ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: CSG Membership Meeting
Tuesday, September 20, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 KUL

BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Brenda Brewer speaking. Welcome to CSG membership meeting at ICANN 75 on Tuesday 20 September, 2022. Please note 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 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 this transcription is not official or authoritative. To view the real time transcription click on the closed caption button on the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency or participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions, using your full name. For example, first name, last name or

surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

And with that, I will turn the meeting over to Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Brenda. So my name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, I'm the chair of the ISPCP and so I do hope that more people are going to show up here. So I was also walking in first to the other room as usual to the GNSO, maybe there are others stuck in there.

So thank you for your participation, we have 90 minutes to go and the agenda is pretty full. I'm happy that we could manage now to have the people from the CFO area here, Becky Nash, Giovanni Seppia, and Victoria. And Xavier is supposed, well maybe he's also coming in later here. And we should have a lively discussion with them about the ongoing auction proceeds and also the pending prioritization, all are well known items to talk about and of high interest to us.

And later on we have an internal discussion about the SSAD pilot and the data acuity discussion. And last but not least, as you know, we will have a meeting with the board in the afternoon and it would be good well to spend some minutes in for last preparations that we put all in order what we have to say.

So, with that, I would like to invite our guests here for the first part regarding the auction proceeds. As usual, Giovanni, we were following that. We had also participants in the groups following that. But as usual, not all of us are really up to date and it would be good well get an overview of where we are with that, what is going to happen in future, what is needed in terms of cooperation in terms of, let me say, staffing teams if that is necessarily and so on.

So thank you. And with that, Becky, and welcome Xavier. Handing over to you, Becky, thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much. This is Becky Nash from ICANN. Org, I apologize for that, I've muted in Zoom. So thank you for the invitation today and we have two topics that we are going to discuss. So agenda number one is related to the auction proceeds, so I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Giovanni who's going to start with that. And then once that's concluded I will move into an update on the planning prioritization framework. Thank you, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Becky. So as you may know or remember on the 12th of June this year the board approved the 12 recommendations that are the recommendations made by the Cross Community

Working Group on the auction proceeds. And ICANN Org has started the work to implement the recommendations and we are now in the phase of drafting preliminary implementation design and plan that will be submitted to the board by mid-October.

And so currently we are in the phase of analyzing the recommendations and presenting a high-level plan. And afterwards, from mid-October, this project will be transitioned to the implementation operations team, which is the team that I'm leading at ICANN, and we will get into the implementation design phase. Meaning that we will analyze the different options for each recommendation and also the different elements that need further in-depth investigation before being implemented.

So therefore this is an ongoing work that we are running together with the team of Sally Costerton who has been leading on this project until now. And as I said, there are 12 recommendations that pertain to the way the auction proceeds should be managed, including the way the auction proceeds should be distributed, the way there should be a program with checks and balances, the way there should be some let's say faster follow-ups throughout the process to make sure that the proceeds are distributed in, let's say, respect of the full ICANN mission and principles.

So this is the status of the auction proceeds to date and I'd like to leave the floor to Xavier, who is going to complement what I just said.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Giovanni, I think that was very clear. I just want to make sure, Wolf-Ulrich, that we address any questions that there are on the topic as desired. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for this overview. I'm looking around whether there are specific questions with regards are you aware of the recommendations having put forward and if there is something to ask. I would have a question because personally I was a little bit distant to that. It is the question from an organizational point of view, how are you going to organize the entire thing for the distribution of the—I have seen that as a kind of group or service has to be installed, and how is that composed? And how is that cooperated within the community here? So maybe I'm wrong a little bit, I'm not very clear about that. But if you could shed some light on that, I would be happy. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, I'll try to offer a couple ideas and then you will ask if that's not addressing your question. So among the

recommendations of the CCWG there is one, for example, that suggests that the separate department of the organization should be managing this program. And that's a feature that we are working on developing as a result of those recommendations.

So from an operational standpoint within the organization there will be a department created for that purpose, with that sole purpose, and that will be managed within the organization with a dedicated staff.

Another feature of the recommendations which may be helpful to address your question is that it was very clear, not only within the CCWG but also within the board that the evaluation of applications for grants should be done by an independent panel. And that is, of course, also a feature that we are working on developing as part of the work that Giovanni described.

So The process at a very high level would be that there is an awareness of the program and the existence of the program that we do, that then we are able to collect applications, that these applications would be vetted in terms of are they consistent with mission? And then once they are vetted, they go to a panel that is independent and that we're going to create and form, and that will evaluate the applications and will then make a recommendation to the board for approval of the entirety of the applications that have been vetted by the panel or validated by

the panel. And that the board would make a single decision to adopt or reject the entire slate of applications.

The board will not make a decision on a single application by application basis. The board will simply say the process was respected and we approve the entire slate of applications that were selected by the panel, or we reject the entire slate of applications. But they will not make a decision on an application by application basis.

Just a couple of features that I think are important and visible, but happy to try to address any other questions on the overall process that are of interest.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for that. A question from Tim.

TIM SMITH: Just to pick up on what you're saying, Xavier, so accepting or rejecting the entire slate, does that mean that there will be a full complete disbursement of all of the auction proceeds at one time or not?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, the current structure that we're working on developing is one of cycles so that there would be a certain—And

this is another feature, and thank you for that question because I should have probably mentioned that one as well. That's another feature of the recommendations from the CCWG, is that the proceeds are disbursed in traunches, or in other words in small, small is not the right word, but in fractions of the total amount over time.

So we are working on a format of approximately an annual cycle that will be repeated as many years as necessary to basically distribute all the auction proceeds available for grants. And once that's done, then the program is finished.

And that's another direction of the CCWG, that this is not created as a permanent feature of ICANN, but only as a feature that enables to distribute all the auction proceeds available until there's nothing left and then the program finishes.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: We have another question from Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. If we are going to be disbursing in cycles, it means that there will be some form of evaluation taking place to ensure that subsequent traunches will be released. I believe that this will also mean that there will be need for additional

recruitment or setting up another team within ICANN to carry out such evaluations or will these be contracted out?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. In the recommendations from the CCWG there was one relative to reviews of the program. There's two types of reviews that the CCWG has suggested. One that is a little bit more operational after a cycle to evaluate how things have worked, if it's been effective or not. And one a bit more strategic after a few years to really check whether the desired outcome of this program has been achieved with the various cycles that will have been carried out by then.

So one a bit more operational one a bit more strategic. And how these reviews are carried out has not yet been determined. That's one of the many things that we need to design as part of the implementation plan.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks for that. I have a further question with regard to the timing. I don't know about that, do we have any expectation when the panel is going to be established, when they should take over the work? Is there a timeline for all these actions?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. So we're in the process of providing the board with visibility and feedback on the work of implementation so far. One step that will need to be carried out after that feedback is for the board to determine the level of prioritization of this project over other work that is being carried out by the organization and the community together.

So the timeline will depend on the board decision as to whether prioritizing or not this project over others that may be conflicting. In fairness, part of that decision will depend on the conflict of resources that there is or is not with this project and others. So if we have very dedicated and separate resource requirements for this project, then there will be less potential conflict with other work.

So that's something we're going to be evaluating as well. But we do not have at the moment a sense of timing until the board had expressed its decision on prioritizing or not this project. I can only say, of course, that if you read the action that the board has taken in June, is that there is a certain desire to get this moving in quotes. And without presuming what the next board decision will be I think that there is an appetite at the board level that this gets ongoing.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for that. And with that, I think there is no—Michael, please.

MICHAEL RODENBAUGH: I'm curious, this money was all collected 10 years ago, how much money was it then and how much money is there now that's set aside for this? And is there transparency or a report on that somewhere?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. So the first auctions were collected in 2013 and they went through I think 2016 of the 14 auctions that led to proceeds being collected by ICANN. Those funds, as they were collected they were segregated into investment accounts. So these funds have been invested as soon as they had been collected by ICANN. And they have never been touched, meaning we've never used any of those proceeds, with the one exception of the $36 million that were transferred from the auction proceeds to replenish the reserve fund of ICANN after the IANA stewardship transition. And that was in 2018 on the basis of a strategy of replenishment of the reserve fund that the board adopted.

So effectively, the proceeds have been depleted by that 36 million, have been increased by the interests produced by the investments over time. Knowing that these interest in return is

relatively small because it was invested in an extremely conservative manner on purpose, of course.

MICHAEL RODENBAUGH: So are the amounts reported somewhere?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sorry, yes, thank you. So every quarter, every calendar quarter ICANN publishes, my team publishes financials in which that information is displayed specifically. So that's what we call the funds under management, as part of this there's the auction proceeds, there's the reserve fund, there's the operating fund, and now there's this figure, which is a fourth fund that's been created. And every quarter we display the value of each of those funds and how the value of the preceding period of reporting.

Happy to share those links, it's on the financials page of ICANN. If you go on the web page, at the very bottom of it there's a list of links, there's a financial page. Within that page you will find those reports. I'm mentioning those quarterly reports, but it's appearing in the audited financial statements every year, it's appearing in the form 990, which is ICANN's tax return every year, and we mention it in about every presentation that we make on the financials of ICANN. So that's probably 10 to 15 occurrence per year where that information is published. CEO report has that

as well, recent announcement has that as well. So it's probably more than you need.

MICHAEL RODENBAUGH: Thank you. Yes, I don't pay attention to the numbers very much. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much for the discussion. And with your notice, Xavier, to the prioritization work of the board has to do so we are moving to the next part of the discussion here, prioritization.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I'm sorry.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's fine, Wolf-Ulrich. Xavier, yesterday in the executive Q&A session someone from the audience asked whether the current financial assets of the org are sufficient to replenish the auction proceeds for the money that was taken to fund the transition. And Goran interrupted to say that's not an org responsibility, that's the board since the board was the one who directed the disbursement to begin with.

So my question for you is if the board came to you and said, what would you say as the CFO about the financial soundness of

replenishing the auction proceeds for the money that was taken a few years ago? Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Steve. So first, so that everyone has the same facts, when the transfer was decided by the board in 2018 from auction proceeds to replenish the reserve fund, there was no discussion or provision taken to have these funds go back at any point of time in the future. So that was never discussed or set.

Having said that, your question is, if I understood correctly, and if I haven't, please let me know, how much or how sanded the finances of ICANN are at the moment, and whether that would enable or not or make possible a transfer back.

So I think that it's obviously a judgment question and it takes some evaluation. The organization has healthy finances at the moment and has had for a while. The pandemic has had a beneficial effect on the finances of ICANN simply because our funding has been steady, but our expenses have been lower because we haven't traveled. So the organization during the pandemic, including in FY22, has generated some excesses as a result of that.

The other factor that I would want to take into account in this answer is that the financial markets are extremely volatile and we've seen that, everyone, the world has seen that except some

bloggers apparently. But the world has seen that happening a lot and therefore there's a lot of uncertainty as to the financial markets. Our reserve fund is exposed to a limited extent to the financial market's fluctuations, and therefore that's a factor that I would want to take into account in evaluating a potential decision of whether or not we should transfer 36 million, or any amount of that, to the auction proceeds.

And I just want to flag that since this was never really planned for or discussed, the question of transfers between funds can be evaluated at any point of time. It's an ongoing exercise that the board carries out on an annual basis. Immediately after the availability of the audited financial statements the board, through the work of its board finance committee, reviews the levels of the funds and evaluates whether transfers of funds need to occur.

So for example, if the operating fund is higher than its target level, the board will evaluate whether some funds should be transferred to the reserve fund or to any other funds. So that's an ongoing consideration that occurs. I hope that helps. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, but by now I can prioritize my agenda items here, moving on to the prioritization. So I would say five to 10 minutes.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much. All I was going to do actually was just introduce you. So obviously we've got a number of the ICANN team here, Becky included. And I was just going to say we're really keen to hear from you and update on the prioritization effort. I had the pleasure of being the CSU's representative on the pilot prioritization work that happened this year and Wolf-Ulrich was the alternate. And so we're very keen to hear the update on that and what happens next for future years.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much, Susan. Hello everyone, again this is Becky Nash from ICANN Org Planning Department, and I am going to give a short update on the planning prioritization framework. And then we'll open it up for questions.

Just as a start I wanted to just highlight that the planning prioritization framework is one of the deliverables of the planning at ICANN operating initiative in ICANN's five year and one year operating plan. The framework is a project that is intended to serve as a guide for the prioritization process as a step during the annual planning process.

The planning prioritization framework describes and outlines what to prioritize, who will prioritize, when to prioritize and, again, the process on how to prioritize. We'd like to highlight that the framework was developed and is based on input received

from many public webinars, consultations with the SOs and ACs, and several hands-on working sessions.

In addition, we ran a pilot with members from the community that were nominated by the SO and AC leadership. And as Susan had indicated, from the CSG, both Susan was the member and the secondary member was Wolf-Ulrich. So this framework will continue to evolve as needed as we go through implementation.

Just wanted to highlight for background information that all of the information as it relates to the document that serves as a guide is on our planning and finance community wiki. And we also have all of the pilot presentations and recordings available there as well. And we will continue to update the community wiki as we move forward into FY24.

So this next slide is just a quick snapshot on the FY24 planning process and timeline. Just for the sake of time we like to highlight that we do plan over 15 months ahead of when the fiscal year is beginning and we have a process where we include all aspects of planning. But what I'd like to highlight for FY24 planning process, which is a timeline that is well underway right now. We had a kickoff presentation in the prep week and we are organizing the FY24 planning prioritization step.

As we speak now we've already received the nominations, which we have a slide on here. And we're in the process of organizing the webinars for that process.

One key item to note is that typically that would be several months earlier in the future years. This year with the implementation of the pilot we then are at the point where we are doing this before the draft operating plan and budget is published for public comment in the December timeframe. Xavier, please go ahead.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I want to compliment a little bit the information that Becky provided, and I want also to come back to Susan's point about the pilot. So remember, this was created so that there can be community input before we start planning. This is a new feature of our planning process. The planning process so far has been that the org produces a draft that is then offered for public comment to the community.

But when we produce the draft, the only thing we have been able to do by then is to interact with the community and collect informal input. The prioritization process is a formal phase that enables org to collect input from the community prior to developing the plan so that it can be taken into account into the plan.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

In other words, we're not blind anymore to what the community's priorities are, we have some input about it. I don't want to over emphasize that, and we'll talk more about it with Susan if that's useful. The prioritization group provides a community view, it's an individual input that is provided. When Susan and Wolf-Ulrich participated they, along with the other representatives of the SOs and ACs provided an individual input. But it's an input nonetheless that we can then take into account for planning purposes.

And the second point I wanted to make is to close the loop on the pilot to which Susan and Wolf-Ulrich have participated. The pilot was designed to review what the priorities should be for the review recommendations that have been adopted by the board. There were 45 recommendations that the group looked at. They were prioritized from the highest priority of urgency and importance to the lowest. And that became an input into org for planning purposes of the implementation work.

And now you have in front of you, the person who is in charge of that is Giovanni, he leads the implementation operations team. And since the outcome of the pilot with a list of recommendations, he has been working with all the teams in org that are in charge of the various aspects of the recommendations to develop a plan of implementation. While, by the way, a lot of those recommendations were already being worked on and that

work continued. So it's not like everyone stopped working while the planning was happening in Giovanni's team.

Giovanni, do you have any do you want to talk a little bit about that process and where we're at at the moment?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah, thank you, Xavier. I'll be very quick, as you said quite a lot already and I don't want to break the flow in Becky's presentation. So just to say that, indeed, implementation operations is working with the different departments at ICANN to ensure that we have an implementation design ready which includes an assessment of the resources, internal or external, that may be needed to implement the 45 recommendations.

Some of them, by the way, are in the process of being almost completed. And we have created a wiki space about the implementation of the prioritized recommendation, which we will update on a regular basis, including presenting the final, let's say, completion reports for those recommendations that are having their implementation finished.

And those 45 recommendations are coming from the four specific reviews, which are the accountability and transparency review, the ATRT3, the security stability and resiliency review, SSR, the registration directory service review, RDS, and the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review, the CCT.

And I spelled it out because yesterday there was this good comment during the public session between the executive team and the stakeholders about the fact that we use too many acronyms, which is true. So I'm spelling out those recommendation and reviews.

So we are working on those. And again, there is a wiki space that has been created. And we are in the process of moving forward with many recommendations as fast as possible. And I think the prioritization from the implementation perspective was really a great way to make sure that we are focusing on those recommendations that are really at the core of the community interest. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Giovanni. So just to highlight then the status of the next cycle for FY24 for this new step in the planning process, we received the nominations from the SO and AC leadership towards the end of August. We've listed here the members and the secondary members that were nominated by the SO and AC leadership. And again, we do want to thank all of the community members for their participation in the planning prioritization group. We have sent out a welcome email to all of the members and we are in the process of sending out a doodle poll for the planning prioritization meetings, of which the first one is always

an orientation or an overview of what the group's deliverables are to be and how the group should work together.

And then we are expecting to have up to a maximum of four meetings. At this time after the pilot, and again, all of the work that's progressing related to the output of the pilot, we are now focusing on all of the types of activities that are eligible for prioritization by the community lead group.

And just to highlight that type of work relates to board approved activities that are ready for ICANN Org to implement. And we are expecting that the members will then provide the output of the prioritization process to org by mid-October or no later than the end of October. And this then permits the org to ensure that this information is received as input in the development of the operating plans and budgets that go out for public comment in the December timeframe.

So again, we want to thank everybody for their support and their collaboration for this planning prioritization.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks very much, Becky. So I had a quick question, but I'll just see first if anyone else has got—Yes, Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, thanks so much. I'm not sure whether any of you have attended the meeting between the judicial council and the board this morning, but the council has suggested and I was tasked with presenting this view, a suggestion that we should try to do as much planning ahead during the PDP working group phase. Because what we see at the moment is that we need to do course corrections after the GNSO council has produced its recommendations.

And that's always difficult, because if you have something approved by the community, vetted by council and adopted, and then you need to go back and change recommendations or even abandon some of them, as we've seen with the SSAD, where we now work with far less requirements than originally, that's complicated. That doesn't make look ICANN good because the community recommendations, to a certain extent, are being thrown overboard, or at least there is a perception of that. So we've very much welcomed the suggestion of having a GDS liaison doing the working group's work.

And I'm interested in your views on how that would fit in with your planning to work in a very early stage, you know, the various departments that are required to be involved inside the org to look at what does a recommendation or does a concept mean, in

terms of financial needs, implementation efforts, timewise before the working group does its consensus call so that if there are red flags coming up, that the PDP working group would have an opportunity to do course corrections before there's a consensus call. And that would take away some of the burdens after the fact.

So hearing about your planning cycles 15 months early, would you be able to adapt to such concept and maybe plan financially and staff resources so that you can anticipate if we know the snake of the PDP life cycle, you know, you see when things are likely going to be matured enough to get to a council vote, that you then have sufficient resources available so that we don't run into this competition for resources in the org and make it easier for staff to cope with the workload?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Thomas. So just a preliminary comment, I think, that the GDS team that you're referred to, which is the global domain and strategy teams, who have the role of implementing policies once they have been adopted by the board. That group has, for a long time, witnessed and participated to the processes of policy development, but not necessarily with the formality of a liaison role as you described, which certainly can help reinforce the value that can be brought by that type of process.

So I think that that's definitely an interesting and potentially valuable improvement that can help the implementation considerations being taken into account early on during the development of the recommendations, which is your point.

I think from a planning standpoint, I think that the trigger would be that such a process is being defined and adopted, meaning the election in quotes or the appointment of a liaison from that team to the policy development working group so that that role is being defined, that role is being planned for, I think that then it will be, in quotes, the pipeline of policy development processes that is being considered by the GNSO or that are ongoing that will then lead the GDS team to be able to plan for the allocation of that one person, if it's one person, who is that is on to each PDP processes going on.

What we do at the time of planning, it's Appendix A or B in our plan.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Five year roadmap.

XAVIER CALVEZ: The five year roadmap that we try to display is intending to list of all of those PDPs going on, as well as reviews, as well as other community work usually that's visible to the entire community.

So that then we take that into account in trying to plan for resources. And if that process would be adopted, I think it's at that time that then the GDS team would say I need to make sure that there is one person assigned to each of those policy development processes to carry out the role of liaisons.

So that's the way we would carry it out. I'm not worried, in quotes, that this would be such a voluminous amount of people involved in the process from a GDS standpoint that they could not adapt or move around a little bit the responsibilities to be able to carry out that role. But certainly, the more heads up there is at the time of planning, then the best it is to be able to make sure that there are people who can do that.

So I think that knowing in advance what that role is and how it would be carried out, and then knowing the roadmap of PDPs going on, whether existing or planned for, the earlier we know that the easiest it is then to allocate resources to those.

THOMAS RICKERT: Just a quick follow up, for full transparency I should note that we only received this document guidelines for the GDS liaison to PDPs like 24 hours ago. So council didn't have an opportunity to discuss this yet. But I think that ideally this person would be attending the PDP group and get all the infrastructure lined up in parallel already, to not only inform the PDP working group during

its deliberations, but also be on standby and ready to start the implementation if and when the consensus call is done. Because the board, as it does today, will also ask what is the impact of us adopting this, as you do for public Interest considerations for example, so that we can maybe win some time there.

Because I think it's an unfortunate trend that we see so much delay in getting the policies on the ground after they've been adopted for various reasons. And this is not blaming anyone, but it's just a statement of fact and we all need to jointly look for ways to be more efficient in getting policies implemented. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Can I? Thank you. I think, in bringing up the topic earlier, you were mentioning the SSAD as being an illustration of challenges. I think it's a very good example of a policy that was developed by the community on which the organization worked to give an attempt at what could it look like if implemented, shared back with the community and the GNSO who developed this. And the group then determined itself, and I know you were a part of those conversations, but for everyone else that may not be the path.

So I think this is a very good illustration of the fact that policies at ICANN apply themselves to issues that are complex and difficult. And progressing through what the ultimate solution is, it may not always be a straight line and may take some iterations. I think this

one is actually, in my mind, a good illustration of the value of the collaboration between the working group that developed the recommendation and the implementation team to say if that's what you meant, this is what it would look like.

That may not necessarily have been what the group originally intended, but seeing how it could be implemented and what the implications of that would be was helpful to the group to then iterate and change its recommendations. Which I think is actually demonstrating the case of having an implementation perspective and input at the time of development of recommendations would be helpful.

By the way, Giovanni and I are thinking about the exact same thing for reviews, because that's the same type of challenge and same type of need. And definitely think that would be absolutely helpful. I think the SSAD, to me, is a very good example of actually good collaboration and iteration in changes of adaptation, basically, of the policy recommendations on the basis of having tested that it could be difficult, or long, or ineffective, or costly, and then revisiting the policy as a result.

And it does take time, to your point. I definitely think that inserting the resource to help with implementation insight up front, the earlier possible, great. I would be very mindful and very cautious in suggesting that while the policy work is occurring the

infrastructure to implement the future outcome of that policy is already being put in place because we don't know when the policy will effectively be done, we don't know what the outcome is during that work. And therefore putting in place an infrastructure that may become obsolete by the time that the policy becomes effective for implementation would seem to me a risk of a big waste of time and money. And we don't want to have people sitting waiting for something to happen that will happen only a year or two or three years later.

If I take the example of the auction proceeds, Sebastian was saying yesterday that there was two and a half years of community work, there was actually five years of community work before the recommendations were submitted to the board. And why? Because it takes time to develop. And the outcome, both in terms of timing and of nature of that outcome is difficult to predict, of course, very early on in the process and throughout the process.

And take the SSAD, we could have said you know what we're going to put in place the infrastructure to develop the SSAD as we are designing it and before we even provide feedback to the community. And then to find out that this is not the right way to go and then we need to change course, and we now have the WHOIS disclosure system, which is a lighter system. If we would

have started the work, we would have wasted our time and money.

So I think there's a balance between starting early and not wasting resources. And it's never an easy exercise, it's more an art than a science. And I think it's something simply we need to be very careful with.

THOMAS RICKERT: Can I do a quick response to that?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Very quickly, we have to look at the agenda:

THOMAS RICKERT: I'm sorry for making this such a bilateral thing now, but had the EPDP been in the position to receive early input on the implementation, we wouldn't have gotten into the mess that we're in now. And I guess that's my point, that had we received an implementation preview during the working group's deliberations, had we known that this is likely going to be a three digit million figure to be implemented, we would have seen different recommendations.

And my suggestion was not to have staff sit by and wait, but to plan for the human resources, the technical resources, the

licenses that might be needed so that we can then move to implementation quicker. And as some of you might remember, I still feel guilty having caused such a mess with the IANA stewardship transition CCWG recommendations that you're still grappling with. And had we had such implementation preview at the time, I think we would have probably seen less recommendations and works from two in particular, and ones that are easier to implement.

So I think that you can't change this overnight, but I think that that we need to up our game in terms of the quality of the recommendations that come out of the GNSO, and we need your help in doing a thorough planning for that.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. To just close it at that, early collaboration to ensure more effective recommendation development and implementation, no question about it, it is a good thing. And I think if everyone is willing to make it happen, it will be a good experience in development and improvement.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: But I have to say, Thomas, that also I need to discuss it in the GNSO, how the PDP is going to be developed itself and which items are going to be prioritized within and EPDP. Okay, that's just my take here. Okay, thank you very much. Becky, Xavier, and

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you very much for the opportunity.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: So let's move on with the agenda. We have to cover SSAD, a discussion and data QC. So we have still to go a little bit more than 25 minutes, I think. So let's move on.

SSAD pilot, who has a lead here? BC?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Within CSG we do have a division of opinion on much of what led to the SSAD. The four counselors from the IPC and the BC voted no on the SSAD because we knew that it did not compel a response, a disclosure response, even a mechanism by which we could automate disclosures with legitimate basis from accredited requesters. Thomas and Wolf-Ulrich, IPC voted yes for that SSAD recommendation when it came out of counsel.

But the IPC and BC nonetheless participated in the SSAD small team where I represent the BC. And in that small team, we know that that is not an opportunity to suddenly make disclosures mandatory. It is not, it was a reaction to the ODA that showed it

was phenomenally expensive to build what the SSAD was purported to request.

So we have done our best, I think, and been very active on the small team to try to focus on things that would make it sufficiently valuable for requesters to use it and for registrars to use it, because all the participation on both sides is entirely voluntary.

Over the weekend, when the small team met and discussed it with staff, I raised a concern that was embraced by all. Thomas, I think you also agreed, staff had come up with a recommendation that requests that were made of a domain for which the registrar had not yet opted in to participate and look at the system would be discarded. And I objected to that. Steve Crocker, Sebastien Ducos, the chair, immediately agreed. I don't believe there was anyone in the room who thought that staff had that right. And I'm anxious for staff to revise. They're not going to do it over this week, right? But that needs to be something I'd like to see us have consensus on.

And that might be the key discussion to have with the board today, is to suggest that there's a growing consensus that that is there. It is essential, as an incentive for requesters, to know that there's at least a chance that their requests will get routed, even only by email, to registrars who choose not to check the database, check the ticketing system. And there's a need for us to

see that the requests will be logged and retained such that they can be mined for data later on to see the nature and quantity of requests that come in. And the quality and speed of the responses, whether it's ignore, delay, or respond disclose.

So there's a document underway right now, a homework document, the BC and the SSAC have started to put comments in to that effect, what I just described. But there are many other questions in there, none of which we're going to get into with the board today.

So my proposal would be that it's a brief discussion with the board and it could potentially be done under the board's suggested ODP topic. And we would want to reiterate much of what Sebastian said to the board two hours ago when council met with the board. And I think that the underscoring of that is the reason why we think they need to be retained even if the registrar is not looking at it.

Goran this morning made the statement that any changes will cause it to cost more and take longer. And as a lifelong programmer, I'd love to suggest that retaining requests that have been filled out does not cost anything more. Sending the email might cost something more, but we'll ask staff to be responsive and serious about this and not just assume that any changes to

their draft document mean this is going to take longer and cost more.

So with that I'd love to take questions from CSG members. We may not be of one mind on SSAD, but I hope that we can be of one mind that SSAD lite is useless if it doesn't retain all requests that come in. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much. Just for my understanding, Steve, are you asking to [inaudible] that point later on with the board on this item ODP process?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Under ODP the board has SSAD. They ask about SSAD explicitly, and I would want to weave our response into that by suggesting the good part of SSAD. And we're very happy with what staff has done, but when staff comes back with a draft and we point out some things that missed the mark, that they should then, in the same spirit, come back very quickly and not try to punt it into something that's bigger and more expensive.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thanks for clarification. Thomas, you want it?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, I very much agree, Steve. I suggested on a couple of occasions that the registrars and registries should commit to using the disclosure system, at least for those requests where they have a choice. For 61F requests they can say, I'm not going to respond to this directly unless you go through the central system. For law enforcement requests where they have an obligation to respond, they can't push the requester somewhere else. But for the requests where they have a choice, they should be doing that.

Becky Brewer has spoken to this point earlier. And just as a heads up, if we ask for staff to make corrections to its paper, I think Becky would take the mic and say, okay, you as a council have to do your homework and do a PDP. That's what she suggested, a consensus policy requiring contracted parties to use that system or do a contract change. And I think that's something that we should prep for and have an answer to, would we endorse a PDP?

I think putting a PDP in the middle of this would just be a distraction and take more time. So I would suggest that at least as a first step, we try to take a collaborative approach with the contracted parties and ask them for a commitment for their members to point to the WHOIS disclosure system. Because contract changes are going to take ages, a PDP is going to take ages, and I'd like to get this on the ground as soon as possible. And if you have other ideas to expedite this, bring them on.

LORI SCHULMAN: Am I next? You pointed to me, I'm sorry.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: She was raising her hand and then [inaudible].

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you. I just want to back up what Thomas is saying. I agree, I think putting the PDP in the middle of this, huge mistake. And I also think, though, that perhaps the voluntary—And I want to ask a clarifying question about what you just said, Thomas. When you say that we engage with the contracted parties and get them to do this, do you mean without any sort of legal obligation to do it? Or do you mean perhaps agree to maybe it's an adjustment to the temp spec itself, not to the main RAA. But just add on to the temp spec saying this is now a new criteria in the temp spec without opening up the main document.

That's how I would see this going. I mean, I think if we approach volunteer—We'd like to get you all on board, we're still stuck with the voluntary nature of this and I don't think that's acceptable to most people in this group. But perhaps if we added a clause in the temp spec, that could be a way to go.

THOMAS RICKERT: Lori, I think the temp spec can't be changed, it was an emergency decision that could be taken by the board at the time, I think they can't easily change that. I think that you're right, that purely voluntary approach might be too weak. But even contract changes with the contracted parties will take ages. So maybe we can think of something innovative and say, okay, we all plow forward and advertise the disclosure system, and maybe have a have an MOU between the various groups to endorse this.

LORI SCHULMAN: I want to respond if you don't mind. We need something with legal teeth. And so my question would be, I agree that the temp spec was done on an emergency basis, but the fact is that this expedited process has taken literally years. The temp spec has already been extended, why isn't the emergency still ongoing? I mean this has now gone from acute to chronic, but I would still argue it's an emergency.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: First Steve, and then you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: When I push back on staff on the degree to which current policy, our contracts would require registrars to respond. Staff said any requester can complain to ICANN compliance if your request is

ignored, delayed, or denied. Under the interim policy or temp spec registrars must provide, quote, reasonable access to registration data in response to requests.

So any requests sent by the system could be the basis of a complaint. I press back on whether ICANN compliance staff would allocate any money to watch the system, and the answer was probably no. So we would need to use the system, gather the data on requests that are ignored, delayed, or denied, and then feed that into compliance. Compliance can then hold them to that obligation.

But let me add this, this is in the report and I circulated this over the weekend. The removal of the temp spec in favor of the EPDP IRT implementation will change the obligations for registrars. The registrars will not be required to use a system that doesn't match with their preferred format of the data feed. That's part of the SSAD that council voted to approve.

So if that got implemented, that policy change, then it would be even more difficult to require registrars to use it, because it requires manual use. There is no API, there's no automated interface to the request system yet.

So that's a little more complicated, Lori, but the first answer is yes, there is a compliance leverage to use the system because they have to provide reasonable access.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. First don't forget to say your name, please.

BRIAN: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. I'd like to make this a lot easier. The paper contemplates that this would flow through the contracted party naming services portal, the NSP, and all registrars are in the NSP. So I'm not buying the concept that they would need to proactively sign up or be legally obligated or morally persuaded to sign on to the system. Why –

STEVE DELBIANCO: They have to opt in to accept the terms.

BRIAN: The terms of the NSP? Well they already have because they all already use it. What terms though? Because they're not obligated to anything, right?

STEVE DELBIANCO: They haven't published it yet, but they will develop those terms and the terms will be necessary for us as requesters and them as registrars. It's a ridiculous notion, the fact that you wouldn't use it or wouldn't participate because by not participating you could you could ignore it, really, and none of the requests would be

logged. But I think we can solve that, we have consensus to solve that

BRIAN KING: This is bewildering. If that's what's going to stand between all registrar's having access to this and requests going to all registrars, scrap the terms. Why are any terms necessary at all if this is completely optional and ICANN is just sending requests through with no contractual teeth or obligation, even for the registrar to use the system to look at the requests or anything? They're being sent in the system, there's no obligations on the contracted parties. It's bewildering the terms would stand in the way of having this go to all the registrars.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The staff came up with that on their own and I believe they retracted and fixed that. Nobody in Saturday meeting, none of the registrars said that they needed that revision. So we might have solved this and don't need to go that route.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. Any further comment? Marie, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I'd like to come at this from the opposite angle, Steve. Because what I heard a lot about over the weekend was that this is not for us as requesters. This is for Joe public as requester. And so two things on that. One, they were talking on, forgive me, I think it was Saturday, it might have been Sunday. One of those days they were talking about the idea that you had to have an ICANN account to use this. I personally don't believe that Joe public knows that ICANN exists, let alone that they need an ICANN account.

But secondly, your point just now that you can take a complaint to compliance, can anyone in the room tell me if Mr. And Mrs. Joe or Joanne public have ever heard of the idea that they can take a complaint to ICANN compliance? And I, personal level, I just don't understand why, how would they building a system where they're specifically saying that we, the people in this room, who I would assume are going to be the main requesters, are not actually being regarded as the requesters. It's going to be, as I say, Mr. and Mrs. Joe and Joanne public.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. The statement was thrown out that we wouldn't be the key, because they kept claiming that the primary beneficiary of the system would be requesters who have no idea who to go to so they go to a central system, uses RDAP, tells them

who the registrar is and routes it. So they don't have any relationships with registrars are registries, they don't know much about the system, and they have a place to come.

And while that is true, that doesn't mean we can't use it, Marie. It didn't mean it wasn't for us. It meant that the primary benefit of central is for people that don't know the ICANN system. But if you're a professional consumer protection or IP lawyer, you know where to go in terms of the registrars who will respond. But for registrar's that you don't know and don't have a relationship with, you may use the ticketing system.

I, for one, might encourage the professionals to use the system so that we can accumulate the data necessary to show that a lot of requests are coming in, they have legitimate basis and they're being ignored. That data can be helpful, particularly if NIS2 were to be implemented, transposed by a country or two.

So this is not solving our problems. And if you want to find deficiencies in the SSAD, we don't have enough time to do that today. It is deficient. Is it better than nothing? Is it going to get approved whether we like it or not? Yes, on both. So see if we can make it better.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Steve. Any further comments or questions? Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Sorry, I'm getting confused between Zoom and the real room. It was just a really quick question about the technology or the ability to send the emails. It already exists, it's already being used by the naming service portal for other purposes.

So for example, when they first adopted the new naming services portal for gTLD registries, which happened before registrars, they all had to sign up to the terms and conditions. And I know personally that a number of our clients, it took them a while, either they were not paying attention, or not focusing, or not giving us instructions to sign up, or didn't like some of the terms and conditions and didn't want to sign up. But for those clients we didn't have no access to the new customer interface. We just couldn't do it through the naming services portal. Instead, the system would send us an email telling us what was in the portal.

The technology is there. It's clearly not difficult to build.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. So is there something from that discussion you would like to take to the board discussion this afternoon? So is it a common sense call on that, please.

BRIAN:	Yeah. So I think the takeaway that I've arrived at here is that this is a lot easier than what the staff paper makes this out to be. And we're not asking for more, maybe we are in a different sense in different areas. But visa vie, having all registrars be able to interface with this, this is a lot easier than what it sounds like we're making it to be because they're already in the NSP, even if they don't want to agree to terms of using the NSP for this an email can automatically be triggered. I wonder if the policy staff has a technical understanding of the way the NSP is structured and works today?
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Yeah, read the paper, they do. They do, but they just, as a policy matter, said that we're going to ditch a request if the registrar hadn't been participating. That was a policy decision. Technically, it isn't NSP, they're using salesforce.com, right? So they already know all that.
WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:	Okay, Thomas?
THOMAS RICKERT:	I had to put myself back in the queue. I think we're having two discussions here and I was speaking to something different. It's one thing whether the contracted parties are going to use the

system by accepting the terms and all that. My point is, at the moment a lot of requesters go directly to the contracted party.

And we know that the two main former WHOIS customer groups are law enforcement and rights owners. So if we don't get the contracted parties to push that customer group to the central system for this pilot there were almost no use. And then we can ditch it straight away because we're going to have figures so low that nobody can justify the investment into a better system.

So my point is not that they use whatever system or agree to whatever terms, although that's an issue. So I don't want to play that down, Steve. But my issue is that we need the buy-in of contracted parties of not processing requests unless people go through the central system because that's the only way we get high usage and an accurate display of the demand in the market.

So if we want that, then we need to push for both aspects, Steve's and the point that I just made.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN   And that is a point we have to discuss next on Thursday, with the contracted parties, isn't it?

STEVE DELBIANCO: The small team is not going to even deal with whether or not this technology would force them to use it. That isn't going to be part

of the discussion, the small team is not making policy. And we have said all along in the BC, and IPC has agreed that the benefits to the requesters are so low that it's not likely to have significant use. But if we fail to log and retain all valid requests, you can pretty much guarantee there wouldn't be any use at all. But we have said at every step in SSAD, Crocker has backed us up too, that there aren't sufficient incentives to use the system as it's being policy driven today. Not the technology, but the policy part.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: So this analysis should be given. Very last point, yeah.

LORI SCHULMAN: I want to keep emphasizing this, because it's a bug and it's driving me crazy. We need to rename it. And there is something that matters in the name. This will never work from even a marketing perspective if we keep calling it a disclosure system. For that reason alone it is a request system, full stop. I am so wedded to this argument and I've got agreement from the board, I had a million high fives when I mentioned it in the—Not a million, there aren't a million people here, but you get the point.

There was a lot of enthusiasm for this because I am just tired of the new speak or the twisted speak or whatever you want to call it. Let's get behind something that tells the truth. This is a request system, it may enable disclosure, but it is not a disclosure system.

It's a very important point and it's one I really don't want to back down on. The name matters. And IPC, BC, branding matters, this matters.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Your you can take up all these points to the discussion with the board. The goal should be that the board takes it well in order to push ahead towards your organization. So that's what you can do. Well, I'll leave it that this point is to be discussed when the ODP came up with the IPC, but all of you will chime in in the afternoon. Thank you for that.

Let's move to the next point, a little bit connected to that is data accuracy discussion. And obviously, I have Lori and Thomas here. Who would like to go first?

LORI SCHULMAN: I don't mind starting. Do you mind if I start, Thomas? Yeah, and then you can fill in. I don't have slides, I didn't prepare slides. I Just have a generalized discussion. I know on the IPC side, we have been sharing information in the meetings and a little bit on the list and our input into the homework has been shared as well to IPC members anyway.

And to let people know what we did throughout the last year is the IPC hosted homework sessions for those interested parties

from the BC the ISPCs, ALAC, SSEC, and the GAC. So we had joint homework sessions for the past year to help fill in what was, at times, a substantive amount of homework.

That being said the report for the first—There's four questions to remind everybody, and Thomas, this is where you might correct me on the exact wording of the questions because probably I should have created a slide about that one.

So question one is what is the current definition of accuracy? The team didn't really get down to—The most we could get to is what is the working definition of accuracy that the contracted parties are using? That's kind of where we went as opposed to an accepted holistic definition of accuracy. So that was question one.

Question two was, where are the gaps? Where are the information gaps that exist in terms of looking at how accuracy is measured, what data we have, what data we need? Here, I think, there was, if not agreement on outcomes, absolutely agreement on the state of play in terms of data.

In terms of whether or not there was an accuracy problem, we really don't have current data. The studies that were done by ICANN go back many years, WHOIS has been redacted. There's been issues of what kinds of information ICANN can request, how

data will flow between the contracted parties and ICANN, and we're sort of in a black hole for data.

So there, I do believe there was consensus that we need more information. That surveys that were done prior to the implementation of GDPR might be helpful to outline where we were, but it really doesn't give us any idea, although we suspect there's still problems. That was question two.

Questions three and four will be asked in the second half of the work of the team. And question three would be what accuracy should be based on what the working definition is today, what data we have, what do we think accuracy should be? And question four, how do we get there? What are the questions that a PDP team should truly be looking at to get us from point A to point B?

A report was submitted to the GNS's council, I believe two weeks ago, that have the conclusions from questions one and two. Three recommendations, there was a lot of discussion about the recommendations. One recommendation is to do a registrar survey to see what techniques they're employing now to verify accuracy.

The second recommendation was to pause any of the work or questions that would involve the transfer of personal data between ICANN and the registrars and registries. It was noted

many times throughout the discussions that the absence of a negotiated data policy between ICANN and the contracted parties really makes this work impossible. And we certainly don't want to be spinning our tails without a good data processing agreement and understand what the rules of the road are.

There's also a note that data protection impact assessment must also be done in connection with any data processing agreement that is negotiated. So we've got a lot of details to iron out in terms of transfer of information, that was abundantly clear.

And thirdly there was a suggestion, and this is something that the IPC very strongly supported, that there are other means of measuring accuracy and look into what those means are that do not require the transfer of personal data.

And one of the things that the IPC had proposed and had general agreement from the rest of the CSG is that we had proposed what I'm calling pretexting other people calling synthetic data, where we create a certain statistically relevant number of basically false registrations. Registrations that are put in a system and we follow these registrations without any intent to operationalize them on a website, because that's not required, to see whether or not this information is being verified in the way that the registrars and registries are reporting it.

And ICANN's initial response to this policy recommendation was, well, we're not going to do that at all because the RAA prohibits the inputting of false data, full stop. This is a strict prohibition. I'm arguing something a little different, that the prohibition was written with the prevention of domain name abuse in mind. That when looking at the purposes and intentions of the drafting, you could certainly argue that this is fulfilling a purpose by looking at accuracy, which is a key component of the reliability of the information that's in the system. And it's in fact, serving the same purpose to make sure systems are in place that prevent fraud and abuse. And that I don't think we need to go to the four corners of the document to find a way to make this pretexting work.

I will let you know that a member of the IPC has already reached out to an American university who has expressed interest in perhaps designing this type of a study and creating a proposal that we could then present to the community. However, we're in very, very, very preliminary discussion, so I really can't say any more than that. But we are listening.

Members of the GAC has expressed support for this study, SSAC seem to think it might work, of course we supported it. So I'd like to see if we can actually put proof of the pudding and get a proposal that the people might be willing to live with.

And that's, I think, it, Thomas, for now. I mean, the report is in the hands of the GNSO. We're waiting to hear their reaction, hopefully they'll have good questions, and then we can continue on with the work. Also, if you had not heard, Mike Palage has stepped down from chair and they will be looking for a new chair. Olga Cavalli times out as well, she had been the vice chair and so they need to find new leadership.

I am stepping down as a representative of the IPC, we've already though filled the spot. My replacement will be a relatively new IPC member with very good knowledge of the industry and enforcement practices. His name is Marco Martinelli, from Thomsen Trampedach and Matt Swartz from the App Association will also be serving as the IPC alternate, and Scott Austin will remain as a negotiator. And, Thomas, again, feel free to fill in or ask any questions.

THOMAS RICKERT: You did great, just one small addition. At the moment we're focusing on things that we can do without personal data being transferred, but ICANN is liaising with the European Data Protection Board to see whether there are ways for ICANN to obtain data to check accuracy, do audits and the like, but that's not under our control.

LORI SCHULMAN:	Yeah, I would comment that a letter was sent asking for assistance and providing a scenario and a use case, but we haven't heard an answer. And the problem is that this ongoing discussion about whether or not the commission will assist in getting answers from the European Data Protection Board has been discussed for the last two years with ICANN. So we didn't want to slow down our work based on the letter, but at the same time, having that direction will be super helpful. So this is why thinking out of the box, trying to figure out ways to assess data without using personal information is the path we'd like to go on so that we can keep the work moving.
WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:	So thank you for that detailed presentation. Thank you, Lori. So what I've learned over the last days and heard is it might be, you mentioned that Michael Palage is stepping down, it might be not easy to find a successor. So there is not a lot of people queuing up for that position.
	So is there any idea from this group also how we could help? Or is there a sense in the group that's saying okay, we are not of that use, which you have expected now to have for—How is the feeling here in the room about that? Is there anything?
	Well, if you would like to continue, you need a leader. So is it up at first to find the leader and then establish a group or really and

continue with that? Or is it right now to say that this group which is existing, is now going to continue on to find a leader by themselves? How does this work? If there's a problem, Lori?

LORI SCHULMAN: The intention now is to find a leader. I haven't heard any other— Unless Thomas has heard something differently, that's what I'm hearing, we're going to find another leader. But I agree it will be difficult. I will say that working with this group was as polarizing as almost any other group that has looked at anything related to registration data. I mean, it's difficult, it's not easy work. But at the same time, I think where we have consensus and where there's a great deal of welcome unity on this issue of what are the rules of the road for data transfer.

Now, I know we have an open comment period for data transfer policy, it's possibility looking at that policy, perhaps some of the learnings and work that we've already done in accuracy can be infused in the comments, that might be very helpful to how I move forward in terms of understanding data transfer.

In terms of leadership, I will say one of the challenges Mike had— Mike is very knowledgeable on this issue. I mean, he knows a lot about it technically. He also has ideas of what he thinks may or may not work and it was very difficult at times to hold back from advocacy versus facilitating work. And I think any chair is going to

have that challenge. And I think that's what's going to make this hard to fill.

However, I mean, if there's someone in the ICANN community doesn't even need to have that depth of knowledge that Mike had, but has a really good experience at facilitation, I would argue we need that more because there's so many people on the group who have deep technical knowledge. And we've got good participation from Dr. Crocker, who knows how things work, as well as members of the contracted parties.

So we're going to think of possible replacements that we want to propose. I think that the biggest characteristic would be who can be a good facilitator.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. I wish you success in that. Thank you. So we have just three minutes to go. Briefly, we touched on the preparation for the board meeting on some items already. Is there something to add, Mason, from your side here for this round with regards to the DNS abuse point or—

MASON COLE: For the board meeting?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: It's just a question as for the board preparation, so something to disclose here in the room?

MASON COLE: No, I don't think so. We've got some specific questions for the board that we're going to pose on DNS abuse. It's on the agenda and I think we're ready for that discussion.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I think we are now prepared for the board meeting, we won't have to talk about it any more. What I would like to add—Or is this a question with that?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, just briefly. Mason, we've exchanged emails on the questions and how we're going to approach this. There was one aspect on initiatives outside ICANN and I'd like to just share during our discussion that [inaudible] whom I represent, we're going to have a workshop with the European Commission in November in Brussels to discuss the recommendations coming out of the DNS abuse study. So I will keep this group apprised of what the outcome of that's going to be. But if okay for you, I would at least like to inform the board that we're trying to make progress with the Commission.

The other point is that in our prepping in the ISPCP we've agreed that that I should probably speak to the resourcing and prioritization and GDS liaison topic, but probably we shouldn't beat that to death, because I've mentioned it during the council session with the board earlier. So I will keep that very, very brief. But I think that we should have a discussion around that with the board.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, thank you. That is under the board topic, thank you. Well, finally so coming to the election and the positions which have to be filled. So I understand so far our counselors from this ESG is clear that they would like to support the Sebastian tomorrow to be elected as chair, that's good. And we have also vice chair for this year is Shawn. So I've conveyed his message to the secretariat also. So we have still to fill one position or two positions within this week. The one is on the close generic group for these two days, a specific work. And the other one is for the— What is it called? There's something with a deadline at the end of the week, so for that we have time.

So we should afterwards, Lori and Mason, if there's time I'll talk about that close generic thing. So it should be very clear, I think maybe there was some confusion in the preparation of that. What is it about really? It's not about a discussion, I understood to

reopen discussions on the substance of that rather than to pave a way for a find common ground in order for these recommendations. And so that is the main thing on that. And that was the question here, which candidate could be the best one to do that. So we have three candidates from us. As you know, there is Paul McGrady, it's Tim, and it's Thomas Philip. And so that should be very clear between them how that is going to be put forward.

Let me add for my point of view, I had also points to make to balance between the constituencies the positions on Cross Community Working called where we are only represented by one candidate, by the one person from the stakeholder group. And from that point of view I raise that it might be our turn here this time.

What I would like to say is for the future, please take care about these things. So it will come more and more that you have to fill those positions and you have to either have a kind of internal process, not really overloaded with formalities, but to be quickly in order to decide to find ways how to fill those positions. So let's take a chat afterwards. And, Lori, please.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yeah, I want to fill in, I mean, we have an embarrassment of talent I just put into the chat. It's great to have three such qualified

people. But we, as a leadership, we're constantly asked to fill spots and it is frustrating when—And this happens and it rotates, it doesn't matter if it's the BC, the IPC, or the ISPCPs, sometimes we don't get any volunteers. And it's really important that we keep the deep bench and that people make the time, and some of these groups are time limited, they're not as involved as others. But it's really time now to dig in and be represented.

I mean there's some times, and Wolf-Ulrich noted an imbalance in maybe there's more from the IPC or more from the BC or more from the ISPs, but typically that imbalance is happening because one or the other of the constituencies do not have volunteers to put forth.

So in order to keep everything balanced and fair we need rigorous volunteers from all three constituencies so not a single constituency is being, you know, has a representative on every team. I want to make that clear because to keep that balance, we need the funnel flowing from all three constituencies.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Lori. So thanks very much. We come to a close here. Thank you very much, and the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR