

---

ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – GNSO: CPH Membership Meeting  
Thursday, October 28, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 PDT

SUE SCHULER: Thank you. Hello and welcome to the Contracted Party House Membership meeting. My name is Sue and I'm the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that the session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session.

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.

The session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Sue. Hi, everyone, and welcome to the CPH Membership meeting, as Sue just so kindly welcomed us all to. I apologize for my loud typing in the background there.

---

***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.***

---

Today for this next hour, we're primarily going to use the time to get prepared for our session with the ICANN Board, which is going to be taking place in the block right after this. So, 13:30 on the East Coast and that makes it 17:30 UTC. So we're going to kind of go through the topic that the Board suggested. We'll go through the topic that we proposed back to the Board. We'll seek to designate some presenters to tee up the various talking points or questions that we want to pose, introduce the topics so that folks are hearing not just from the ExCom members but really from our membership as well. And then if we have time at the end—I chatted with Ashley a little bit before this call—we would also like to touch on the document that the CPH Abuse Working Group has been working on about reporting requirements and reporting—I don't think we're using the word standards but that's sort of what that document covers. So hopefully, we'll end up with a few minutes at the end of the call to be able to touch on that as well. Ashley, anything you want to add, any words of welcome you want to share with the group?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hi, everybody. I think that's all that's necessary. Go ahead, get going.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Awesome. Thank you. All right, so as you guys know, because we've talked about this in a couple of meetings now, and because I'm sure others on this call have attended some of the other Board meetings that have taken place over the course of this week, we have a topic

---

that the Board has proposed. Sue, if you wouldn't mind sliding the screen down a little bit, I can read it out loud here.

Provide input or comments on how you think we could efficiently identify and work more closely with governments globally, as well as educate, train, and interact when it comes to geopolitical issues relating to ICANN's mission. So just for some added context, this is the topic that the Board has posed to every community group that it's meeting with. It's now had a number of meetings over the course of the week. I think we're the last one because I think our meeting is just before the public forum and all the wrap-up sessions for ICANN72.

Sorry, the other thing I meant to mention is that it was also one of the ICANN CEO goals for Fiscal Year '22—sort of losing track of what year or date it is in these strange times. One of the goals for Fiscal Year '22 is to improve the interaction with governments and engagement with governments across the world. So one of the things Göran has been passing around and plugging during the course of this meeting is the CEO report. I will try to drop the link to that in the chat. But it goes through some of the engagement that ICANN have had over the past year with various governments.

So I tried to listen into a handful of the Board meetings that have taken place over the course of this week. On this topic, one of the interesting refrains that I've heard a lot in the discussions is, why don't you just rely more on the GAC? And then even in the Board's meeting with the GAC, the GAC was like, "We're here. We're here to help you." So I think it might be interesting to get the Board's perspective on that

---

conversation, if they think there are better ways to leverage the GAC, if they think there are limitations to that and how that could be overcome. Because I think that dovetails really nicely into the next topic we're going to propose about prioritization. Because I think we as a community are sort of grappling with this question of like, why create more a new work when there's already a lot of work that maybe isn't really complete? And so in that vein, why try to create new structures and new processes when you have an existing structure that is pretty robust? Are there efficiencies that can be gained instead of building new things from the ground up?

So I just wanted to open that. I want to open the floor. I want to get other people's thoughts on this question. If there are specific points you want to raise or questions you want to pose back to the Board on this topic. Like I said, we're looking for all kinds of input, and especially if other people want to be the topic leads or get up in front of the Board and raise their hands during the next session we have with them. I see Ashley and then Beth. Ashley, go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hello. Just to note that the Registrar Stakeholder Group has not discussed this, so I'm not necessarily speaking on their behalf, more just my reactions to the question and having watched a number of the sessions as well. It doesn't seem to have been very well received—ICANN Board's desire to engage more with governments. And where there does seem to be some support is education. ICANN can always do more to educate other governments. And quite honestly, I see that

---

pretty much as the limit of what they can do effectively, as well as do something in a manner that doesn't get them in the crosshairs of just about every other constituency.

Something else that I've noticed, for better or for worse, is that a lot of us, as stakeholder groups, are engaging with governments more than we have in the past directly, which at first made me nervous because it seems kind of out of scope of, say, what the Business Constituency should be doing. But then we'll use our own group, Registrar Stakeholder Group, as an opportunity to comment to the Europeans only because it seemed like we needed to for NIS2. So perhaps that is the better way to do it. Let the constituencies speak for themselves and ICANN's role can be primarily what has been, which is monitoring, bringing these things to our attention, and engaging in educational outreach when appropriate. Anyway, I'll stop there since there is a queue forming. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks for that, Ashley. Over to Beth next, and then Seb.

BETH BACON:

I'll turn on my video so you guys don't suffer along. Thanks very much, Ashley. I agree with a lot of that. I do think that maybe when you read the topic, it is a Board goal or a CEO goal. And they're asking, how do you think we could effectively identify and work more closely with governments? So maybe it's an opportunity for us to say, "Hey, you have a great resource on how to engage well with governments via the

---

GAC.” If the GAC is not the right vehicle or they don’t have the right representatives for what ICANN is looking to do because it looks like they are trying to efficiently engage, then we say maybe use the GAC as a resource. Don’t rely upon them. This is an ICANN responsibility. As Ashley said, we are, as stakeholder groups, already engaging with governments, we do it on our own, we can continue that ourselves. But I think that ICANN, if they could maybe dedicate resources to go in and brief the GAC or have conversations with the GAC on a more regular basis, understand where they maybe want more policy or technical expertise and have ICANN either arrange for stakeholder groups with expertise to come in and do that education. Or say, “Hey, GAC,”—you might be from your ministry of communication, you might be from a regulator, you might be from the Internet governance office—“what do you need from ICANN? Where should we go? Who should we talk to? How can we help you? Make it about how ICANN can help the GAC. Because I think that it is a resource but I do note that when it was brought up, folks were saying, “We’ll just use the GAC.” The GAC was a little bit reticent. Göran came up with some reasons why the GAC was maybe not the right representatives. But I think that it’s still a huge resource and opportunity. So I think maybe we could flip it back to them and say if there’s issues with the GAC, maybe you educate them, maybe your job is to go in and do a little more liaising there. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Beth. You’re getting a lot of plus ones in the chat there, especially on acting as a resource providing educational materials. I

---

think one thing that we've observed is ICANN's gotten a lot better in recent years about producing webinars and those kinds of things. Even if the exact GAC representative to show up at the three annual meetings are not the best suited to be the liaisons on certain pieces of legislation or legislation and development, like creating those kinds of resources and stuff that can easily be shared, like easy digital things that can be passed around and shared. Maybe that's a step in the right direction to be educating the other members of governments about ICANN's mission, its role and things like that. Seb and then Ashley again.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Hi, everybody. The question puzzled me, too, in the session with the GNSO. There wasn't much more than what has already been said. Indeed, invitation to go and talk to the GAC. I agree, depending on the country, the GAC may not be a very high representation of the government, but this is what we have. They gave the example—and, Maxim, correct me if I'm wrong—but they gave the example of Russia, saying that there was probably things that were happening there that we need to be aware of and be able to interact with that were above and beyond the GAC. The reality is that it's not like we're going to knock on anybody's door there and suddenly going to get opened. The GAC is as open a door as we have. They need to work with that. I mean, I understand that with GDPR, with NIS2, with all these things, they wish that they had doors much higher to be able to open and discuss with, but that's what the GAC is for. And if the GAC needs to be either

---

reforming or giving more credentials locally, etc., it's a different problem. It's not really ours. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Seb. Good points. Ashley, and then back to Beth.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Clearly, all our conversations spring additional ideas in our brains. Yeah, I think these are some really good points that are being raised. I think something else that perhaps we should encourage if the GAC hasn't ready themselves. On Sebastian's point, this is what we have in the GAC. We may not think they're the best place considering, like what parts of the government they're coming from and that sort of thing, but really what other parts of government are better placed?

There are no DNS ministries. We have the GAC. They've got knowledge of how ICANN works and operates. I think a lot of what they sometimes need is support from their higher ups, recognition from other parts of their government. So, I think recognizing the value that there is when they do have ministerial level meetings, when they bring in their ministers, so that their higher ups do get exposure to these issues. I think that's always useful. So if they continue doing those sorts of activities, they have been. I don't know if they have any things, any new ones in the books to do particularly in this virtual environment, but I think those are helpful.

Again, it's been said, but it makes me nervous when ICANN want to do anything more beyond representing themselves and what they do and



---

educating people on what they do, because that's not going to go well for them. With other governments, I'm sure ... I can only imagine how Göran's comments on Russia were received by Russia.

So I think it's just probably best if ICANN does its best in defending itself, what they're doing. I think being represented at IT meetings as a sector member is a good thing in the sense of they can explain who they are and that sort of thing. But I think that's pretty much where it needs to stop. It's going to be hard for them to be an advocate beyond what is the high level. So anyway, I'll stop because I don't think I'm making much sense at this point anyway, but I think you get what I'm trying to say.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Yeah, Ashley. I do. I wish I remembered who made this suggestion, but some of [these governments], there's kind of a divide, potential or existing legislation that could impact ICANN as an entity. Göran talked about this a little bit, like things that impact people's ability to connect to the Internet, things that impact like the global DNS. But then there's also a category of legislation and like NIS2, I think, and the DSA really fall under this in certain ways, that impacts the topics on which ICANN develop policy. So I think keeping that separate ... While still doing a job of educating governments about the fact that there is an Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers that does develop policy on X, Y, and Z is a good thing, but trying to wade into those things that otherwise should be the purview of the policy

---

development community. It's probably never ICANN wants to be planned. I think maybe that's what we're getting at here.

Apologies for the audio. It also could be because I'm on inline microphone and I'm [inaudible]. So I'm just going to apologize for that and sit on my hands while we now go to Beth and then Maxim.

BETH BACON:

I'm also having Internet issues, so hopefully mine's better. I agree a lot with, again, Ashley, what you said. As we're trying to practically prepare for a Board meeting, I like the approach of saying, "ICANN, this is for us to tell you how you can more efficiently do this. We think that you should A) adhere to your scope." They do. I mean, they've done that very well. And then also continue to serve as education. From our experience—I'm saying "our" because Ashley and I both used to do this—in the ITU. If you're on a government delegation, having ITU there, they may not be able to engage directly, but they can certainly bolster arguments, give delegations information and education as to how to discuss and dismiss maybe a little bit nutty proposals.

So they do have a role. And I think, again, the education is key. So we can advocate for them to do that. And then I think also just really advocating for them to use the GAC as a resource, again, perhaps educating them going in more actively, getting a session with them during ICANN meetings and saying, "What do you want to learn about? What do you want to tell us about?" It should be less presentation, more discussion the GAC doesn't even allow on presentation.

---

Then finally, I do think that we should call out Elena Plexida has been enormously helpful and generous with her time in the last few months, especially with NIS2 and DSA, and she's a fantastic resource. So I do think that we should shout out the effectiveness of her role and that engagement to A) because it's true, and B) just to show that we're appreciative and that they are doing something right and don't get rid of that, and that we are not out here to say that ICANN is doing anything wrong. It's just that they could do differently different things. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Beth. I think a lot of folks in the chat are adding to your fandom of Elena. She's really great at her job. All right. Next, over to Maxim, and then Alan and Russ. Russ? Okay. Go ahead, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I think the GAC's role is a bit overestimated because when you talk to GAC members, you most probably will have the response taking into account the position of the particular ministry. Ministries do not live in love and peace in governments all around the world. And unlike United States where quite powerful agencies are represented in GAC and PSWG, all other countries, I'm not sure. Definitely they may ask GAC about where to come next but they need to be prepared that situation where some tiny non-for-profit from some particular country comes to the government and says that they have values and mission. I am not sure they will be taken into account seriously. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Maxim. I'm not sure what to do with that last comment I think because I wouldn't necessarily qualify ICANN as a tiny, random, nonprofit, different country. I think the point of this question is that ICANN has realized that there is a need for some government interaction. And I think if they're of the belief that if that is a futile effort maybe, why are we having this conversation in the first place?

I want to just quickly pause, before I go over to Alan and then Russ, to note a couple things. Talking in the vein of like what you said at the top, Maxim, who is on the GAC? What representatives participate in the GAC? We're seeing some comments in the chat in that similar vein. I want to direct everyone's attention to one from Donna earlier about how the GAC appears to largely be political representation as opposed to legislative experts. They're different skillsets. So if the Board requires regulation insights, they should utilize GAC reps to find those reps in the various governments.

Then there was another comment that I'm sort of losing track of—oh, from Donna. An important role for the GAC is that they extol the value of ICANN and the multistakeholder model domestically. This goes back to what Seb said, right? It's not about trying to force the GAC to be something that it's not. We understand that there may be limitations to the way it exists right now. I think the larger overarching point that we're trying to put across here is that it's an existing body and existing structure that could be used better. It could be leveraged to achieve other goals that align with what ICANN is trying to do here.

---

And that is by maybe using the GAC reps as more in a liaison capacity, not necessarily expecting the GAC reps to be the number one experts on the topics, for example. I'm hoping I'm capturing that. I'm having a little bit of a hard time keeping up with all the chat because it's going pretty fast. I'm going to turn over to Alan now and try to get caught up. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN WOODS:

That was from reading the comments and from what you just said, it's pretty much what I was hoping to say as well. If we're engaging in or asking ICANN, it's a little tangential to what they're asking, but if we're saying to them educate the GAC better, engage with the GAC better, there is a bit of a two-way street there as well, and just let them know exactly where they're able to make such stands. Are they the experts? Having that two-way street, saying to them, "Yes, I am the GAC rep, but I am capable, I'm authorized to make this statement." To know where their authorizations lie is I think very key in those conversations, because there's no point having those conversations with people who are ultimately not the people who are going to have that conversation within their own government.

So I think ICANN needs to be very clear. And it's not a conversation as contracted parties can have with GAC. It's definitely something that ICANN should have with the GAC in saying, "If you send GAC representative, that GAC representative should be so empowered or at least know the boundaries of which their power should light, and we should know about in return." Obviously, I'm coming at this from

---

recent, shall I say, activism of a certain GAC member who—it’s that lack of clarity where people can run with a particular thing right back to a legislative endeavor, mantra to the MSM and make good on threats, for wanting better terms, that I think it’s very important that there is that clarity into the role that they’re playing that ICANN knows who they’re talking to. Because at the moment, I don’t think it’s very clear at all.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Alan. Russ, over to you. Welcome, Russ Weinstein, to the CPH call.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, everyone. Russ Weinstein from ICANN. Really fascinating and helpful discussion. I just wanted to, I guess, give you guys maybe a little bit of outsider perspective on the conversation I’m hearing is sort of mixed messages. I know you’re still sort of shaping the message you’re trying to get to, but I sort of heard only use the GAC to liaise and to get to the right representatives. But then I heard all this fondness for the work Elena is doing in government engagement, and those seem to be conflicting from my ears so maybe I’m missing it. But it seemed like you liked the work Elena is doing in Brussels and across Europe but were saying, “But don’t do that elsewhere.” So maybe you can help reconcile that before you get to the Board.

---

SAM DEMETRIOU: I think Ashley popped her hand up to respond exactly to that. I will let her do that. Go ahead, Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hey. One, I don't have a whole lot of exposure into what Elena is doing directly with governments. What I do see is that she gives us great briefings on what the Europeans are doing on NIS2, and that she knows how the governments work and what the status is of their efforts. I think what we're saying is we like that. We like that ICANN is educating governments. I think what you're also hearing is, but you should also continue to support and continue educating the GAC as well.

I think what we're putting up warning signs is how much further ICANN should go beyond that, which is should they be going and negotiating with other governments directly and taking positions? Because that's, I think, where it gets really complicated, and that it's going to be hard to represent the entirety of us, and particularly when it comes to the fact that the GAC is part of ICANN as well. So education, education, having somebody like Elena on staff, whether it's for Europe or for other regions, who knows how governments work, knows how to get details of what's going on, that's great. But it's just I think more on the advocacy side and how ICANN goes down that path, because that's where I think it gets really tricky really fast. If that doesn't jive with everybody else's thinking, perhaps we need to continue having a conversation. But that's how I was seeing things shape up.

---

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Yeah, I would definitely agree with you there, Ashley. This is sort of part of watching the sausage being made, right? Sort of gross expression. When I read this prompt or this question from the Board, it read to me as what more could we be doing or what could we be doing better to engage, which isn't to say that what is already being done is not working. I think that's where you're hearing a lot of thumbs up for the work Elena has done. I got the impression based off this question that ICANN and the Board was looking for more input from the community for how to kind of push the ball even a bit further on this subject. I think that's what we're trying to offer here.

I'm just quickly checking the time. We're at 27 minutes past the hour. I think this is probably a good time to try to organize ourselves for how we're going to go into this. I'm seeing a couple of questions that have come up in the chat. One is why is this question being posed at this moment in time? Why is this a priority for ICANN now? Where does ICANN see challenges or gaps in its ability to effectively engage right now? What does ICANN see as the desired outcome of all this? I think those are three really good questions that have been tossed out there.

So I want to get your focus/thoughts on—do we want to tee this discussion up with some of those questions? Do we want to put those out there, hear back from ICANN, and then respond from there? Or would we rather just go into this conversation about, well, one opportunity might be to use the GAC. Here's some ways to do it, and then kind of build from there. What do you guys think? Feedback. Go ahead, Beth.



---

BETH BACON: Thanks. I'm conscious of time that we have other things to get to. I think that it might be worth us, just very quickly, taking the opportunity to say we love what Elena is doing. We love that work. We like the scope of her engagement. Here I think we have heard from other conversations on this topic regarding maybe take the GAC as—utilize that resource, those relationships better. And then we could go into—I think those three questions are really great—to say, “To better help you with this right now, where are you seeing the gaps? Where are you having challenges with efficiency, efficiently communicating?” and close it out with some questions. So then if we work that way, we're offering something, but also we're kind of substantively engaging in a continuing conversation. They can think on it and come back.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Good points, Beth. Thanks. Keiron?

KEIRON TOBIN: Thank you. Yeah, I agree with Beth's point. I think one of the main issues as well is that anyone who's worked in government such as I have and stuff like that is the policies and agendas change. And so as much as you might have a connection one day, if a new government is though it in X, Y, and Z ministers, etc., you change to different priorities. As much as it's worth getting kind of—if ICANN are looking for different governments and stuff like that, the problem that you're

---

going to have is that there's constantly different elections and different rules, and each jurisdiction is going to be different. So if they're just looking for a list, that list could be outdated by next year. So if we're looking to the governments, we need to know exactly what we're looking for, and what they want to do with it. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Keiron. All right. So here's the next question. Who wants to tee this topic up? Who would like to be the point person for this? A lot of good input from a lot of people on this call. Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm happy to get it rolling.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thank you for that. So I think we're pretty well set up in terms of how we're going to introduce this, the questions we're going to see, some of the suggestions that we're going to make. Once Ashley gets the ball rolling, speeds it up, I'm assuming always in these interactions we'll get some response from at least one of the Board members, and then from there the queue is open at that point. We will have the ability to unmute people on the fly, even if they're not designated presenters up front. So please, everyone, feel free to contribute to this conversation. Please feel free to add your points. Let's make it as interactive as we can.

---

All right. Do we feel like we're ready to move on to the next topic? Or is there anything else anyone wants to make sure we cover on this first item? Okay. Sorry. Let me just double check. Yes, not seeing any hands. All right, great.

So on the next item, this is the topic that the CPH had teed up for the Board, and it's on this ongoing discussion of prioritization. Especially in light of the fact that we know ICANN Org as part of their Planning process—capital P Planning process—is going to be working to develop a prioritization framework. But that's taking place in the background of fairly significant volume of work that either is with the Board and is waiting to be acted on, approved, rejected, or what have you, or have gone through the Board approval process and is still waiting to be implemented.

So we've talked about this a pretty good bit on the last Registry Stakeholder Group call to which our Registrar colleagues were invited. Did I say Registry twice? Registrars. So we have talked about this a little bit. In the meantime, Donna, Susan, and Sophie I think all work together to put some of these thoughts down in writing. We've shared that. I shared that with Ashley. I think she shared that with the Registrars. Donna, Susan, or Sophie, I'm going to call on one of you guys to maybe kick this one off. Go ahead, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

I guess I'm happy to kick it off. We had a document that we had certainly shared on the Registry list and I think on the Registrar list, I didn't receive any feedback. So I'm not sure whether that's the path

---

folks want to go down or whether there's another approach that was intended for this.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Donna, you may want to give a quick overview of how this part of the discussion would be teed up, and then we probably can respond.

DONNA AUSTIN: I guess after a conversation we had on the Registry drop-in call is that we were kind of tying this to ICANN has responsibilities under the Bylaws, which sets expectations within the community that work would get done in a reasonable period of time. And what we're seeing is a movement away from that or what appears to be a movement away from that. What we're also seeing as a result is that, in addition to volunteer burnout, we have a consequence of volunteers feeling disempowered or discouraged because after spending considerable periods of time on various review teams or PDP efforts is that it goes into a black hole that doesn't seem to appear at the other side in any reasonable period of time. So that was the approach that we were looking at. And then I think there's some questions that fall underneath that.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Sue, you may want to scroll down to the questions, just so we have them in front of us.

---

**DONNA AUSTIN:** Sophie's on the call but I don't see Susan. I think when we discussed this with the Registries, there was a concern about the responses that we would get from the Board on this and I have this [in the door], certainly the CSG session with the Board. And I think what we kind of come to the conclusion is it's not so much about the responses, it's more about the message that we want the Board to hear. So I don't know whether you want me to read into the record what we have in this document or whether we just go to the questions.

**SAM DEMETRIOU:** Donna, I'm recalling the guidance we got from Becky during the call last week where she emphasized that it is important, I think, to be very specific with the Board and to note almost like the individual concerns. I don't know that we need to read the full document. I think that would be a bit much, which isn't to say that it wasn't good work. I think it was very helpful in organizing thoughts around this topic. But I think possibly opening with a statement about the number of items that we understand to be in a bit of a limbo state, things that need action taken on them, the amount of time that has passed since the last milestone, is maybe a good way to tee this up and then launch into some of the questions. Would that make sense?

**DONNA AUSTIN:** I think the reference to the Bylaws is important because we tend to lose sight of that. So I would like to make that connection if there's no objection to that, and then we can get into the questions. But I can certainly cut down, just pull out some key points.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Sophie, do you want to jump in?

SOPHIE HEY: Yeah. Thanks for that. Just to add to what Donna has been saying, I think the point of making references to the Bylaws was to tie it more as to why we're having this conversation with the Board on the topic of implementation and work that Org needs to be doing, rather than having the discussion with Org. So I just wanted to agree with Donna that, yes, I think we should be making reference to the Bylaws maintained and stuff.

SAM DEMETRIOU: I don't have a specific problem with making a reference to the Bylaws. My read of the Bylaws is that it's more of a guideline than a strict standard. I don't think that undermines the larger point here, though. I think it possibly supports the larger point, I think we should just be prepared for that response. But like you guys said, it's not really about the response as much as it's about kind of getting on the record about this. Or I shouldn't say it's not about the reaction. The response we're looking for is to understand what the Board sees as its responsibilities here in addressing this and how it views its role as overseeing the process of how work goes from the community output to real action, how it becomes tangible, how it takes shape, and why it's an important concern for the folks who show up and volunteer and work on these topics day in and day out.

---

All right. So does anyone have any follow up questions? Is this topic clear to folks? I know it's kind of a lot. It's a little bit insider baseball, but it's sort of emerging as a bit of a theme for ICANN72. If you've attended other sessions, there's a good chance that you've heard reference to this. Also, as we said, ICANN Org is working on this prioritization process so it's clearly something that is on their minds as well. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I think to avoid station where we ask the Board about something about anything and suddenly Göran answers, we need to point our questions to the chair of the Board, not to the Board where it will be just intercepted by Göran and we will hear another scream about, "It's not fair. We're doing everything fine." So it will not offend others, but we might have more, I'd say, Board answers. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Maxim. I think that is correct. I think we want to be hearing more from the Board than just the CEO specifically. Ashley, then Martin and Kurt.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Pesky mute button. I think it's important that we be prepared to ask. I think the obvious question is going to get posed back to us, which is what is our view on the prioritization effort? The Registrars really haven't had a chance to talk about it. So we kind of knee-jerk reactions or potential concerns. I think from my insight into it is that it

---

seems like it's going to be a process that takes a long time as well. To be as positive as I possibly can be, once we get a framework in place and we start to utilize it, presumably it will just remind and work quicker. But I think it's not going to help us in the immediate term in terms of dealing with the backlog. I think we also need to be prepared, one, to recognize that we have a role to play in this as well so it doesn't come across as blame, because I know that's not what we're trying to do. And to think about what it is we can do to assist in this process so it doesn't come across as a gang up.

I don't have the document open right in front of me. If we could scroll down a bit in the document to the questions, or is that it? Sorry. Yeah. The last question, please. Yeah, I think the questions are good. I think this last question is quite good as well. I just wanted flag. So I will stop there. There is a queue. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Ashley. Martin and then Kurt. We just dropped the link to the Google Doc in the chat as well. So folks should be able to [approve] at their letter. Apologies for not doing that earlier. I was sleeping on the job. Go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks, Sam. A couple of points. I think in terms of framing the questions to the Board, I would suggest that it's preceded with the point that we'd like to hear from Martin and other Board members, and then follow through with the questions.



---

A second point that I'd be happy to follow up in the discussion is, has the Board and staff actually evaluated and assessed what resources, how much time and effort is required to implement all the backlog of activities so that we have a better sense of what gaps they have in terms of expertise, heads, and financial requirements or anything like that. So it feels to me that they're just saying they can't do this. It's far too much. We don't know what to do so we need to prioritize it. But I'm not finding it's very clear as to what they can actually do on the resources that they have. Thanks, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Martin. Kurt?

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks, Sam. I think it was you that said that this seems to be a rising theme in the meeting. And I think that is the case that the Board heard this in a few different meetings. I think in response to any defensive response, you know, we're here to help the multistakeholder model. We're not here to find fault with anything. And we think that not letting the prioritization swallow the whole, which is getting things done, is very important.

This is kind of far out, but I think there's actually a nexus between this and the question that the Board posed to us, and that is one way to have better work with governments and have more influence is to have a highly admired, smooth running, excellent operation sort of organization that commands that as soon as you hear the word

---

ICANN, you go, “Oh my gosh, that place is great.” So I think there’s a nexus between executing and ICANN’s ability to work with governments. But I think my bottom line was this is a rising theme. We’re trying to be constructive because we think this is important, because it takes a lot of courage to say stuff like this. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Kurt. I thoroughly agree on your point about this. We’re coming at this as a constructive conversation, right? We’re here to try to make the multistakeholder model better. And I think your point about efficiency and effectiveness, giving credibility to ICANN the whole model. I’m not talking about whether ICANN Org does and the people who work there do their jobs effectively, I’m not only talking about that but the whole system. There is a lot of legitimacy that derives from its ability to function effectively. If it doesn’t, then this whole experiment is just that. It’s just a silly little experiment. Especially when it comes into conversations with governments, that credibility and that legitimacy I think are really key aspects. I think you’re right that this kind of stuff feeds into that larger topic.

All right. Just quickly reviewing the chat here. I think I’m seeing a suggestion and agreement on leading off, if you will, or elevating to the beginning, closer to the beginning of discussion. This last question here about the Board’s thoughts on the concept of accountability in implementing recommendations within a reasonable timeframe. I think what we’re trying to get at here is really asking the Board about its thoughts about its responsibility and oversight. I’m just looking for

---

checks or plus ones or nods for those faces that I can see. It seems to me like that is where we want to maybe take this question and get the Board's thoughts on this. Like I said, it's less about how the folks who work for ICANN do their everyday jobs. That's not what we're trying to make comments on. We're trying to keep this very high level and focused on the Board itself and the Board's role and responsibility, actions, and things like that. So we'll kind of elevate that up. We'll open with a bit of an overview that hits on. As Donna said, the highlights of this subject, not necessarily a very long, five-minute statement read into the microphone, but the highlights of this noting what's in the Bylaws, and then sort of tee up that question to drive the discussion going forward.

Donna, are you comfortable and interested in teeing this one up when the time comes?

DONNA AUSTIN: I said I will give it my best shot, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: That sounds great. I appreciate it, Donna. Martin, is that a previous hand? Did you want to jump back in the queue on this topic? All right, click previous one.

All right, folks, 12 minutes to go in this hour-long session. I think we're decently well set up to go into this conversation with the Board. We've got Beth batting leadoff. Sorry, no. Ashley batting leadoff on the government topics, although I hope Beth will chime in, you raised

---

some really good points there. Donna batting leadoff on our topic for the Board. Like we said, if anyone else knows that they want to get in the queue or knows that they're going to want to speak on this, let us know early. We can promote you to panelist on the earlier side. But everyone will have the ability to pop a hand up and get their mic unmuted as we have this conversation with the Board.

Any other questions about the next hour and a half of our lives? Or shall we pivot and touch on the Reporting Requirements document in the remaining now 11 minutes? All right, I'm not seeing hands. So, Ashley, I'll kick this one over to you if you want to introduce it for us.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

I'm happy to. I'm also happy to have Reg or Luc or anyone else. We're just trying to get a document finalized and posted. There's been a lot of interest in it from other stakeholder groups through the course of this meeting. So we would much prefer to point people towards the revised version rather than the old version. So I just wanted to check and see—I don't know. I haven't checked the participant list if Brian or Jim are on the call. But this is a document that the Registry side's DNS Abuse Working Group worked with our side's DNS Abuse Working Group and making it a joint CPH document dealing with the abuse reporting standards. I think it's called evidentiary standards now. So I just didn't know if you guys had an update from your side with respect to reviewing that document and whether or not we were at a stage now where we could take it and get it posted. I think that's pretty much where we were going with it. No, it's called CPH DNS Abuse

---

Reporting. Okay. Any other inputs from my side? Just checking to see with my Registry cohorts where they are.

ZOE BONYTHON: Ashley, I can't put my hand up. But I maybe have an idea of exactly where we are as well. But let Brian speak first, if you'd like to.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: No, no, no. That's great. Go ahead, Zoe, please.

ZOE BONYTHON: Okay. Sorry. As Ashley alluded to, initially we got some comments from the Registry leadership of the DNS Abuse group on how the document could be updated to include what should be done in the rare circumstance where a registrant needs to contact the registry, rather than the registrar, typically, if the registrar is not responding. So, there was some initial feedback given for how it should be updated, then the Registrar's DNS Abuse group and leadership sort of took that and incorporated that as best as they thought. This updated version was sent then back to the CPH DNS Abuse Working Group, who have been mostly Registries have come back with some additional feedback. That last feedback now needs to then be looked at, incorporated by the Registrar side probably by leadership. And then the idea is once that's done, it will then be shared with the full stakeholder groups of both the Registrars and Registries. Once we've got sign off from the wider membership, the idea is then that it would be ready to publish. But ideally, we would hope that from the

---

thorough review that it's had both within the Registrar and Registry DNS Abuse groups that normally there shouldn't be too much more work to do by the time it goes to the full SGs, and it should be ready to publish.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: So the ball is in our court. My bad.

ZOE BONYTHON: Yes, it is. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Brian, did you want to add anything?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: No. The only thing I would add is just the substance of the tweaks that also that document was very helpful document originally penned by the Registrars but—I'm looking at the wrong screen—it was before the CPH definition of DNS abuse. So the substance did change quite a bit in that sense in that now it is much more focused on what we all agree is DNS abuse and the CPH definition of DNS abuse. So I think it makes the document much clearer. Personally, I thought that the changes were good. And I thank our Registrar colleagues for entertaining our thoughts on it. I think it's in a good place. So hopefully we can wrap that process up soon. But I think we can for sure, tell the Board that we're in the process of finalizing it and should be helpful guidance to the rest of the community.

---

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Brian. Yeah, if things go really off the rails, we can always throw that in there as, “Hey, it’s okay. We’re still doing good work.” I think this is going to be a good and constructive conversation with the Board.

All right. Anyone else want to get in the queue? Anyone else want to raise any topics or circle back to anything? We’ve got about six minutes left in our time together. All right. I’m not seeing any hands. So I think we have our plan for the meeting with the Board coming up in 36 minutes. Look forward to seeing you guys all there. Ashley, anything you want to say in closing?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I don’t think so. Just get ready for our next meeting.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks, everyone, for being here. Thanks for the good discussion. Last day of ICANN72 is upon us. So we’ll see you at the next session. Have a great day, everyone.

SUE SCHULER: Thank you, Sam. We can end the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**