ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – GNSO: RySG Membership Meeting
Monday, October 25, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 PDT

SUE SCHULER: Hello, and welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group membership meeting. My name is Sue. I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair and moderator of this question. If you would like to ask your question or make your 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're 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.

With that, I'll hand the floor over to Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much for that, Sue. Hello, everyone, and welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group membership meeting at ICANN72. This is the very first meeting slot of ICANN72, unless you count all the meetings that took place during Prep Week and last week. So let me be the first

to formally welcome everyone. This is Sam Demetriou. I am the Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. We have 60 minutes today for this meeting. You'll see, if you're in the Zoom room, the agenda that we've put together for today's meeting.

We're going to start off by doing a bit of a policy preview for this meeting. We have a number of Registry Stakeholder Group members who are actively participating across different policy development process working groups and other GNSO Council working groups. We're going to get a preview of the meetings that are going to be held, starting with the transfer policy, IDN, EPDP, the registration data policy, EPDP IRT, and then the Data Accuracy Scoping Team.

Then we'll go over to our GNSO Councilors. We had a pretty in-depth and thorough discussion about current GNSO Council issues during our last bi-weekly meeting, our last membership meeting, which was this past Wednesday. During this portion of the call, we will circle back to the question about the NomCom/GNSO Council liaison job description that we started discussing on Wednesday but decided we would circle back to this week.

We'll also briefly touch on that paper that Maxim sent around from ICANN Org about how to deal with changes to ICANN consensus policy. Maxim sent that around to the list [inaudible] a little bit of space to talk about that.

Once we're through that piece of the agenda, we'll turn over to Dmitry Burkov, who's one of our representatives to the Customer Standing Committee. He'll give our annual CSC update.

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

And then, after that, we'll move on to more of the administrative part of today's meeting, where we will do a formal handoff from our outgoing Executive Committee members to our new Executive Committee members. And then we'll wrap up with a bit of a review of the past year.

So before we dive in, I will pause here and see if there are any questions about the agenda today or if there's anything anyone would like to add to the agenda, where we can make sure we cover it in the time that we have together.

Okay. I'm just checking Zoom for any hands or comments. I'm not seeing any, so just a reminder to please just feel free to pop your hand up at any point during the discussions. We'll be monitoring the queue. Feel free to use the chat if you have a question you want those read aloud. It will be helpful to mark those with the words "Question" at the beginning and end. But we'll be keeping a pretty close eye on the chat for folks to get involved. And also a reminder to just please put your affiliation next to your name. it helps us keep track of which of our members are here for this meeting today.

Okay. With that, I think we can go ahead and dive right in. First, I'm going to hand over to Barbara Knight, who's going to give us a bit of a preview about what the Transfer Policy PDP Working Group is going to cover during their meeting this week. Barbara, over to you.

BARBARA KNIGHT: Thank you, Sam. So the Transfer Policy PDP Working Group meeting is scheduled to occur tomorrow, October the 26th, at 17:30 UTC. The hour-

and-a-half meeting will actually have about 20 minutes that will be just an overview of the work that we're doing in that particular PDP, and then it will continue deliberations relating to additional security measures that are associated with inter-registrar transfers. So those various security measures would include locks preventing transfers after creating or inter-registrar transfers, after a change of registrant, during UDRP proceedings, as well as during redemption/grace periods, etc. So that is pretty much in a nutshell what we'll be discussing tomorrow, just to give you a preview of coming attractions for this particular stakeholder group.

The majority of the policy discussions are really most impactful to registrars. That being said, Jim, Beth, and I have been compiling a list of potential modifications to the transfer policy that have been under discussion that may impactful to registry operators. So with that, we hope to be able to provide that or a summary of that information on those topics in the next few weeks to the broader Registry Stakeholder Group.

That's all I have. Any questions?

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks very much for that, Barbara. We'll be looking forward to seeing that compiled list of issues that you referenced.

Does anyone have any questions or follow-up for Barbara?

All right. Not seeing any hands. Now we can turn to Dennis Tan for the IDN EPDP preview.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Sam. Can you hear me okay?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yeah, loud and clear.

DENNIS TAN: All right. Good morning, everyone. So a short and sweet update on the IDN EPDP. Thus far, the working group has been meeting at a regular weekly clip. We have looked at three issues thus far. One is the adoption of the root zone LGR as a source to validate variant top-level domain names as it pertains to existing TLDs. As a background, SubPro recommended to adopt the root zone LGR—the big IDN table—to validate TLDs and calculate the variants for new applied-for top-level domain names. So this group will look at applying the root zone LGR to existing TLDs.

The other topic we're also discussing is the role and what to do with the self-identified variants in the previous rounds, whether they need to conform or not to the root zone LGR and what are the implications in other processes as well.

And the third item that is in discussion is what happens if a registry operator of an existing TLD is trying to apply for a variant, and the applicant or the registry operator does not agree with result of the root zone LGR? What are the challenge mechanisms? What is the process in order to file an objection and whatnot? So we're looking at what SubPro

recommended as an objection process or appeals process and looking at whether that process would be fit for purpose as far as existing TLDs as well.

So, thus far, that's what we're looking for, Sam. So, happy to take any questions.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Dennis.

Does anyone have any questions for Dennis?

All right. Dennis, not to put you on the spot—because I know this is something that came through very recently—but do you know if the IDN EPDP has plans to discuss the communication that came from the ICANN Board on the IDN 4.0 guidelines? Or do you think that's going to start at the council level first?

DENNIS TAN: Good question, Sam. I think it's going to start at the council level first. I am aware of the communication from the Board to the council, but as far as I know, the working group has not received that yet. But if I would have to put money on it, I think it will come back to the Registry Stakeholder Group before it goes to the IDN EPDP. That's just my two cents.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay, great. Thanks for that, Dennis. And Edmon is confirming he has the same understanding. So [inaudible] that making its way through the channels. And when it lands back on our desk, we'll be ready to deal with it then. All right. Thanks again, Dennis.

All right. Beth, whenever you're ready, if you want to take us through a preview of the IRT's meeting that's taking place this week.

BETH BACON: Hi, folks. This is Beth. The IRT is going to be kind of straightforward. We're going to continue our work on the doc—The OneDoc is what we're calling it—which is where we're compiling the consensus policy. We have been, in the group, working in the additional requirements that have come through the next phases of the IRT, so we'll also be discussing that. The IRT meeting itself will take place in this time slot, noon eastern/nine Pacific—not sure what it is European or Asia-Pacific—for just an hour. And we will, again, just dig through those things. I do believe that Dennis may not have put it on the agenda, but he usually opens the mic for some questions from the community if they are involved. Fairly straightforward this week.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Beth. And noting Rubens left a comment in the chat that there's been a positive development in the Registration Data IRT, which was ICANN Org removing the optional language in the policy. I think this relates specifically to Recommendation 7 of the EPDP Phase 1 that the IRT has been dealing with. Is that correct, Rubens?

EN

Yeah. Okay, so he's confirming.

Yeah, there's been some movement on that recommendation, which I know has been outstanding for quite some time. So I think great news on that front and look forward to any other updates that come out of the IRT this week.

Any questions for Beth or any for more follow-up?

All right. Not seeing any questions. So next we'll turn to Sophie to give us a preview of the Data Accuracy Scoping Team's meeting later this week.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks, Sam. So the Data Accuracy Scoping Team has finally really started its work very recently. It's not a PDP. It's aimed to scope whether there's any issues that need to be explored further on the topic of accuracy. So we'll be looking at the issues of enforcement in reporting, measurement of accuracy, how effective the enforcement in reporting and measurement of accuracy is, and whether there's any impact or improvements that need to be made.

The meeting is tomorrow. It is at 19:30 UTC, which I believe … I know it's 9:30 in Europe. Over in Asia-Pacific, I think it's sort of 5:30/6:30 in the morning. And, honestly, I'm not sure about the U.S.—sorry—for the times for that.

I will also note a couple of other points. So our Chair, Michael Palage, is looking to put out a mailing list where people can send comments in an

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

input that they want to share with the scoping team. And we're also exploring a possibility of including alternatives for members of the accuracy scoping team. However, given that's not within our charge from the council, my understanding is that we will need to ask council about that and whether alternates will be permitted. So tomorrow there will be an open mic session to the meeting, and we'll be looking at formulating our workplan.

If I've missed anything, then I'll ask Marc and Beth to jump in, but that's it.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Sophie. Mar[c] or Beth, anything you guys would like to add to Sophie's overview?

No? Perfect. All right. Any questions on the accuracy scoping team and the status of that ongoing work?

Okay. All right, not seeing any. So that brings us to the last part of this particular portion of our agenda. Just as reminder—I mentioned this at the top of the call, but I'll say it again—we spent time during our last membership meeting, which was just this past Wednesday, going over the issues currently at play at the council level and doing a preview of the council meeting that will be taking place this week. However, during that discussion, Kurt teed up the topic of the NomCom job description. We said we would take a little bit of time over the weekend in the later part of last week for members to familiarize themselves with that

subject so that we would be able to have a little bit more of an in-depth discussion on that.

So I'm going to turn it over to our councilors at this point—Kurt, Maxim, and Seb—to take us through the next part of that discussion and any feedback that you guys are looking for—I think Kurt may be starting off with the e-mail that you sent to the stakeholder group list a little bit earlier today—and where this discussion stands now so that we can give you the feedback that you guys need to go into that council meeting later this week.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Sam. I can do that and then discuss a little bit what the GNSO Council is doing at this meeting since there's some new information there, too.

So there's a council vote scheduled to revise the GNSO councilor job description for the Nominating Committee. And while there wasn't a redline that I could find, the gist of the amendment to the job description for those NomCom appointees to the GNSO Council says that the [changes reflect] that preference for appointees that are not currently affiliated with any stakeholder group or constituency, recognizing that this might not always be feasible.

So, again, I'm not as knowledgeable as I should be. I always though that this was the sort of instance. So I don't know what's specifically pushing this issue. During our last meeting, we talked about the possibility of asking for a deferral since things are happening fast before the ICANN

meeting. It seems like the e-mail I sent to the ExComm (Executive Committee) of the RySG is a letter that's on the council list from the IPC that are essentially raising the same issues. The agenda item sort of describes that the council should consider this but then, as my cat will tell you, it's also urging that we put it to a vote. And the IPC in their letter is wondering what the rush is, and this seems, to me, to be one of those changes that could be a big change or could not. So we want to get a better understanding.

So I think the way this is going to go now is that there'll be some deference paid to the IPC e-mail, certainly either before the council meeting or we can write an e-mail or during it, chiming in, saying we'd like to have a better discussion about this so we understand why the change is being made. So I think, if we can give that e-mail a broader distribution—I just saw it this morning, so I fired it off to you guys—our path is to say, "Yeah, let's not have a vote this time. Let's understand what this is all about and have a vote next time." Again, as the IPC says, there's not a real rush in this, and putting it off for a month is fine. So without asking for a deferral of the vote, I think we could support the IPC in their position. So that's what that issue is.

So I'll pause to hear what anybody has to say.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Kurt.

Does anybody have anybody feedback for Kurt on this?

EN

While folks are thinking about it, Kurt, I might just ask a clarifying question. Did you say that IPC is asking for a deferral of this and that we would be supportive of that request without necessarily making the request ourselves? Is that sort of where we've landed on this?

KURT PRITZ: So in the IPC e-mail, they say, on substance, the approach and the emotion is debatable at least, and they've attached a markup version for discussion as prepared by the IPC. So they say in their e-mail that, procedurally, some dialogue should be required before a vote. So the vote is premature. But they don't specifically ask for a deferral. And on substance, they offer a redline. As I said, this just came out this morning, so I haven't looked at it yet.

So I think chiming in to say, "Without opining on the IPC e-mail, I think we could agree that we would like to have discussion on it and then vote on it later" … Probably when the agreement of the leadership without pulling the deferral card, if that has any cost to it … I don't know.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay. Thank for that clarification, Kurt. I don't know that there is really any cost associated with deferring on this. Paul pointed out in chat that the NomCom is not even really going to begin any of its selection process until January.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah, exactly.

SAM DEMETRIOU: So it seems to me like there is some time here.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Beth, I see your hand has gone up and done. Did you want to jump in or have we sort of covered those?

BETH BACON: No, I think we've covered it. Sounds like we have a solution. But, honestly, my Zoom is just freaking out and I don't know why my hand keeps going up and down.

SAM DEMETRIOU: We are getting very close to Halloween.

KURT PRTIZ: No comment.

SAM DEMETRIOU: It could be a haunted Zoom room.

BETH BACON: My computer is possessed, you guys. I'll see you next week after the exorcism.

EN

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. So it sounds like that is a pretty good path forward to maybe back up the IPC in terms of some of the concerns that have been raised there and that there's no special rush in getting this done. I mean, I can understand the desire to wrap something up procedurally, but if this has to wait for another month, I think there's no real harm in that.

I'm noting just a bit of discussion in the chat. And I think this gets to more of the substance of the change being discussed to the job description, right? And that change has expressed a preference—I don't know if it was a hard and fast requirement—for candidates who are unaffiliated with an existing GNSO organization and that this is potentially a reaction to some of the recent appointments that have come out of the NomCom. But I think some of the NomCom just has to work with the applicants that it gets and find someone very knowledgeable in GNSO procedures and all the other—first of all— requirements who also doesn't have an affiliation or at least a history with an existing GNSO group. That's obviously a bit of a challenge here.

Does anyone else want to weigh in on that aspect of it? Any concerns or questions that they want to feed back to our councilors to bring into this discussion? Or have we kind of put this one to bed sufficiently?

KURT PRITZ: I'm good.

ICANN|72
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay. Yeah, I think it seems like no else is really super-eager to get in the queue on this.

So, Kurt, any other updates or preview items that are new and shiny since our discussion on Wednesday?

KURT PRITZ: Yeah. So the council is having a strategic planning session associated with this meeting, although not during this week. But we had sort of an icebreaker session. And the strategic planning session discusses continual improvement in the process changes, in the policymaking process, consensus policy 3.0, implementing elements of all of that and how we can improve things.

Also, today—because I guess it's in everybody's goals for getting things done by the ICANN meeting—the council received, from ICANN Org, a 14-page paper called Modifying Consensus Policies. And, evidently, ICANN Org developed the paper as a thought exercise to share with the community for information and input on existing processes. So this is a draft version for the council to comment on. So, similar to the last one, I haven't had a chance to read the paper yet, but Philippe has suggested—and it's probably a good idea—to try to incorporate this into our strategic planning discussion. So that's a new development, and anyone can see that on the council list and the document.

And then, finally, the only other change from the last meeting I reported is … Well, there's a couple. One is our meeting with the Board. One of the items we were going to bring up was the Phase 1 recommendations

and the Board adoption of them. Remember, Recommendation 12, which had to do with the organization field, was maintained. And Recommendation 7 really goes to the transfer of data between registrar and registrar or what people refer to in shorthand as thick WHOIS. And so, again, today, we received an e-mail from the Board saying they're leaning towards acceptance of the Recommendation 12. We could talk a long time about that is but shouldn't have been contentious. So the Board is reporting that they're leaning toward accepting that and Philippe's take on that as well. We can take this off the agenda with the Board. So that's good news. So that's a development for you to know about.

Phase 1. The GAC meeting, the GAC portion of the agenda, really goes to Phase 2, where they comment pointedly about each constituency or stakeholder group submitting a minority statement and whether this was indicative of whether the whole process was broken.

And Philippe and the leadership have put together some talking points for the GAC. I'll tell you they seem okay to me but slightly weak. And if the council is going and defending the process, I think we could probably do a better job. So hopefully there'll be some time to stare at those things and sharpen them up before meeting with the GAC so we can say that minority features are a feature, not a bug.

So that's essentially the only changes that have come up in the last week. So thanks for giving me the opportunity. And on behalf of Maxim and Seb and I, thanks.

I C A N N | 7 2
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Kurt. I very much appreciate the updates there.

                           I see Maxim has got his hand up, so, Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's just a notice. For the last year, I think, more and more I see, in the GNSO Council's life/situation, instead of some discussion and then doing something, we see something on the agenda and we have to decide. And when I ask "Why are we in a hurry and are we in a hurry at all?" there are no answers. But we're supposed to vote for something, etc., etc. So it might be a new fashion. For ICANN, sending the serious papers in hours before the beginning of the meeting is an old habit. But for the GNSO Council, it's something new, I think. So we have to be extremely careful with the items which appear suddenly before the meeting. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Maxim. And I'm glad you brought up that paper again. I wanted to circle back on that and maybe ask a couple of follow-up questions because you expressed your surprise, I think, in your e-mail when you shared it with our stakeholder group mailing list about receiving e-mail and especially about the timing. About 24 hours or something, I think, before this meeting kicked off, it was finally shared by ICANN. Did the council have an indication that ICANN Org had been working on this paper?

                           And for anyone who hasn't had a chance to go through it yet or who hasn't had a chance to really dig out from your e-mail from the

weekend, this paper is a discussion draft about how consensus policy can be modified. So that should be in your inbox for members of this stakeholder group.

So, again, just to reiterate, I'm curious to know if the council knew that this was coming, if ICANN Org has any previous discussions with the Council that they were working on this.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I will check in my mailbox, but I don't remember that it was something like a month or two months or something. Maybe it was way earlier. Actually, we didn't ask for this.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Right. I see what you're saying. This wasn't something council had requested. It seems like something that likely bubbled up from staff. And Donna is sort of echoing that in the chat.

If anybody knows what the impetus for this paper was or has any thoughts or insights into … Why start on this paper and why now? Why publish it? I think it's an interesting question. As the ICANN community matures and not every consensus policy is on a novel topic—some might refer back or tread some similar areas as past consensus policies—I can understand the need to have something like this. I was just curious if anyone knew how this came about and anything like that.

I'm just pausing for a quick second to look. Go ahead, Susan. I was just pausing to check out your chat contribution, but I see your hand up. Go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: No insight on that whatsoever that I can offer. All I would say is I'm not delighted about the idea of this landing in everyone's inboxes literally as the meeting is about to start. It feels a bit like it's not going to get the attention it deserves because it's arriving at a time when people don't have time to read it. I don't feel that that's a good way forward, given that it can't really be adequately discussed during the meeting because it has only just arrived. It would be much better to arrive in people's inboxes after the meeting is concluded. And the timing seems … Well, I'm not sure. I mean, it's easy to … Yes, "deliberate." Someone is saying it. It's easy to infer that faith from it, to be honest.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Susan. Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I suggest we, as councilors, are directed to say that, unfortunately, this information came extremely late, and our constituency didn't have enough time for a proper discussion. So we cannot tell you what the, I'd say, thoughts and ideas are. So we ask for deferral of this exchange, maybe to make it offline, but not to say after that, "Okay. You [haven't had] enough time during this SPS session of councilors, and you just lost your opportunity." Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:
Thanks, Maxim. I don't recall that this is on the agenda formally. So I don't know that there's any action that the councilors will be expected to take on this paper, but I would agree with you that tabling a more in-depth discussion on this for maybe the next council meeting, when everybody has had a chance to look it over … I mean, the ICANN meeting week has now started. People are going to be busy. It's a pretty big ask to go through a ten-page document and develop a coherent viewpoint and reaction to it in the next couple days. I think it's asking a bit much of folks. So I agree with you that tabling discussions on this until maybe the next council meeting likely makes more sense when we've had a chance to discuss it internally as well.

I see Beth's hand and then Kurt.

BETH BACON:
Thanks, Sam. You said a lot of what I was going to say. It didn't look like there was an action required. Obviously, this is too short for us to have a view of any kind. But to the extent that ICANN maybe … I mean, if they do give them time, you could simply say, "Fine. Walk us through where this came from and why you're giving it to us, but don't expect any response." So if there is an opportunity here from ICANN to get some of our questions answered, I don't think that would be a waste of time. But I agree. There's no way we can respond at this point. But thanks very much, Maxim, for sharing it with the group.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Beth. And even to the extent that, if this is going to get pushed off to a later council meeting, if the ICANN staff who worked on it is available to discuss it in more depth, that also might be very helpful for maybe the November meeting or even the December meeting if it gets pushed off a little bit further.

But I think, yeah, getting a bit more background on this will help us better assess the contents of this report and then be able to channel that through the council to provide feedback.

It'd also be good to know if ICANN is looking directly for feedback just from the council or if this is going to be put out for public comment. If we as a stakeholder group need to work on anything more formal, just knowing that work is coming down the pipe would be very helpful.

Oh, yeah, it's for the strategic planning session. Okay, yeah. Sorry. Thanks for reminding me on that, Maxim. You had said it earlier and I just missed that. So, yeah, future discussion. A little bit more time to deal with this would be helpful. Go ahead, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think that the strategic planning without review of the task is a bad idea from an operational perspective. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yeah, makes sense. Thanks, Maxim.

All right. So does anyone have any other questions on the council-related items, council work that's being done this week? As with every

Annual General Meeting, the GNSO Council is going to have a number of work sessions throughout the course of the week, so I know many of us will be listening in on that. But while we have our councilors here present, I just want to do one last check to see if there's any questions or comments.

All right. Looks like we're good. I think, with this then, we can transition over to Dmitry. He is going to give us a CSC update for this year. As a reminder to folks, we get an update from our CSC reps on an annual basis, usually in conjunction with the Annual General Meeting. So, Dmitry, whenever you are ready to take over. I know you have some slides you're going to share.

DMITRY BURKOV: One moment. Dear colleagues, it's a pleasure for me to see you all here. I don't want to waste your time because a copy of this presentation, Sue can provide to you, and I prefer to accent on some key points.

First of all, I want to congratulate you because now it's five years that we've existed. It's a result of the IANA transition. And five years ago, it was the first CSC (Customer Standing Committee) meeting and first review and first PTI. It's post-transition IANA now, PTI is Public Technical Identifiers.

I've been on the [CSC] for the last three years. I prefer to accent what has changed because you can read the standard phrases and also can use a reference/links if you will need more information. I want to remind you of a [picture] five years ago. It still works. It's a minority

change, if at all. What's happened during this year is just that some members are still the same. Some are renewed. I want to remind us that the CSC consists of the full voting members and chair and a few liaisons appointed by different organizations.

As a result of the last five years, it has become clear who is interested in this controlling/mentoring function of the Customer Standing Committee. In whole, what I want to say is that my impression and my feeling is it's an effective tool which controls the PTI activity and allows to identify in advance some weakness if it will happen.

Just as a reminder, because it's all SLA, all metrics, based on contract. It's the scope of work of the contract. We just check and investigate if something went wrong. That's just an example. PTI publishes this report in advance before our meeting. If something went wrong, we usually discuss and investigate the reason.

Typically, what the final conclusion from our side is that it's always good. It's excellent. And I'm very satisfied that, during the last years, during a majority—practically the whole year—we've had 100% excellent. Sometimes it's satisfactory, but no more than one threshold was not met.

You can see the whole picture for the whole history of PTI and CSC. Why am I satisfied? Because now there are no technical faults. All faults are just about—for example, some operators sent requests the last moment before Christmas. Yes, of course, we discussed that it's possible to interpret what means business days/calendar days, but we decided that PTI will take an account more carefully around Christmas

days. I also hope that registry operators also will take into account to not expect a reaction if you send it on Friday before Christmas—Friday evening. Don't expect that it can be done in the next three days.

Also, as some new SLAs are added, sometimes PTI performance in fact depends on internal procedures of TLD operators because, for example, some procedures require a reaction and answer in time. And if the operator delays an answer for weeks, it's very hard to expect that an SLA can be executed in time by PTI.

So it's a typical fault in metrics, as you can see, but in general, in my opinion, to compare with the beginning, it's a great achievement of PTI. And in general, also, as I'm involved with PTI and other activities, in my estimation, this is a great job that was done.

I mentioned about some change because, after the transition, some processes were deployed, and some changes, according to these procedures, were implemented. There's three technical checks. There's an SLA for IDN LGR tables. And ccTLD creation transfer.

About complaints, the to be honest, it exists. We have remedial action procedures, but it still [never was before.] It's clear how it will work if something happened, but we still have no such cases that we use this procedure for and especially escalated to another level. I hope it will not happen.

In details, if someone is interested, you can follow these links. Or if you are interested more, you can participate because our monthly calls are

open for all, and you can find the links for these calls on the following page.

Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Dmitry.

Does anyone have any follow-up questions for Dmitry on the performance over the past year?

All right. Not seeing any hands. I just want to thank you, Dmitry, and Gorab, who unfortunately was not able to attend today's meeting, for continuing to represent the Registry Stakeholder Group on the CSC. I know you have a pretty hefty commitment/meeting every month, making sure to review all those reports. So I just want to express our appreciation for continuing to do that work.

If anyone at any point would like to increase these updates—we tend to them once a year—if anyone thinks there'd be value in sharing more updates, just let us know.

This is also a great opportunity to remind folks that—Donna has noted in the chat—the next CSC effectiveness review is going, as far as we know, to be taking off relatively shortly. The group has been formed. Donna and Jonathan Robinson are going to be representing the stakeholder group on that review.

And, Donna and Jonathan, I believe there's been some discussion about adopting the terms of reference for that review, and that's—right.

And Donna is confirming that the group has had their first call now. So that work is officially underway. I misspoke. It's not imminent. It's actually happening.

Donna, did you want to say anything about that review?

DMITRY BURKOV: I [thought] about the review. It's for the next update, the next report, because it's just at the beginning.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Right. Okay. Then, yeah, we'll save this, I guess, unless Donna or Jonathan wants to add anything before we move on.

All right. Great. Well, thank you again, Dmitry, for that.

All right. We have about 15 minutes left in our call today, so I think this is a good time to officially do the handover. Usually we get to do this in person, which is a little bit of a bummer. We can't stand up, shake people's hands, give them a round of applause, for the work they've done. But I did just want to take this moment while we have everyone here together on the call.

Since this is the Annual General Meeting, every one of our Executive Committee officers' terms are coming to an end for the following folks. So Jonathan's term as Treasurer will be coming to an end, and he will be transitioning that role to Karen Day, who was elected a little bit earlier this year. I want to thank Jonthan for all the work that he has done as Treasurer. But I don't think there's a job in the stakeholder

group that Jonathan hasn't held at one point. He's been a great community member. Always had a very shrewd and measured eye for the budget, making sure that we're on track but not getting too hung up on the day-to-day work of it. So I think he made my job as Chair very easy because he put everything in terms that I could very clearly understand, despite not having an affinity for numbers or budget things. So I just want to take a moment here to recognize the work that Jonathan has done. As Sue is putting into the chat, we would all do a round of applause if we were in person. So, Jonathan, please accept our virtual applause and our thanks for all the work you've done as Treasurer. [I'm thinking about] goofy little video applause.

All right. Next, we're also going to be transitioning the role of Vice-Chair of Administration from Craig Schwartz to Alan Woods. Craig was with us on the ExComm as VC Admin for two years, and in that … No. Sorry. That's a mistake. Craig took over Beth's role when she had moved into the Vice-Chair of Policy role. And I think the reason I think it was two years is because Craig got a ton done in that one year that he was on the Executive Committee.

The biggest project that I want to express a lot of appreciation for is that Craig oversaw—alongside Sue, but Craig really was the architect behind it—updating and revamping our website—our Registry Stakeholder Group website. I think it was still in its original form factor. It was the same one that had first launched so many years ago. And Craig went out, he found a vendor, he oversaw the entire project, and he did it so quickly. It actually blew me away. So Craig has been a really great asset to the ExComm. Always super-organized. Kept us on track and just

handled all those administrative items with a lot of skill and deft action. So I want to thank Craig for your service. You turned one year into what felt like a lot more—in a good way. In a very good way. So I wanted to take a moment to appreciate all of Craig's work. Again, a silent round of applause here for the work Craig has done.

All right. And then the last person that we need to recognize is Donna. As the former Chair, she's been serving on the ExComm in the past year in the role of Chair Emeritus. I want to thank Donna for all of the guidance that she's given me. She's been a really good mentor in terms of being available to answer any questions that I had about taking over the role of Chair, plus her experience working within the stakeholder group and also having worked in the ICANN community for quite some time. She's been very helpful as the ExComm and then the stakeholder group as whole has dealt with a number of different issues that have come up over the past year. And, also, Donna, I think, really embodies the spirit of volunteerism and putting her hand up and pitching in and doing work in this community, as she has now volunteered for the CSC review team. And she also volunteered for the IDN EPDP. And with Edmon's departure as Chair of that group to join the ICANN Board, Donna has stepped up to chair that effort as well.

So thank you, Donna. Thanks for being there and lending us your expertise over the past year. And I'll just pause here so we can give a round of applause to Donna.

All right. And with that, we'll formally welcome Karen and Alan to the ExComm. Strap in. It starts now. No, I'm kidding. We've been working

on transitioning to Karen and Alan over the past, I think, couple months at this point. So we're very excited to have them on board. We're excited to welcome them as new officers to the stakeholder group, new ExComm members. And we look forward to working with them as well.

All right. See now? If we were in person, we could also exchange hugs and all that kind of stuff. Alas, we are not. We'll have to save those for the next time we do get together.

All right. Thank you, guys. Thanks so much for that. So the last thing we had on the agenda today—I'll pause here to see if there's anything else anyone wants to cover—is to look back over the past year—it's been kind of a crazy one—and just take some time to acknowledge all the work that's been done. So before I dive into that, is there any other questions that folks want to ask? Or is there any other substantive policy or what-have-you points that folks want to bring up before we dive into that and close out today?

All right. Not seeing any. Then I put together a couple of brief remarks to close out today's meeting. This Annual General Meeting concludes my first year as Chair of this stakeholder group. I would say this past year has been sort of tough one in the same way that last year—2020, the last year of Donna's tenure as Chair—was a bit of a tough one. When I took over at the end of the AGM last year, I knew Donna had wrapped up her last year with nothing but remote ICANN meetings, and I was really crossing my fingers that my whole first year as Chair would be all remote ICANN meetings. I know many of us were holding out hope that this meeting would take place in Seattle or there would be some in-

EN

person component in Seattle. But here we are. We're about to start. We're kicking off our sixth fully remote ICANN meeting. And it's hard.

I want to just acknowledge that this isn't the easiest thing to do. It's not easy to get on Zoom and sit in front of your computer for long stretches on time. It's not easy to get a lot of work done when you're not able to be in the same room as people and you're not able to have that easier communication that can take place when you're face-to-face instead of being moderated by screens and phone calls and instant messaging apps and all of that stuff. But you guys have done it. The members of the stakeholder group continue to show up day after day, week after week, and continue to get a lot of work done even in the face of unideal conditions. And I just want to take this moment to express my appreciation for that but also how impressed I am with the work that everyone has been able to accomplish over the past year.

Just as a quick review of all of that, we've done a ton. We've done a ton of work as a stakeholder group over the past year, guys. The DNS Abuse Working Group has really hit its stride in a big way. They have been producing a lot of documents, a lot of good information, that I think is advancing the conversation around DNS abuse across the whole community, both as registries and then in conjunction with our colleagues in the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

So I want to take a moment to acknowledge both Brian and Jim, who are leading that group, as well as everyone who's participating and doing a ton of work in that group: Dennis, Keith, Sophie, and Je[ff]—all

I C A N N | 7 2
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL

of the folks who are contributing and really helping put pen to paper, getting documents published, getting work put out there.

We also formed the Registration Data Services (RDS) Task Force earlier this year. We brought together all the folks who are interested in the topic of RDS data and the different ways that that intersects with ICANN policy. And so that group has really dug into a lot of difficult and hard-to-digest topics, including the proposed legislation that's coming out of Europe, the NIS2 directive, and the Digital Services Act. And so that group did a really great job in producing an educational and advocacy document that we shared with members of the European Union parliament and we'll be sharing with the E.U. Council as well. So I think that piece of work was very impressive. So a big thanks to folks like Beth and Alan and Mar[c] and Matt who have all been really engaged in that group and who have really been leaders in that topic.

We've also got to thank Donna and Rick and Jeff and Maxim and others who've been involved in the RDAP RA Amendment Working Group. That has been slow progress, but that group this year really hit a milestone, where we finally finished negotiating with ICANN. They resolved all of the outstanding topics for discussion, pushed ICANN on some things that we really needed to push them on. I know it's been taking a while. I know, when you talk to Donna and Rick, they will tell you they know it's been taking a while, but it has reached a point where we're now just waiting for amendment text from ICANN. So that's a major accomplishment over the course of this year, despite some slow goings and despite hitting some rough patches where we weren't necessarily communicating very well or hearing back from ICANN on certain things.

Similarly, the Roles and Responsibilities Group also broke through some major negotiating items with ICANN. I know we had a full and in-depth update on that from Beth as well as from Matt and Alan last week, so I'm not going to go into too much detail about that. But that group is continuing to slog through and get work done.

And then the last group I'll mention is the Next Round Discussion Group. So Donna and Martin and Karen and others have been engaged in getting interested members together, organizing, to deal with any and all issues related to the next round of new gTLDs when they come out.

All right. The last group of thank yous that I'll do is for all of those stakeholder group members who have been involved in or leaders of all the [PPs] that have made a lot of progress and reached conclusion over the past year. So big kudos to Jeff for getting SubPro wrapped up at the end of 2020. Major thanks to both Kurt and Keith, who are involved in different phases of the EPDP. Hopefully that, with the council vote this week, is coming to an end. A big thank you as well to our representatives on those groups.

I also remembered that the RPM PDP published its final report at the very end of 2020, so that's another big accomplishment from this past year.

And now, as we mentioned, the IDN PDP has launched—the Transfer Policy, the Accuracy Scoping Team. So just a big thank you to all those stakeholder group members who are continuing to be involved in that and continuing to fight the good fight and represent the interests of our stakeholder group.

And amid all that, we still contributed to a ton of public comments. We still got a lot of other work done, and we get together every week and still managed to process through a large volume of work despite us all wishing we could just be somewhere together and be able to maybe have a coffee and have a drink.

So I want to close out the meeting with just my extreme expression of appreciation. You should all feel very proud of the work you're doing. Oh, yeah, and one last plug for our association members. Both the BRG and the Geo-TLD groups will be having meetings, I think, both later today.

And the next thing on the agenda for today was going to be the CPH DNS abuse outreach session, which is happening in about 32 minutes. So hopefully we'll see most of you there. Hopefully you'll see you in the BRG and Geo-TLD sessions.

And I hope everyone has a great ICANN72. It's been a great first year as Chair, despite some challenges, and I'm looking forward to another great year in the second half of my term, starting now.

All right. Thank you, guys, so much for everything. I hope everyone has a great rest of the meeting. And with that, I think we can wrap up for today.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

I C A N N | 7 2
VIRTUAL ANNUAL GENERAL