
ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: RySG Membership Wrap-Up
Thursday, September 22 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 KUL

SUE SCHULER:

Thank you. Hello, and welcome to the Registries Stakeholder Group Wrap-Up session. 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 this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to 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 so much, Sue. And hi, everyone. Thank you for those who have joined today. You made it. We're at the last day of ICANN75. I think a lot of us are maybe a little out of practice with such a long six day meeting. So if you're still here, way to go. Good job. Especially the folks who've been slogging through doing the meeting remotely as well. I want to just give you guys a big round of applause for hanging in.

A lot of folks have departed the venue already just due to flights and transportation challenges. So we're going to keep this brief if we wrap up early, I think that's totally fine. We do have a couple items though that we do need to get through as part of our AGM schedule as a stakeholder group. And so that's what today's session is really designed to cover.

We're going to lead off with an update from the Customer Standing Committee. Gaurav is going to walk us through that. Thanks for being here, Gaurav. Beth is going to lead us through some public comments discussion, and then we have just a few other wrap up items as the session's title imply, to go through before we all break, head back to our homes, and then reconvene on the phones for our future sessions.

Before we hand it over to Gaurav, I did want to just quickly follow-up on something that folks may have heard in the public forum,

which is the session that took place just before this one. And I think it's important because of the next steps in the work that we're asking everyone to do in the coming weeks.

There was a question that was raised at the public forum and a statement that was made that the discussions we had, the conversation we opened at our meeting on Tuesday regarding proposing some contract amendments, that negotiations have been taking place. I want to be extremely clear with everyone, with our membership, with registrars, and with the community as a whole, that negotiations have not taken place in any shape or form. The negotiations about our contracts cannot officially take place until the actual negotiation process is initiated per those processes that are laid out in the registry agreement and the registrar accreditation agreement.

When I mentioned that some of us have been having conversations, it's about the idea that we had put forward and whether the idea of contract amendments is something that we should pursue. So I wanted to just make that very clear in case anyone feels like they have miss something that's been going on. You absolutely haven't. Everything that we also said about, like, the opportunity to get engaged is going to be open to the whole stakeholder group to membership to have the input on what we should be doing in the course of those contract negotiations is still very much the case.

So just wanted to set anyone's mind at ease if there was any confusion or maybe bad feelings about that. No negotiations yet. They're about to start though, so get excited. All right. Thanks so much. Any questions on that before we go Gaurav? All right. Then, Gaurav, take it away, my friend.

GAURAV VEDI:

Thank you, Sam. Sue let me know whenever you're ready. All right. Hello, everyone. Good morning. My name is Gaurav VEDI for the record. And I will be providing CSC updates today. And trust me, as I mentioned we're just going to keep it short and sweet, looking at the attendance today. With that Sue, let's roll the next slide. Next one. All right. So for those who are not familiar with what CSC does, so CSC stands for Customer Standing Committee. And essentially CSC performs operation and oversight for PTI's performance or compliance towards IANA functions agreement. Typically, in terms of monitoring SLAs metrics and corresponding thresholds. And typically, the direct customers of the naming services are top-level domain registry operators as well as root server operators.

Now what it means is that PTI monitors, collects, and publishes corresponding reports on a periodic basis, typically a monthly cycle. And CSC consumes that report, and then assesses that report, analyzes it, and looks for anomalies, deviations from the

corresponding threshold values with respect to SLAs and so on. So if they identify any such pattern, they go back to PTI, notify them, and then they work with them to get the satisfactory explanation with the PTI and corresponding mitigation plan for those.

So next slide, please. All right. Just a quick update on CSC roster. So CSC is comprised of four members, two from ccNSO, and two from GNSO. Until now Dimitry and myself, we spent almost four years as a representative from registry stakeholder group. And Dimitry will continue to operate in similar operations. I will be stepping down end of this ICANN meeting, and I will be replaced by Rick Wilhelm.

Now Rick is a well-known identity in the domain industry. He comes with tons of years of experience with DNS registry operations and so on. And I think looking at the CSC charter and the qualifications, so Rick perfectly suits the candidacy requirements for that. So Kudos to Rick and welcome aboard Rick, if you're listening.

Coming back to the rosters, so two members from ccNSO, Brett Carr, and Frederico, they will continue to serve CSC. We have one liaison from PTI, Amy Creamer. Four Liaisons, one Holly from ALAC, Milton from GNSO non-registry. Gloria will be replacing Laxmi Prasad from GAC, and Ken Renard, the last one is

interesting, Ken Renard RSSAC. He's replacing Liman, Lars-Johan Liman.

Now if you know so Liman was one of the first members who participated in CSC when CSC came into existence post IANA transition along with PTI. So Liman was on the forefront of that CSC committee. But Liman has completed his six years term, and he was the chair of the committee. But eventually, he had to step down. Ken Renard is replacing him.

Now Brett Carr was the vice chair, but now he has been nominated, and he has accepted his nomination for new chair. So Brett will be running the CSC meetings as a chair. However, the vice chair selection is still pending. We have received a couple of nominations from Holly and Frederico. So those elections are still pending. So it's going to be an online email voting. So as soon as we have those updates, I'll be happy to share those updates with The GNSO Registry Stakeholder Team.

Sue, next slide, please. All right. So as I mentioned earlier, so CSC typically monitors and reports on PTI's compliance with the Naming Functions Agreement. There are 64 individual metrics within which are arranged in seven different categories across technical checks, staff processing times, gTLD creation, IDN creation, root zone label generation tools set, ccTLD creation, and so on. So these and if anyone is interested in looking at those

SLAs, those SLAs are already published and listed on the PTI's website for additional information.

Next slide, sue. All right. This is just a sample of what the monthly report from PTN looks like. It comprises of all the 64 metrics arranged with the corresponding percentages of if the metric has been accomplished or not. So one 100% indicates that specific metric was met during that month's report and so on. So CSC consumes that report. And if there are any anomalies identified in the report, CSC reaches out to PTI for further explanation.

Next slide, Sue. All right. So PTI provides a report and CSC produces its own monthly report based on the ranking. If one 100% SLAs are met, CSC marks it as excellent. Otherwise, most of the time, it's satisfactory if one or two SLAs are missed. If there are significant degradation or any trend has been identified in complaints or a negative trend in the compliance for one or two SLAs, if it's repeated over several months, then CSC marks it as for a significant improvement, so it needs improvement in that case. As an example, if 63 out of 64 SLAs are met, so CSC marks it as 98.4% compliance with respect to the overall metrics.

Next slide, Sue, please. Again, this is just the screenshot of the PTI performance in last six years. Just the striking feature here is, if you look at first three years, 2016, 2017, 2018, so a lot of SLAs were below 100. And the reason was because CSC was established in

two 2016 along with PTI, and we did not have enough data points to formulate accurate SLAs. So the intent was as we progress over a period of time, those SLAs will be fine-tuned over a period of time. And that's exactly what PTI did. If you start looking starting from 2019 and onwards, so most of the time, PTI has been able to access or accomplish 100% of the SLAs most of the time, which is a great sign for PTI.

Sue next slide, please. Okay. I'm just going to talk about the complaint process here. As I mentioned, CSC performance operational oversight for PTI's performance with respect to the compliance of IANA Naming Functions agreement. And CSC's role is actually limited here with respect to monitoring that overall complaint management system, and identifying any systemic or persistent trends with respect to any degradation performances and so on. If CSC determines that there is a performance issue exists, so CSC has formulated something called remedial action procedure.

Next slide, sue. All right. So what is the remedial action procedure? So if CSC determines that there is a systemic problem which has been persistent for over two, three months or longer period of time, then CSC invokes that remedial action procedure, and PTI is obliged to prepare and follow that remedial action plan. In case PTI fails to provide satisfactory explanation

or the mitigation remediation for that specific issue, then CSC follows a three-level escalation process starting with PTI Board.

If the issue still remains, CSC reserves the right to escalate to ICANN CEO and further to ICANN Board. But till now, in last three, four years since remedial action procedure was formulated in 2018, no event or situation has been identified where there was any need to invoke remedial action procedures. So which is a good sign and a healthy sign for PTI and CSC.

Next slide, please. All right. And trust me, this is my last section here. So I just want to spend a few time a few minutes here going over the second CSC effectiveness review findings. This review was completed recently and the record is actually published for the public comments. It's available until the end of November. So please feel free to take a look at the report and please provide your comments and feedback. So CSC, PTI and the other supporting organization will definitely work internally to address some of those issues and feedback and comments.

Now a little bit of background. As per ICANN bylaws, the effectiveness of the CSC has to be measured, evaluated, assessed every three years. The first CSC effectiveness review was initiated in August 2018, three years from there, last year August 2021, the second CSC effectiveness review was initiated and the findings were completed just recently.

And then the structure of CSC effectiveness review team has essentially four members, two from ccNSO, two from GNSO. From GNSO, this year, Jonathan Robinson and Donna Austin, they participated in the review committee. And along with ccNSO and Liaison's from ICANN, PTI, and CSC, they provided the key findings.

So I just want to capture and summarize over the key findings here. So first bullet point, CSC is operating effectively and according to its charter, which is a no brainer. I mean, this is expected. Effectiveness is primarily related to caliber and dedication of the CSC members. And in any case, if any metric is missed by PTI, those metrics are easily remedied in the subsequent reports or subsequent months. Also, CSC continues to have an excellent working relationship with PTI. In fact, PTI and CSC, they collaborate and they complement each other.

So far, we haven't seen any conflicts between the liaisons and any members because it's a closed group. It's a very small committee comprising of four members and just five or six different liaisons. So the committee works very well. So it has been having an excellent working relationship with cross functional teams. I also wanted to highlight here that the CSC effectiveness review team assess the effectiveness of the CSC against the fourteen metrics. And it concluded that eight metrics were achieved, three were not applicable and three were not achieved.

Next slide, Sue, please. All right. I think this is not visible, but again, so this is coming directly from the report. So if you go and take a look at the report which is published or open for public comments, so you will find this information there, which highlights what metrics have been achieved, what has not been achieved.

So the three metrics which were not achieved were related to the attendance criteria. So some of the members because they are globally distributed across the world, so sometimes it's really hard for the members to attend those meetings. It's not just CSC members, but also for Liaison's. So we started seeing the trends where members or liaisons were not able to attend and meet the attendance criteria.

So the CSC effectiveness team suggested few suggestions, in addition to having the regular members also allocate or assign a alternates for each of the supporting organizers. For example, in case, let's say, GNSO assigns two members, they can also assign alternates. In case one of the member is not able to meet or attend this criteria or not able to attend the meeting, at least the alternate can attend the meeting for that specific month and still be able to meet attendance criteria, and make sure that the CSC's operations are not impacted.

Next slide, sue. Next slide. All right. There were a couple of other findings, key findings where there were significant discussions around whether the CSC's role should be expanded. So as I mentioned earlier, CSC's role is very limited right now in terms of monitoring PTI's performance or compliance with respect to IANA Naming Functions Agreement. But the effectiveness review team came back with the finding that this is exactly the reason why CSC came into existence post-IANA transition. And CSC is doing a fantastic job so far. And at this point there is no additional need to expand the role of the CSC.

The second point of discussion was that even though they are SLAs, 64 SLAs, which have been defined, but there is no process which currently exists, and no one is responsible for initiating and managing in SLA review process, which means those SLAs are not reviewed on a periodic basis. So CSC has some internal processes where in case if there are changes required to some of the threshold values for SLAs, or introduction of new SLAs, which we did in three, four years back when we introduced IDN roots on label generation rule set related metrics.

So CSC formulated some of the procedures around introduction of new SLAs and also modifying the values of some of those SLAs. But currently, there's no one responsible for initiating and managing in SLA review process. So this is still an open action item. I think this will require broader community discussion, but

I just wanted to highlight that. And the key question here is should CSC undertake regular reviews of SLAs or not. So, again, your input as a direct customer is needed. And with this, I think that's all I have. Unless anyone has any other questions. I'll give it back to Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much, Gaurav. We have a hand from Donna. Donna, take it away when you're ready.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam, and thanks Gaurav for the update. And I guess this leads into your next session Beth on public comments. But to the effectiveness review that Gaurav has just outlined, it was, I think we only posted the report for public comment during this week. So it's only a recent posting. I think one of the things that we're looking for feedback on is around the regular reviews of the SLAs from the CSC Effectiveness Review Team perspective.

I think we agree that it's probably reasonable for the CSC to be involved in that, given the closeness that they have to the SLAs and the fact that they're monitoring them on a monthly basis. So I think that's really it's a no brainer. And I can't remember a hundred percent, but I think what we're recommending is that if PTI and the CSC agree that this is something they want to do

depending on what comes back in the public comments. But I think the recommendation goes on to say that there has to be a public consultation associated with that.

The other thing that I just like to mention as well is that one of the potential challenges that could come down the pipe for the CSC is getting candidates that are actually interested in participating in the CSC. And that's because the nature of the work, there's no controversy around it, and that's merit to the CSC for the work they've done, but also reflective of the fact that IANA does an excellent job. And I think from the slide that Gaurav put up, they've basically meeting their SLAs to 100% modest month. So it's not very often that they fall below that.

So one of the things that we are recommending is that alternates be appointed. So in addition to, it's great that we've got Rick coming on Board and Dimitry is still representing us on the CSC, but there is a suggestion that an alternate be identified as well so that if a meeting time is not suitable, and can't be attended by our representative, then the alternate can take their place.

And the reason for this is that in the CSC charter, it's a pretty high bar to attendance. So in order to meet that attendance, we've just come up with a possible way to make sure that the representatives are meeting that attendance level by bringing in

a proxy or an alternate to attend those meetings if they can't attend. But CSC is doing a great job.

There is the discussion around whether the role for the CSC should be expanded. That's always a tricky one. And some of the reason for that is because this is perception that what the CSC does is pretty boring. And I guess there's some merit to that, but the underlying challenge is that while everything's going really well, that's the case.

But if we ever got into a situation where IANA'S performance wasn't up to scratch, and we did have systemic problems with IANA's performance, that's when the CSC really comes into play and becomes an important link to any escalation to try to remediate any issues that are going on with IANA.

So thanks to Gaurav for the time that he spent on the CSC. I think it's probably been maybe four years. It's an important role. It's pretty much a role that doesn't get much kudos, but it's actually really important and very important for the customers of IANA, which are primarily TLD operators with the Europe ccTLD or gTLD. Thanks, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Donna. Any other questions or comments regarding the CSC update from Gaurav and the CSC review

update that Donna walked us through there. Or, like, some highlights from the CSC review update. All right. And I think we're good to wrap this one up. And now we'll hand over to Beth to walk us through the items currently open for public comment.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Sam. This is Beth Bacon. Guys, it's what you've all been waiting for. I know that you only traveled to Malaysia for this public comments update. It's going to be spicy, bottom line to you. We have a bunch of public comments. We have nine open public comments. We had a really nice break over the summer and that is gone now. So all that relaxation needs to, I hope has energized you so that you're ready to draft nine public comments. We'll go through the list quickly. And I want to give just a little bit of flavor around each one so that folks can start thinking about items that they may have expertise in or that they care about or that they have forgotten about and maybe need to reread it a little bit. No shade. That's what happens. We have a lot to cover here.

So if you have questions or comments, please feel free to put your hand up, interrupt me. I'm just going to run through some of these and ask a few questions, see if anyone has any initial reactions as to whether hard guess or hard no on comments. We have a few things to consider with regards to maybe partnering

with some registrars. We do have a lot of comments, but there are a few in here where we may have common ground. But it's always nice to be able to do a CPH comment.

So we'll start with the Universal Acceptance Roadmap for Domain Name Registry and Registrar Systems. This is due October 17th. The due dates range from October 17th to October 31. That is a tight turnaround for a lot of comments. And for those of you who will be hopping on planes to go to the Contracted Party Summit, also known as the thoughts and feelings summit as per Sam, you might be starting to do that October 31st, November 1st, depending upon where you're coming from in the world. So we're going to try and get these done a little bit early. I know. It's like asking for a pony.

So Universal Acceptance Roadmap proposes to have a test systems for UA readiness and that's all based on the acceptance readiness framework that has been published. These are all linked obviously in the comments. Wim has created Google Docs with all of these beautiful links. Please don't think that I looked all of these out myself. It was Owen. They're looking for a review and feedback on the study by relevant technical community, so I'm looking at you tech ops. Please read. I just looked at hard eye contact with Dennis. I wasn't even [00:26:26 -inaudible]. I was pretty nodding that was a mistake on his heart.

The road map will be finalized based on the input that we all provide as the community, and then they're published for reference for contracted parties. So it's not necessarily something that's going to be binding, but is important is things that people are going to follow along with. Dennis, I see a very interested hand and a volunteer, I hope.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. Let me just quickly answer. Yes, I'll volunteer to look at it. I actually have to scheme the report, and I just want to point across the room. He's one of the authors or contributors. So I know Michael, so we have worked in the past. So just quickly, it's a paper coming from item or not the UASG. It is not coming down as a recommendation policy or what have you. It just a real month again. A framework. If a registry or registrar would like to become Universal Acceptance ready, meaning treating or processing Unicode domain names, or Unicode email addresses, how would they do it?

So it's technical in nature, but I'm happy to take a look at this and just to make sure there's precision there and potentially, as registry, registrars, we are organizations company. And so maybe have this at the UA, the component, how layers on all the InfoSec security aspects of a company wants to put in their system. But

be happy to take a look and provide some feedback to the stakeholder group.

BETH BACON:

This is Beth again. Thank you, Dennis. This just shows to all of you. Don't show any interest or sign of life as I'm talking about a comment because you can get called on. And you owe him a drink because you just said that he's going to comment now. So I'll let you get that amount amongst yourselves. Really appreciate that we're going to look into. I think this is an important one.

I think that while you say it's not binding, it's something that certainly who's the registry if it's going to be giving registry's guidance and other registry's guidance, let's make sure that it's good, and it's strong, and it's flexible for us. Any other comments or questions? Okay.

The next one is the pilot on the holistic review draft terms of reference. So this is out of the ATRT. It's recommendation 3.5, as I'm sure you're all intimately familiar. And it's to initiate a new specific review called the holistic review. So along with the Board's direction to implement as a pilot, there's going to obviously have implications for community structures and groups.

In case you don't remember 3.5 recommendation, the objectives of that are the effectiveness of collaboration mechanisms between ICANN structures, the structure's accountability to their members and constituencies, continuing purposes structures, and potential changes in structures, let me say structures again, and operations to improve overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as to ensure optimal representation of community views and continuous improvement efforts of structures. So structures, it's about structures.

The review is comprehensive and it'll impact, obviously, ICANN structures. Basically, this is it's what it is. It's a holistic review and it could impact in advice for any part of ICANN. So I think that it again, I see Chris is showing interest. This is your fill in. Chris is going to write this comment, and it's [CROSSTALK].

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks very much, Beth. I'd put your hand up and this is what happened. No, I wanted to just flag that the challenge with this is that it's extraordinarily badly written recommendation with gaps that are wide that you could drive trucks through. And that it can be interpreted in many different ways.

And the Board has done its best to say to the community with this public comment, please tell us what you actually want us to do. This is not good enough for us to work on. So to take a simple

example, there's a recommendation that says that the independent reviews should be abolished, which frankly, I think it's a fine idea and replaced with continuous improvement, which I also think is a fine idea.

However, it also says that when it comes to structural recommendations, the holistic review team, i.e. not the continuous improvement process, but the actual review team itself can make recommendations as to structure. And what that means for the ccNSO, for example, is that they would be expected to work on recommendations from the rest of the community, and I can tell you now, they simply won't do that. And it wouldn't mean the same thing to the GNSO if the At-Large everybody else got together and said, these are recommendations to the structure of the GNSO. That would that would be a recommendation.

So comments are needed. Pushback is required or rather clarification is required. If this is what it means, I don't like it. If this is what it means, I'm fine with it. And it's very important. So, yes, I will help. And I can tell you that the CC this afternoon will also be setting up a small team to draft their comments. And if you want to do a bit of collaboration across that barrier, I think probably our intentions and pathways would be similar, so it might be worth thinking about. Thanks.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Chris. I also see Sam's hand in the room. Because she is a rule follower.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. And just to echo and add on to what Chris said, I think that ATRT3 team in earlier phases tried to be explicit that the holistic review wasn't meant to make recommendations about, like, restructuring the community especially the GNSO, but we have been hearing from different voices throughout the community that there may be a push by other groups to let this be an opportunity to advocate for the restructuring of the GNSO.

So I think I totally agree with Chris, and I'm seeing John in the chat, like, that this is something that's going to be very important. I'll put my hand up also to contribute to that one. In fact, I have the terms of reference printed out in my bag that I was going to read on the plane here, but it'll have to be for the plane right home.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just can I comment or was there someone else in the queue?

BETH BACON: No.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So Sam, that's right, but just to even take it up another level, in fact, there was a split on ATRT. And the half of the ATRT thinks it means it's a community wide review mechanism and the other half thinks it is a half-half whatever thinks it isn't. So it's more than just the community. They themselves were split and so we really do need to get in and fix it otherwise it's going to be a problem. Thanks. Because in other words, we can't ask them for clarification. Because if you ask them for clarification, you'll get two different answers. Thanks.

BETH BACON: Thank you, Chris and Sam. This is Beth again. I think you guys have captured that well. It's pretty clear in the comment also they're looking for input, like, how do we do this? When do we do this? What is this? So for all those reasons and then some of the notes in the chat from Donna as well, I think that this is I appreciate you guys putting your hands up to help. We have submitted as registries several comments on ATRT in the past, especially specifically ATRT3.

So I think that we can pull back and reference some of those things we've already advocated for. And then given the interest in the community to sometimes put their fingers in everyone's piles and get a little more access the GNSO, a little more influence

in those policy development processes. I think this is important for us. So thank you guys very much for the excellent background and for putting up your hands.

All right. We will move on to the next one if I don't see anything. No one else? Chris, is your hand up? No? Just resting? Okay. You're resting ready hand. Yes. Okay. So the next is the proposed amendments to the base gTLD RA and RAA to add RDAP contractual obligations. I'm not going to go into depth on this because we had a beautiful session yesterday, perhaps at some point this week. Carr let it.

We had also Rick there and Donna as well and Sam. A couple other members of the negotiating team. I encourage you to go listen to it, look at the slides. It was a good conversation, and they presented it really well. We've been hammering through this for quite some time and I think that I can speak for the registries when we say we feel like we're in a good place.

So the question really here is, we have talk to the registrars. They also will be putting in a comment. So the question is, do we want to collaborate with them? There were some questions in the session from some of the registrar members that I think just hadn't been paying close attention to the process that were maybe not in line with what the registries might think.

But I do think that throughout the end of the process, the registries, registrars were fairly aligned on where we ended up with the obligations in the language. So it may be an opportunity for us to collaborate. Does anyone have any concerns, feelings, thoughts? Donna, you can't see it, but I'm looking right at you. Oh, hands up. Okay. Donna's volunteering to draft. Thanks, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Beth. So we have had a little bit of discussion about whether this is something that we provide a CPH comment on. And I think we were leaning towards a yes on that. But I do know as you did Beth that there were some interesting comments from the registrars yesterday, but we can double back on that. But I do think that given we did this as a contracted party's negotiation, I think there would be a good look if we could actually submit a CPH comment which would be along the lines of we support the recommendations or the redlines as they are. Thanks.

BETH BACON:

This is Beth. Thanks, Donna. I agree that it would be nice if we can get together. And again, I think that some of the questions were simply those registrars that weren't as up to their eyeballs in the negotiation because it lasted a while. So we'll reattach them and we can always-- if there are aspects of a registrar

comment that we don't necessarily fully agree with or we have questions or concerns about, we also have the ability to do our own comment, but very strongly and heartily plus one most of what they say. So we'll have that.

As we move forward, we'll I'll coordinate with Owen who is their vice chair of policy and in charge of comments, and we'll keep you updated. So thanks, Donna. Also I have your name down the list. Appreciate it. Anyone else for that one? Questions, comments? I know it's [00:37:24 –inaudible].

All right. So the proposed updates to the GNSO operating procedures, the Council's Committee for overseeing and implementing continuous improvement review of the working group self-assessments. So it's the CCOICI WGSA, which just makes you want to blow your brains out. But the longest short of this is that there's been some updates to the SOI language. I want to thank Karen Day who worked on that. I think they are, in my personal opinion, I think they're very good improvements.

I think there's a lot of clarity added. It's just they're not huge, but it adds a little more specificity to who you are and why you are participating in a group, which I think in a community such as ours where there's so much expertise spread around and there's so many overlapping interests., it adds a little bit of clarity. It's nice to know who's participating where for what.

And in addition to that, there's just some changes to the operating procedures that are not super significant. Karen, do you have any comments? No. You don't have to have any comments. Okay. So I do think that because it is not obviously GNSO operating procedures the bread and butter of things that we work on, it is important that if we agree with these things or disagree with these things, then we'll have to do a comment. I think this one that can actually be fairly short and sweet. I do think it can be supportive of most of these things, but I encourage folks to look at it, just the text.

And if you are feeling like it's a lot because when you open the document, I think it's like 96 pages, just go down to the version control. I think it's on, like, page 26 six or so, that might be the SOI language. And the changes are summarized. So you can see exactly what's changed in this version instead of just going through all 96 pages of the operating procedures. All right. Questions, comments. I don't see any hands in the room. Okay.

The next is the registry data consensus policy for gTLDs. This has been a real sleeper hit, guys. I don't know if you've heard of this one. The registry data consensus policy is finally up for draft. We have worked for several years on this through the EPDP, and this is implementing mostly of the Phase 1 and some of the Phase 2 recommendations.

I'm not going to go into super depth here because we have in our previous session, I think, on Tuesday, noted that we will dedicate a drop in call or part of a biweekly to actually walk through those changes to the policy in the comment. Guys I'm fading. And then we'll talk about where you might have questions, comments, concerns.

This is another one where I think that perhaps we can either plus one strongly or work with the registrars because we were very much in lockstep with them throughout the EPDP Phase 1 process. And also, they were very supportive as a group CPH team in the IRT process. Anyone have any questions or concerns on that? Okay. Making a note for myself, guys. Hang on one second.

All right. The next is the draft IANA and PTI FY24 operating plans and budget. This is everyone's favorite annual comment. In the past, we've had a couple of folks who were really intimately familiar with the operating plans and budget. They had offered comments and taken the lead on this for several years. And really could see the nuance and changes just through changes and folks have retired and gone on to live lives that don't include ICANN.

I don't understand. We don't have that same level of experience in the budget and operating procedures. So I am looking to see if anyone has any interest in this, people who with some budgeting

experience in their own companies, in their own history that could possibly take a look, help.

Wim has very graciously offered to, as he usually does, pull from our previous comments, but also do some analysis on those things that we have flagged as issues in the past, see where they appear in the budget and the operating plan and help us dig through it. They are very large, meaty, overlapping, confusing documents. And there's numbers in them, so I lose my mind. So just flagging this one, we are going to need help. It's an important thing for us to look at. This is I hate to say, like, a lot of it's our money that ICANN is spending. So let's make sure that we agree with how they're spending it. Donna, I see your hand.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah. Thanks, Beth. And this isn't necessarily Donna has expertise in this area, but I just wondered whether there's any value in having, I don't know whether it's Xavier or Becky coming to talk to us and not to just walk us through this is what the plan and budgets are, but more if we've got an opportunity to highlight some of our concerns, whether we can have a conversation with them to see if we can understand things a little bit better before we submit comments. I know we don't have much time on this. It looks like there's a lot of time, but there's not really, but

wondering if that's some way that we can enhance our knowledge maybe. Just an idea. Thanks.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Donna. I don't think that that is a bad idea at all. I do think that no matter what we are going to need to do a little bit of quick homework before that, because if Xavier comes in, he can certainly just present the budget, but we can present the budget to ourselves by reading it. So I think that we would want some targeted questions, some issues of importance to flag for him that he could focus on. But we can certainly reach out and see if that is something that they would be willing to do. Maxim your hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Do you hear me?

BETH BACON: Sure do.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Okay. I participated in this procedure of GNSO of writing comments to draft IANA in the operating plan. And even to have reasonable questions, you will unfortunately have to read through these documents. And it's worth having some of our councilors on the group, which makes these comments for the

Council. Because basically, last time there were concerns about the ability of PTI to have hardware, I mean, backup hardware and enough coverage of the travel for the members involved in work of PTI and engineers. All those key signing procedures, etc., etc. Thanks.

BETH BACON:

This is Beth. Thanks, Maxim. I really appreciate that. And I will point to the beautiful Google Doc that exists already. So please feel free to go in and flag those. And even if you just want to flag issues and you don't particularly have the time to dig through all of the documents, go into the Google Doc, make some bullets and say, I have questions about this. I have concerns about this. It's a great way. And if we are going to have attempt to have Xavier come in, then that's a good way to gather those thoughts. All right. Thanks. I don't see any other hands.

I will move on. Last two, and I've just locked my screen, so now you have to wait for me. I'm sorry. Last two, the proposed amendments on the SLA and IANA numbering services. ICANN and the RIS have identified necessary updates to the SLAs to incorporate obligations for the administration of reverse DNS resolution services. The amendment only adds specification for the administration of the resolution services and doesn't otherwise alter or remove any existing obligations under the SLA.

So again, I'm going to look pointedly at folks who have cares about those items. I think it would be fine if we could just say, have our tech folks review and say, yes, we are supportive of this or no, this is a hot, hot dumpster fire, and I don't know that we would have gotten this far if it were. But so if anyone's willing or able to take a look at that or just pass it on to someone in your company who is more technically inclined, please do so. Questions, comments, feelings.

The last one is the initial report on the second CSC effectiveness review that I'm not going to dive too far into because we just had what was wonderful and very thorough presentation. We had comments from Donna. So Donna obviously was volunteering to draft this comment as well. So I really am really happy to put her down, and I thank you, Donna, for your service. Oh, sorry. The microphone's broken.

DONNA AUSTIN: I feel so funny. Yeah.

BETH BACON: I mean, I'm tickled.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. More than happy to do it. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah. And Donna, I mean, this is Sam. Just if there was any, I don't know, if you didn't want to leave the comment drafting because you've done all the work on the actual review team. That I think is totally understandable, but I think it may be really helpful to do either as part of a drop in call or part of a biweekly. If you could lead the group in just an overview of what's in there like you did a few minutes ago flag some of the most important recommendations that you think it's worth the registries commenting on. That would be super helpful.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. You can do that too, Sam. And I think this one was only posted recently, so we've got a little bit more time, a little bit.

BETH BACON: Yeah. They snuck that one in just right before. So, yeah, we have until November, the 8th of November for that. And, yes, obviously. If you can do that, obviously, I'm going to happily take the bulk of drafting and corralling folks for this.

So, Donna, if there are just things you want to flag, and then when we go through that, just act as our expert guide as we do that. I really appreciate it. I have taken way too much time. I'm very sorry. There are a lot of comments. Does anyone have any

questions, comments, concerns with regards to public comments other than the fact that there are nine of them? Thank you very much.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks, Beth. So, yeah, clearly, a lot to be paying attention to and a lot to be doing. Once we wrap up this meeting, it's going to be a very busy fall for public comments and also just for stakeholder group and ICANN work in general. So rest on the plane, guys. Okay. Next item we had scheduled, I think we can keep this pretty brief. It's just a check-in on the registry stakeholder group priorities that we had worked on at the beginning of the year.

This is also something that we walked through in our session with the Board. I just to want to quickly apologize. I had meant to send these out over emails, so everyone had them at hand prior to going into that Board session. And I opened my laptop at the start of that Board session and realized that it was stuck in my outbox. So I'm very sorry that you guys didn't get these in a timely manner. Here they are just the headlines. We have a Google working document for the stakeholder group that goes into more detail about each these.

In the interest of time, I don't think it's necessary to walk through all of these. We have had a pretty detailed run through of where

things stand on these. I guess, I just wanted to use a little bit of time today if you guys want to share some thoughts and opinions about this as to whether a, were there anyone here that you think we should spend a little time as a group talking about today, or coming up on a future call?

And then secondly, do you think that this process was valuable. Do you think it was useful? Do you think that setting some priorities for the year going into the first ICANN meeting, which usually takes place sometime around March in the calendar year, is a worthwhile exercise?

I wanted to get that feedback just so that on the ExCom, we can be planning around that and preparing to facilitate those discussions early in the New Year. If it's something that you guys think is a valuable exercise. Obviously, because it's ICANN, some of these topics will carry over into 2023. So, like touching base and understanding if things that were identified as priorities are still.

But I think knowing what the membership values is helpful to us in planning like how we structure our calls and how we use our time, our working time together and hopefully making that efficient. So those are the two things I wanted to touch base on if folks have any thoughts that they want to share around that today. Susan.

SUSAN MOHR: Hi. Yeah, if I understand what you're asking correctly, I do think it's really useful to have these. And I think it's twofold. I mean, the first one's obvious really is just it is really useful to all have a shared understanding of the things that the group collectively think are important and what needs to be taken forward.

Obviously, some of that has its own challenges in terms of you're hoping to reach resolution on something, but it's a contractual negotiation and so you can't necessarily do it. But the other reason is because I think we came up with that list of priorities, I think because the Board had asked one of their vague questions about what are your priorities.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Exactly.

SUSAN: That one was maybe less vague. But then we went into this meeting with a vaguer question about how are we all going to collectively advance our strategic priorities. And you think it's helpful then to be able to go into that meeting with them and think, well, I don't know what you wanted us to answer, but here's what we want to talk about. So, yeah, I think it's really useful.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Susan. It also just that you'd inspired a thought, which is that we had collaborated on this via Google Doc. And when we do that, we obviously send out a link to the Google Doc, but I don't know that everyone has, like, a thorough index bookmarking list of all the Google Docs at play. I like to pretend I do. It's really just one window in Google Chrome that has 900 tabs open.

But I think using space on our The Members Only section password protection section of our website is probably also a good place to consolidate this. Very much in the vein of what we do for the public comments. So I'm just making that out loud mental note for myself and for the ExCom. Beth, and then Alan.

BETH BACON: Thanks. This is Beth. I think big plus one to Susan your comments, I think, well said. I also think that it's helpful if we do have it in the members only, which is a great idea for when we get new members. It's drinking from a fire hose. There are a lot of different concerns. We have different interest groups. We have different things going on. What does everyone care about? And what is a way for, they can catch up quickly. They can see at a glance what folks are caring about. And they can see if their concern is missing.

So it's a nice way for us to make sure that we are representing all of the views in all of our different stakeholders within our little weird stakeholder group, not that we're weird. Yeah, you know what I mean. Not weird at all. But I think it's helpful, and I also think it's a really nice way. If we have versions of it, we can track the progress of, okay, we did bring this up with the Board, this was their response, we had a really good progress on this or this closed out. This took us two years, why is that? And it's a way for us to internally have a little bit of some metrics of our progress and success.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Great suggestion, Beth. Thanks for that. Alan, then Donna, then Maxim.

ALAN WOODS: Alan Woods. Actually both Susan and Beth said exactly what. So I'll just try and say plus on. I do think that what a really good side effect of this was being able to internally focus ourselves because again it puts pressure on ourselves not to let these things go and as a good reminder periodically for us to know why we're spending so much time in something. Because that is our key core priority for this year. So I think it keeps us in line and I would absolutely support continuing doing it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Great. Thanks, Alan. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam. So I agree. I think this is a great exercise and one we should continue to do. The discussion with the Board yesterday, Goran, I don't know whether he's trying to be funny or not, but he suggested we should have timelines on these efforts. And I 100% agree, not so much timelines, but we need deadlines.

So when we do this, it might be helpful if we can identify what we think this should be done by this date or this is a project that will take 18 months and see if we can try to keep that. I know it's really hard. It's not because there's always something else that comes up, but perhaps if we can be a little bit more concrete in what we think timing would look like.

And the other thing, just on the community representative group, to identify members for the IRP standing panel, there should be a blog going out about progress on that sometime after ICANN75. I know it's been racing a couple for, but just so that folks know that we will be putting out a blog that's a status of who we are and where we're at with the process. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Donna. Thanks for heads up to. Keep an eye out for that blog. Maxim next.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I support the idea of Donna to have, I'd say, at least some target dates, etc. Because during my Council time, it was a thing called SPS session strategic planning, things, etc. And for four years, they were collection of ideas. And basically, there were piles of ideas which were not taken care from the previous years. And it's worth checking from time to time like once per two month if things are still relevant, or do we still need to do that, or if it needs to be updated. Just short glance review or things like that. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah. Thanks, Maxim. That's a really good point to just do regular check ins on where things stand and keeping an eye on, especially the carryover from year to year. Obviously, some of these as you'll see are not individual stakeholder group efforts alone.

So we may not have full control over the timing of things, but at least understanding, like, from our side, how long we think things should take and bringing those as we start new initiatives. Bringing those expectations to the table, I think can be very helpful, versus starting something, having an idea about how

long it just takes, but not communicating that out loud and then getting frustrated when it takes a long time. All right, Beth. And then I think we can probably close this one out.

BETH BACON:

Thanks. This is Beth. I apologize for taking the mic so often. I think there's something that we've been noodling on in at the ExCom level. And I think it ties nicely with the comments I get from some of the others about with the continuity and tracking these things and what's the progress on our strategic priorities.

And that's the idea of doing a report out at the end of an ICANN communicate, if you will. At the end of ICANN, everyone scrambles to see what the GAC said. And then, oh, it's very exciting. And then it ends up. There's a point of view from some folks and there's some blogs and things that always come out.

I think it would be really nice if we could have just on maybe we just keep it to the strategic priority items that could guide that if there's an issue of importance, have folks who-- we were trying to noodle on this on how to make it not onerous for us, but also not onerous for the SG as a whole and maybe we have volunteers. I just wanted to plant the seed, maybe people can think about it, give us some ideas.

I think it would be really nice for us to have our point of view where we thought we had progress, where we're really excited for new ideas to make sure that, like, some confusion or concerns about how things are proceeding that came up in the public comment. We really clarify those things. So just wanted to plant that seed, see if anyone found that interesting or people think that's just a really terrible idea, which is also valid.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. Nacho, you want to go ahead?

NACHO AMADOZ: Nacho Amadoz. I think it's a great idea. I think it's good. I volunteered to help. And I think that's a good idea because if we are able to signal which of these public comments or activities are connected with the priorities that helps the people that are not committing as much time as you are. Because you are committing a lot of time and then you're familiar with all the issues. But then most of the members, if it's not, to get up maybe wider picture with the traffic lights that indicate them, what is it the three or four things you really need to look at to help us do our work. So I am happy to help with that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Nacho. And that's a really great connection and suggestion to use it as a way to tie in. Like, all these things we're putting out there is needing volunteers for and then clarifying. Giving folks resources to be able to contribute more actively. I think that's a really, really great observation and something definitely worth pursuing. Cool. All right. So look for more info about that and opportunities to get involve on that effort.

Okay. At this point, we now are into the fun part of this session. We've served two things that we like to do to wrap up our engagement and our stakeholder group meetings at the Annual General Meetings. The first of those is to thank members for their service in various roles over the course of the last year. And then the final one is to just officially hand off to our new ExCom and our new ExCom members who will be taking their seats in the next 10-15 minutes.

So To begin with, I want to just extend a very heartfelt thank you and expression of appreciation on behalf of all of the registry stakeholder group and all of our members to the following individuals for all the work that they have put in not only over the course of this year, but in many cases for, like, for many years running here. So Maxim Alzoba, we want to thank you very much for representing the Registry Stakeholder Group on the GNSO Council for, I think, four consecutive years. So thank you so much, Nacho. Pause, Thanks so much, Maxim. Nacho's next. I know. I

mixed my notes up. We can just say it's the end. We'll clap for everyone at the end.

We want to also thank Paul Diaz for his work on the Nominating Committee. We want to thank Gaurav Vedi for representing the registries on the Customer Standing Committee, for, again, a solid four years. We want to thank Howard Eland for representing us on the RZERC.

We want to thank Sophie Hey for all the work that she's put in as the mentor, the Registry Stakeholder Group recruitment mentor for the NextGen program, including organizing what I thought was a really use full session here at ICANN75 to give the NextGen participants a chance to meet some of the folks from the contracted party house. We want to thank Donna Austin for putting her hand up for a lot of efforts, including both the CSC effectiveness review that she alluded to earlier. And also for the prioritization planning pilot group that was kicked off earlier this year.

In addition to all of those individuals, I also want to thank very warmly all of the folks who have gotten involved in all of the different efforts across the ICANN community, whether those are policy development working groups, things like the accuracy scoping team, efforts like the community representatives group to select the IRP standing panel, the group that is looking at the

implementation of the rules for the IRP. Those are things that are incredibly important to the ICANN community.

And the fact that people are continuing to show up and put in this work is what is the lifeblood of the work we do here, right? It's what makes all of this matter. It's what makes all of it function really well. So I just want to take a moment here, recognize everyone who has put in a lot of work over this year, over many years running, and just say, thank you. And please keep it up.

Okay. Now with that, we now will do an official hand off to our new ExCom members. So I jumped a gun a little bit. But Nacho Amadoz is going to take over for Maxim Alzoba, as one of our GNSO councilors. Our current councilors, Kurt Pritz and Seb Ducos will remain in their roles.

We also have a major congratulations to issue to Seb who was just select officially yesterday as the new chair of the GNSO Council. So big kudos to Seb. Craig Schwartz will be taking over as our representative on the Nominating Committee. And then Beth and myself will be renewing our terms as chair and vice chair of policy respectively for another two year term.

So thank you guys again also for the continued confidence and support of the two of us in this role. I think I speak for both of us and say we really enjoyed serving this group and doing this work. So we're excited for another two years. All right. I think with that,

with all, like, the feel good stuff, we can probably go ahead and wrap it up.

All right. Let's wrap it up. Let's take an early lunch. Hope everyone has safe travels back to wherever it is that they're going, and we'll see you guys on the phones and on those Zoom rooms pretty quickly. We have lots to do. Thanks, everyone.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Sam. We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]