeholder groups prior to this meeting so hopefully this isn't new news to anyone.

The question we got from the ICANN Board is about what collaborative actions the community should be taking to

continue to further progress achieving our strategic priorities, which is a weird sentence construct, but I'll keep my thoughts to myself on that. So really just kind of yet another topic or question around this idea of priorities, trying to get things done within ICANN.

So what the joint ExComs had discussed was actually back and revisiting the priorities that we as the Contracted Party House had walked the ICANN Board through during our bilateral meeting at ICANN73, which is the one that took place in March of this year. And so that kind of covers a number of initiatives going on within the community, some of them inside the GNSO, some of them within the broader ICANN community that were in progress that we felt needed to advance if not kind of come to a conclusion this year.

So we thought about kind of, we'll go through and we'll touch base on a number of those. Those include things like the registration data policy, which has reached a milestone in finally going out for public comment just prior to this meeting. It also includes things like finally making some progress on the selecting the standing panel for the independent review process. That's like a big community-wide thing that has been making progress, but is going a little slowly.

So we'll kind of talk through some of those, touch base, get the Board's reactions or thoughts on some of the ones that are

especially still outstanding and still kind of need some additional work and hopefully kind of get their thoughts on where those can go. I think personally that grounding in this question in very concrete items will hopefully make for a more fruitful discussion than just keeping it really ambiguous and discussing the concept of priorities at a high level.

We also talked about the concept of like needing to talk with the Board about implementation of outstanding policy and review recommendations, especially implementation that has been outstanding for quite some time and making some progress on that. We actually had a pretty good conversation with Russ and his team, including Karen Lentz's team earlier this weekend about some of the work that ICANN is targeting for implementation starting at the end of this year and into next year. If you attended the GNSO planning meetings, working group meetings yesterday, Karen gave a good overview of some of the stuff that's coming up.

So I think some good progress there, but continuing to reinforce this message that it's time to actually finally get some things across the finish line and that that's going to be really important for the community as a whole, I think is it's to a good thing to continue to just reiterate with the Board and make it very clear to them that we're not going to let up, like we are all here to get work

done, and it's important to see things actually kind of finally reach conclusion.

Does anyone have any questions about this set of topics before we go into the CPH proposed questions? All right. I see Owen's hand and then we'll come to Donna's question in the chat. Go ahead, Owen.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: This is Owen. I was actually going to speak on behalf of Donna in the chat there, so I can read it for Donna. It says, "Is it possible to refresh our memory of what priorities we identified at 73?"

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yes, we can do that. We can send around an email to the respective stakeholder groups.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I have a memo.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I came up with two off the cuff, guys. But yeah, but yes, no. Great suggestion, Donna, we'll make sure that we circulate those. All right. Next slide. Okay. Here are the two CPH questions that were proposed. I'll let the original proposers of these two questions

introduce them. So first, Ashley, you want to go through the first one?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

I just hit my computer key like that was going to turn on my mic. Let me reopen that document. Okay. Yeah, so we have here the intention of this first question, which I'm realizing is kind of hard to get to the point because there's so many words, is kind of to go back to the Board, like kind of putting this question that they put to us kind of back to them in a different way and referencing the plenary that we had at ICANN74 where there was this whole session on who sets ICANN's priorities.

And if you recall, it was all over the place, the responses, which I think is kind of reflective of—there's still a lot of questions within the community as to who sets ICANN's priorities. There was some focus on this prioritization pilot that is going on. But I think what came across pretty loud and clear from my perspective was that a lot of work still needs to be done and creating processes to address other processes and then their processes is maybe not proving that effective. So it'd be helpful to see if the Board had any takeaways from that session. Where do they see the community in the next five years? Are we going to be in the same place where we don't really know what our priorities are, who is making them, and where are we in implementing them? And that

is basically it. So I will stop there, but I see Michael Palage has his hand up.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Ashley. I don't know when these were decided, but I thought Paul Diaz today asked a really excellent question during the Q&A session with the executive board about the repayment of funds and Göran's response was that's not an ICANN Org question but an ICANN Board. So I think, is there any way to potentially work that in? Because I really thought that was a really good pointed question, and Göran specifically said that's a Board issue. So perhaps add that?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: As another separate question or as part of this?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Well, so I would propose it being a separate question and if we're only allowed two, I would think Paul's is probably better than the five years that we're probably, you know... That would be my suggestion if we can add a third, add a third.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay. I think the issue is that we have to give the Board a heads up as to what questions we're asking so they're not taken off

guard. So it's not so much that we can't have a certain set number of questions, but they needed to be aware of them in advance.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Well, so given that, I would say that they were put on advanced notice on today's Q&A session. And I would just request that that be added as a third.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sam, as this is coming from a registry, I might leave that to you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: [I just came back in.] No, I'm kidding. let's see if we have time. Can you also—I noted there was a question in the chat, Mike, about like can you just clarify for folks what the repayment of funds means?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Oh, I'm sorry. So what Paul's question to Göran in today's earlier session was there was a reallocation of funds from the proceeds from the auction, 30 some million—I forget the exact number—that was paid to replenish the reserve funds.

So Paul's question was: you took the money and put it in the reserve funds. Now that ICANN's financial situation has improved, would it not logically be appropriate to take that money, put it

back into that fund from the auction proceeds so that it could, in fact, be allocated by the community? I thought it was a really good question.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay. Thank you. And I think part of the reason we were like; can we ask this as well? We just weren't sure exactly what it was referring to. I think it's probably reasonable. We can at least put it forth if they aren't in a place to answer it on the fly. We can always just ask to follow up via email on it. I don't think it's super unreasonable to add one.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yeah, thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay, cool. We'll add that one on. We'll just follow up with whoever is going to be running the slides for that session and we'll make sure that it gets on there. Alright. Any other? Crystal, I see your hand. Go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, Sam. Crystal Ondo, Google. I just actually want to say, I completely agree with Michael adding this. And maybe we can just ask Paul to ask the question if he's available, because the

concern I have is if—I get that the ICANN Board wants to prep the questions, but we're here on the ground and things do pop up, right? Like I would love to know where they stand on IGO acronym release. It's been a decade, right? Like there are things that came up in the last couple days during this meeting that make it hard to pre-plan for these questions. And I think having very specific questions like auction proceeds and reserve fund is actually more useful than having—I mean, do we actually think the Board's going to answer this in a way that we're satisfied with? I don't think so, but I would love an answer to auction proceeds.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I'm not going to make a prediction about that question, Crystal. But no, I mean, that is a very good point. I mean, I understand. It's a balance, right? Between wanting to give enough time to prepare, to hopefully have substantive answers to the questions we raise versus like we're meeting on day four of a six-day meeting. Things come up in the moment. And I think as long as we can have a little grace and flexibility about we're going to throw something out there late, if you can't answer it now we can always follow up. I think that's totally fair. So, yeah, we'll go ahead now that we'll talk to Paul about pitching it and being the one who actually tees up this discussion.

Also, that brings me to a point that I meant to say a little bit earlier. I think we have kind of a rough idea in our heads about

who's going to take what topic based on kind of who proposed the questions in the first place. But I really love when other members, especially aside from the ExCom, have the opportunity to talk and ask questions directly of the Board in these meetings. So we're always looking for volunteers, for people who want to lead a topic, want to introduce it and want to kind of follow up.

So if you're interested in that, please just grab Ashley or myself after this and we can make sure that that happens because they don't need to hear from the same people overall over and over again. I mean, we have a big membership and they definitely want to hear from you guys, too. Okay, Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Are we—sorry, Jeff Neuman. Are we on the second question or were you opening it up? I have a question on the second question.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Okay. Well, then why don't we have Alan? Oh, sorry. I thought I heard something. Alan, introduce it quickly and then follow-up?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Sorry. Before we get off the first one, I'm happy to ditch this question completely. This was more of an effort to have some questions given back to the Board because when we sought input

before we didn't receive any. So if we wanted to just get rid of it and replace it with the questions that are being proposed today, happy to do that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Anyone in the room have any strong—

CRYSTAL ONDO: I know staff is over there. Are they allowed?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: They're conferring amongst themselves. We're all looking at you. It's fine.

RUSSEL WEINSTEIN: Hi, this is Russell Weinstein from ICANN. I didn't listen to the question. I apologize. I was talking ...

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Oh, making lunch plans. That's fun. Do we want—I think the question at hand is, do we want to just ask this question? Do we think that the Board's going to have anything really concrete or substantive to say? And we're talking about question one on this slide here, which is not labeled. Number one is just the top bullet point.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Sorry. And more specifically, if we can change questions now, or if the Board would be aghast at process.

JEFF NEUMAN: Jeff Neuman. Just so you know, the GAC is working on what questions they're going to ask right now and they're submitting it. So I think we can do it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Well, they get to do whatever they want, apparently, but I'm not going to say anything.

RUSSEL WEINSTEIN: So as I tried to note to Sam. Absolutely, if you guys have a question, this is your time to formulate them and get them in. It's better it's easier for us as staff and Org and the Board to prep them in advance. But if you have a different question, you guys should use this time to have a good productive discussion with the board. The ask, I guess, is get it to us as soon as we can so we can get some notes. But I think this one really is a Board—I don't think the Org is going to do a lot to prep on this one. I think it's for the Board, just as Göran said in the earlier Q&A. So use the time as valuably as you can.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay. Thanks, Russ. So as we're kind of working this on the fly, at least let's start from a standpoint, like let's lead maybe with the question from Paul because it's going to be really concrete. It's a follow-up to a question that was lodged earlier. Let's maybe next touch on the question on the ODP, which Alan is going to introduce in a minute, and then we'll see if we end up having time for the priorities and reaction to the 74 plenary session. Oh, sorry. Was there a—sorry, I missed the chat. Was there a suggestion on IGO acronyms? Was there like a serious suggestion on IGO acronyms, Crystal? So, Crystal, do you want to be in queue during the session to like to ask that question?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Sure.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay. All right. New order. Paul's question. Crystal's question on IGO acronyms, question on the ODP. And if we have time, we'll go to this question, the top question on priorities. If we don't end up having time, Ashley has said she's okay with axing it so we can just always jettison in in real-time. Okay. Alan, you want to tee yours up?

ALAN WOODS: Sure. Thanks very much. Alan Wood, Identity Digital, for the record. This is actually a relatively straightforward question and it is more conversational in nature with the Board, noting the fact that the ODP is something that was created and put in thought to aid the board in order to come to a decision with regards to complex recommendations that are coming to them. Given the fact that we're over a year into the ODP processes and the two ODAs that—there were two ODPs in the ODA that we have: do they believe that it is actually performing the function that they expect it to? Are there any things that they would like to change in it? And just get their feedback into the process that they created to help them so that perhaps we can get a better understanding of whether or not it is working for them and can we help smooth or streamline if needs be?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Alan. Jeff, go ahead. You've been waiting patiently.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'm always patient. Thanks. So it's Jeff Neuman. Yeah, so it's not as straightforward as to ask him a question on this, because the only one that was complete was obviously the SSAD one. The ODP one is still ongoing and there's no ODA yet, and we haven't seen anything. So it's a little—if you want to ask just about the SSAD and did it satisfy that purpose, that's great.

The second question, though, on the SubPro ODP is Göran made this statement that it should make implementation of SubPro actually quicker. And I actually have mapped out the timelines and it's really almost impossible to even meet the exact same timeline as we did in 2007 to 2012, given that the ODP, the earliest vote on—sorry, the ODA will be at the earliest 24 months after the delivery of the recommendations.

So I'd love to be in on the second part of it. So the first part, you could ask like, did it serve the purposes for the SSAD? And then I'd love to be in the queue about the SubPro one and just seeing what their view is, or just bringing up the dates and having them understand that the ODP is not going to make implementation quicker than it was the last time around, in a nice way.

ALAN WOODS:

Thanks very much. Alan Woods, for the record, here. Yeah. I have no problem with that. I think the only counter I would have from that—obviously, what Göran said is the color to that particular statement. He said, I think that's an important statement to raise, but, of course, if you're doing a process by which you want to be more informed because of your duty, your fiduciary duty that you're trying to put into this process, chances are that might actually slow down as well. But again, Göran's statement there is probably the kernel of information that's very important there. So I think that's a good point.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. We are just at time and by that, I mean we're one minute over. Okay. We started two minutes late. It's fine. So any last questions or pieces of input on this last topic, and as we get ready for the conversation with the Board? I'm going to reach out to Paul and Crystal about getting written versions of the questions so that we can at least just have them available on the slide for the session. We just need to get that over to them as early as we can so that it's there for the other folks who are attending the meeting. And, Jeff, we'll have you on tap along with Alan to discuss the ODP question in general. Russel, did you want to get in? Yep, go ahead.

RUSSEL WEINSTEIN: Sorry, finish up on your Board stuff.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: That was it. I didn't have a closing.

RUSSEL WEINSTEIN: Again, Russell Weinstein from ICANN. Just another plug, we're happy to meet with you guys during ICANN meetings during our upcoming summit. But also we're always available to meet either as a whole CPH group to bring in ICANN staff, whether it's folks from Karen and Lars's team to talk through the policy roadmap,

implementation roadmap, or SubPro updates or that kind of stuff, or people from my team to talk about things going on. So just an open invitation to engage and collaborate with us on things. And don't feel like you have to wait for ICANN meetings or summits or any of that stuff for either both the stakeholder groups independently or together.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Russ. Also, sounds like Russ needs a friend, guys. Call him up. I'm teasing. I'm teasing. All right. I think we've reached the end of both our time and maybe my sanity. So we're going to draw to a close there, folks. Thank you all so much for the good discussion. If there's any lingering questions or carryover, we're going to have our respective membership meetings tomorrow after the meeting with the Board. So we'll have plenty more chances to talk about this substantive stuff throughout the week. Thank you all very much for being here. Thanks for the really great conversation and I'll sign off for now. Ashley, anything to close?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: What she said. Thank you.

SUE SCHULER: Please stop the recording. Just a quick reminder, we have a cocktail party this evening for the Contracted Party House at 5:30.

JEFF NEUMAN: And also, please remember to tip your waiters. And Sam will be here all week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]