
ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – GNSO - RySG Membership Meeting
Tuesday, October 20, 2020 – 14:30 to 16:30 CEST

SUE SCHULER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, wherever you are. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group membership meeting for ICANN69.

Please note that this 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 I've noted there in chat. I'll read the questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or the 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.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Sue. When you do take then floor, just be careful. Don't fall over.

Welcome, everybody, to the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting for ICANN69 on Tuesday, the 20th of October, 2020. This is an AGM for the stakeholder group, so we will have some changeover of seats at the end of this meeting.

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.

With that, this will be my last meeting as Chair, so let's make it a good one.

I would like to thank Jonathan Robinson for coordinating and getting a plenary session done yesterday on the domain name market business. It was certainly well-attended. There were over 220 people in the room at one point in time. So pretty good attendance. We did have to fight a little bit to get that on the schedule, so I think it was worthwhile. So thank you to Jonathan for getting that organized.

I do know that there was a DNS plenary session earlier this morning, where it was sadly too early for me. I did listen to a bit of it but not much of it. So I'd be interested if anyone was to share their thoughts on how they think that went this morning.

Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Donna, and thank you for acknowledging the meeting yesterday. I apologize to anyone who listens to the transcript and noticed that I managed to introduce myself as the stakeholder group chair. I don't know quite how it happened. Before you had even vacated your shoes or Sam had even filled them, I managed to try and sneak in there. So our wires were crossed early on Monday morning.

But I did go to the DNS abuse plenary today. I don't know if others did. I felt it was well-structured and well-balanced. There was a good lineup. As Michele pointed out, it was all male, so that was a little unfortunate, but there was quite good representation. David Conrad

spoke from ICANN and went back over the whole DAAR reports and all of that. I think you and Jim Galvin and, I think, Sam, who had contributed to the Organizing Committee, seemed to have managed to get a balanced viewpoint. There was quite a strong view expressed by Mason Cole, I suppose. He really wanted to see action and some changes and we didn't want to keep having the same topic on the plenary. But I think it generally came across well for the contracted parties in that there was a clear perspective that we were looking at things in a balanced way and attempting to respond as best as we reasonably could. That doesn't mean we stop working at the issues now, but I felt that the whole session went well. I'd be interested if anyone else has a similar point of view or a counter point of view. Thanks, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jonathan. Craig, go ahead. Craig, if we're talking, we can't hear you.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Can you hear me now, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, I can. Go ahead, Craig.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: So what I was saying is I also attended this session and echo Jonathan's sentiments about it being well-organized. I did find it really

interesting that most of the stats that David Conrad and OCTO presented basically showed declining levels of abuse across a variety of metrics, and there was a pretty active chat session going on that said this is not necessarily what we're saying and, if the stats are really declining, then why are we focusing so much time and energy on something meeting after meeting after meeting? I don't know if others heard the stats differently, but there were a variety of graphs that were shared that showed everything basically trending down.

I think the biggest issue, and maybe one that did have some increasing numbers, was spam. As we all know, that really falls out of our definition of abuse unless it's used to create or used in phishing or botnets or other types of activities.

So I'd be curious to hear what others' takeaways were from that session.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Craig. Just a general question. Do you think some of the issue is associated with what [inaudible] we have a contracted party-agreed definition of DNS abuse. If there's not a consistent definition of DNS abuse, perhaps that's where the data can get skewed if people are talking about DNS abuse that we don't believe is DNS abuse. So I wonder if that might be part of the problem.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ:

There wasn't a differentiation made as I think we would within the stakeholder group about spam; that is, is it just general spam that the

world is used to, or is spam that results in phishing or other types of attacks? So it might be interesting, the next time OCTO presents information on spam, to the extent that it has it, if it can differentiate along the lines that folks like us discuss.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Craig. Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Donna. I largely echo what Craig said. I put the numbers in that David Conrad actually cited in the chat, if anyone wants to take a look. [It] notes some real sizeable reductions—roughly 15% reductions—in phishing and botnets, and a 25% reduction in malware. So we were left with the situation where it was raw, objective numbers versus, “Yeah, well, that’s not what we are seeing anecdotally” and several times people asking, “Okay, well, that’s fine. Could you share with us the actual data that you’re seeing?” and hemming and hawing to that.

So I think it’s two things. I think that, with abuse, of course, even if we’re getting better at mitigation and it’s becoming slightly less of a problem, it is still a problem, so it’s the anecdotal versus the objective in one sense. But then the question around definitional issues, I think, does remain. There was a question from, actually, a brand protect registrar to the panelists, asking, “Well, for abuse, would contracted parties be willing to plug back into the TMCH so that registrants get a warning if they’re going to register something that has to do with the trademark?”

So, to the extent that had anything to do with abuse, it just goes to show that there is not everyone on the same page because clearly that falls well outside of any contracted party definition of DNS abuse.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Donna, I think you're muted.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. I was telling you, you were muted, Sam, because I couldn't hear you. Thanks, Brian. Go ahead, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks. I'm surprised we didn't have that "two person muted, trying to talk to each other at the same time" thing happen until right now. We made it pretty far.

I wanted to just echo what Jonathan and Brian have observed and just build on that by saying that I think this definitional issue and this data issue—like, we're seeing different data that potentially follows a different definition, but we're not able to share it in the same structured way that ICANN's OCTO is able to share it—has the potential to bog the community down a bit unless we are very active about steering the conversation in a different and more constructive direction.

The other thing I took away from that session this morning, especially in the chat, was a lot of calls for shifting the conversation. I noted some—we'll call it plenary fatigue, I guess, where people were noting

this is the fourth time that we're talking about DNS abuse at an ICANN meeting at the plenary level, and some concerns that we're not really advancing the conversation. I just kept going back and thinking that this is a real opportunity for our working group that we've recently established within the registries, as well as the working group that's working within the registrars, and then collectively those two groups working together, to really dig in and get some work done. Perhaps the next time this gets requested, we have a little bit more concrete stuff to talk about and we can really steer the conversation in the direction we want it to go.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Sam. I do think that the definitional piece is important because I don't think we're talking apples and apples. And that creates confusion when you're talking about data.

Alan, before I come to you, Keith mentioned in chat that, during the session, Jorge and Mark Carvell from the GAC suggested that there be a DNS abuse session at the IGF. I had a look through some of the potential sessions that were coming up through the MAG—the organization that decides on the sessions that will come up at the IGF. ICANN actually put one forward on DNS abuse, but it's more from an educational perspective. So I'm not sure what the timing is with the MAG and when they select, but ICANN, actually—we're going to do something on that. Alan?

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you, Donna. Very quickly, I just wanted to take one step next and say that the GAC-PSWG session directly responding to the DNS abuse session this morning, they thought it was very, very good as well. But there were some weird, left-of-center takeaways by the members on that. I just think we just keep an eye on it as well; that they were talking about gaps in the contracts, they were still talking about the results of the ICANN audit, of the registries, and how that highlighted some gaps in our contracts, and that that's where their focus is going to be on. So, considering where we were talking about statistics and moving forward and education and things like that, it was odd takeaway: to hear that was what the PSWG were going on about at their meeting straightaway afterwards. So I just wanted to flag that as an immediate aftermath.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Alan. I guess they hadn't had a chance to posture away from what they agreed to talk about before the session.

So thanks for the feedback, everybody. I think it sounds like that at least it wasn't just another DNS abuse session. It might have been a little bit more substantive than that.

As Sam noted, we do have a DNS Abuse Working Group that we recently set up. That is co-chaired by Brian Cimboric and Jim Galvin. I have now officially stepped down from that. So we will look to get moving on that after we wrap up ICANN69 and move forward. So that would be great.

Alrighty. With that, I think I've seen Rick on the call. Rick Wilhelm and JC Vignes are our representatives on the IANA Function Review Team. The review team published a report in the last week or so, I think, so we thought it might be timely for Rick to give us an overview of that, given that we will have to provide comments on it. So, Rick, I'll hand it over to you if you're with us.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Donna. Can you hear me okay?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, I can.

RICK WILHELMA: All right. Very good. Thanks. As Donna noted, JC and I were the two Registry Stakeholder Group representatives on the IANA Function Review Team. This had been going on for quite a while. I think it might even date back to late 2018 when the group started to get back together. This is one of the bylaws-mandated reviews of the IANA function. We were slated to review the contractual compliance of the IANA function with their agreement that they have.

The group recently completed its initial report. It's out for public comment. I'll go ahead and post the link to the public comment in the chat here. The initial report is out. Overall, the initial report four relatively minor findings—minor in my personal judgement, not really necessarily overall. Nothing major really found here.

There's a couple of finding related to transparency; that the contract requires that IANA post certain documents. So there's two recommendations about that. There's a finding that there be a change made in the bylaws because the review found that there's a duplication in the bylaws that is redundant. So we're recommending that a change be made on those. The last one is a recommendation to make a minor change in the contract because there's a statement in the contract that has an obsolete carryover from the NTIA contract. As it's currently written, it's unable to be fulfilled, so we're recommending that the contract be modified to remove that portion of the contract, which is unimplementable at this time.

The report itself is pretty long. It's something on the order of 70 pages, but if you want to look at it, the findings and stuff can be found in the first several pages. You don't have to dig all the way into the findings and such. There is a total of about 15 or 16 people, I think, on the review team. It was co-chaired by Frederico and Tomslin, who did a very good job. We had excellent staff support and good support from PTI itself by Kim Davies, who was there to provide information and answer questions—that sort of thing.

Overall, the review went relatively smooth. It just took a fair bit of time to get done, as these reviews take. It's out there for public comment. We've got an opportunity as the Registry Stakeholder Group to file some sort of a comment, even if it's just a small one where we file expressed support for it.

So that's probably enough commentary on it, unless there's questions or comments or, Donna, you think there's anything else that deserves further elaboration. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Rick. I definitely do think that this is something we need to comment on because we are customers of IANA. This review was set up as part of the CWG on IANA ... I can't even remember anymore—the one that Jonathan led. So it was important in the context of the IANA transition. If there are findings that everything is going along well, then we need to say that's terrific and we continue to support IANA because one of the reasons this was set up was, in the event that things weren't going so well with IANA, that it was one of the things that needed to be conducted in order for movement to start to take IANA out of ICANN. So this is a pretty important review.

Rick, when did you actually start work on this? Was it around February or March?

RICK WILHELM:

Umm ... Let's see. I think it started a little bit earlier than that. Let me look here at some notes. I think that it started more in December. In November/December is when the first meetings started. Then the pace picked up as we got into January. Yeah, JC is agreeing that it was before Christmas. So that's [inaudible]. So, yeah, November/December. Then the pace quickened after the holidays.

And it is really, to your point, Donna, an attestation to the good work that the folks at IANA are doing—that the review was relatively dull. I mean, they do a lot of work related to compliance, and Kim spent a lot of time going over all of their efforts related to contractual compliance. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Rick. And just one further question. Did you ever have an opportunity to meet face-to-face with this review team?

RICK WILHELM: We met face-to-face as a meet-and-greet in the October meeting that we had about a year ago when we were just coming together. So it wasn't a working session, but it was a meet-and-greet/pre-kickoff kind of thing. Of course, at that time, we thought we were going to be getting together in March in Cancun, and then, of course, things got crazy.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, Rick, with all that context, I would say that the team has pulled this together pretty quickly when you think about ICANN timing. If we set aside the fact that we couldn't actually kick it off [until after] 18 months because of the challenges we had getting the group together, I'd say you might be a poster child for getting reviews done. And the fact that you've done most of it virtually I think is a credit to the team as well, particularly when we heard, during the meeting session yesterday, people say, "Well, we can't progress these things unless we

have face-to-face meetings. So congratulations to you and the team for getting it done in reasonably quick time.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. Fred did a lot of great work, as did Tomslin. One of the key contributors there was James Gannon, who is the CSC liaison, who was really invaluable and did a lot of heavy lifting on the document. But everybody on the team did a lot of good work. So it was a great team effort.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, great. Thanks, Rick.

Any question for Rick before we move on?

Okay. I don't see any hands up.

All righty. Sam and I had a bit of a discussion about that this is an AGM. I'm stepping out, and Sam is stepping in. There's an opportunity for us to have a discussion about our working methods. I really encourage people to participate in this discussion because it will be helpful to all of the membership and most importantly, I think, to Sam as she moves into the role and understands what people find is helpful for us and what she could be talking about or thinking about changing.

I'm just going to give a little bit of an overview/reflections as an outgoing chair. I've tried to put this down on paper, but I could never agree with myself on how I think things are. I think the state of the Registry Stakeholder Group ... I think we've been in a very steady state

for the two years that I've been Chair. Our membership hasn't fluctuated very much. I think, if we lose two members, we seem to be able to bring two members in. We do have the 80/20 rule that most groups have in that 20% of the people are probably doing 80% of the lifting. And that's not a criticism. That's just the way it is.

But I do have some concerns given that I do think there's a number of work items that are going to come to us in the next twelve months that might stretch our resources a little bit, so I would encourage people to get involved to the extent that they can. I appreciate that, for some businesses, they don't have the bandwidth to be able to contribute and that the Registry Stakeholder Group and the membership and the work that we do is actually an important resource for them to understand what's going on in the industry, but they can't necessarily participate. So I understand that that is the case.

One of the things that I do think we need to pay particular attention to that's coming down—I received an e-mail from Maarten Botterman about this last week or the week before—is the GNSO review that is supposed to kick off in the middle of 2021 because I do think there are some challenges within the GNSO and the structure. I think there are some of us who are well aware that this review will be an opportunity for some within the GNSO to open up a conversation about the structure of the GNSO. So we need to be ready for that.

But, having said that, I'm also aware as Chair that—this has come up more recently—we have members in our group that are also in other groups [of] the GNSO, and that can create some tension or friction

when have conversations within the stakeholder group. So I do ask that, when you're in this house, that's the hat that you wear. We need to be very mindful of that and we need to be careful of that because I don't think we need that kind of attention within this group. We're here to advocate support and discuss with ICANN things that are associated with registry operations, and we need to be mindful of that.

As the Chair for the last two years, I've been fortunate that I've had Sam, Beth, and Jonathan as the team that supports the chair. We try to meet every week, if we can. I certainly appreciate their support in the work that I do and also as a sounding board. I think that has been really important; to have another voice and another opinion and to just toss ideas around about how we think things should go.

When I came in as Chair, I guess I had some ideas about some new things that I could do, but the reality is that just these two biweekly meetings come around really quick and, unfortunately, I think I probably didn't get some of the things done that I wanted to get done. But, having said that, we did achieve a lot.

I think I took over from Paul, I think, in Barcelona, and Jamie from Compliance let us know that there would be an RFI coming out associated with the [inaudible] of all registry operators. He wouldn't provide that [inaudible] of that meeting, but it came out soon after. I got an e-mail from Crystal on those, basically saying, "You have to do that. You have to do something about this because they can't do this."

So I'm thinking, "What the hell is going on?" So I quickly got up to speed and understood what's going on.

But one of the things I did learn as part of that exercise is that we have dedicated expertise within this group that is always willing to step up. So, with the audit, it was certainly Brian and Crystal that really provided the path for us to get through that. I think, at the end of the day, we had a number of testy conversations, I would say, with Compliance. But, at the end of the day, I think we got a good result. That was something that we had to stand firm on, and I believe it was one of those things where you appreciate the membership of the Registry Stakeholder Group because, once we have something in common that we need to go—I hate to say "into battle on," but when it's something that is of common interest to us, we are very good at coming together and drawing on the resources that we have and providing a path forward. So, to Crystal and Brian, thanks for that introduction and providing the guidance that I needed to help the Registry Stakeholder Group get through that.

And that has come up time and time again. I know that, when we talk about IDNs, it's Dennis Tan that we go to. And we always have Rubens and Edmon Chung, who were there as well. And, obviously, [with] GDPR, I think it started off as something that I think came to the stakeholder group through the geo-TLDs. We said that it was picked up when the EPDP was put together. We selected a team. That was actually a selection process that was done by the Executive Committee. And we had Mar[k], Alan, and [K]risti as our team on Phase 1, and then Mar[k], Alan, and Matt on Phase 2. They've been

tremendous in the way that they've ... The interesting thing about the EPDP is that they had to represent the stakeholder group. They weren't representing the individual registries. That was a little bit unique. I know we've done it before with the IANA transition. We did have a team—the CWG on IANA transition. We all had a common goal. But this is a little bit different with the representation that they had to do on the PDP.

So we're very fortunate that we have those resources available to us that are willing to put in the work, but I do appreciate that it is hard at times. I know that there's a Part 3 that's coming, and Mar[k], Matt, and Alan have all signed up to go again. I sincerely appreciate that. I think we need [to] continue it, but I do worry about the impact that it can have personally.

Another thing that I'm a little bit concerned about, not just within the stakeholder group but more generally within the GNSO and perhaps within the community, is that we do talk about issues in terms of battle lines. We're going back into the trenches again, and it's us against them. That's unfortunate when we think about ... When the multi-stakeholder model was put together, I don't think that was the intention—that we would have drawn battle lines—but that seems to be where we've ended. So how we get out of that? It will take a little bit of time, but we can do it. And I think we need to do it.

One of the things that has struck me recently is that ICANN is an international organization, but we're a very closed community. There's a lot of things going on around us in the international context

that we don't seem to be able to bring into play. Or I'm not sure how well ICANN does in representing what ICANN [needs to do] to those external international elements as well. So I think we've become a little bit [inaudible], and perhaps we need to stick our head up a little bit and just remember we talk about the multi-stakeholder model a lot and that we support it. We probably need to think a little bit about, are we living it to some extent? And that's just not on our side. I think that's communitywide.

So that's a little bit of a ramble from me. I'd have to say that I'm very pleased to be handing over to Sam. Sam has been on the ExCom for, I think, three of four years now, so she understands who we are and what we're doing. She's done a tremendous job with [vice-chair] policy. I think one of the benefits of that role is that you are looking after all of the topical issues that are going on in ICANN. So you have a good appreciation of the substance and the things that we've been dealing with. Sam has led us through a lot of the review team exercises. I think we still have the security and stability one coming down the pike. But I think that's really important to Sam as she steps into the role because she knows the substance. I think she'll serve us very well moving forward. She's particularly competent. She has a tremendous sense of humor. I often refer to Sam as Mrs. Maisel because that's who she reminds me of sometimes. So think Sam's humor will get us through the next couple years.

With that, we're going to go into a little of navel gazing. I did have to stop and think whether that's how you spell "navel" or whether that's how you spell "gazing." So this is an opportunity for us to have a

discussion and think about it from the context of, if you were Sam, if you were the incoming chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, what works for us now and what would you like to keep the same? Are there things that you would do differently or change, or are there improvements or enhancements that would like to make? So I really would like a lot of participation in this because it's important for Sam, I think, stepping into the role: to have a sense of what the membership would like to see. There may be some things that are easy to do and easy to change. Others may take a little bit of time.

With that, Sam has her hand up, so I will turn it over to Sam, and then we'll work through the list. Go ahead, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks so much, Donna. Thank you very much for the kind word and your vote of confidence in me taking over. I got a little bit worked up listening to that.

Just a note about this next section and this discussion that we're about to have. Donna noted at the top of the call that moments like this, moments of transition, and an annual general meeting are a good opportunity to look back on how far we've come and think about how we want to continue working together in the future.

But I also want to note that we've spent a lot of time this week, I think, talking about what the remote posture or the working-from-home setting means for ICANN as a whole, but we as a stakeholder group who are so accustomed to doing almost all of our work—call it 90% of

our work—in this remote setting are very used to working remotely and still getting a lot of work done. But I think it is still worth asking ourselves if there’s stuff that we can do better or if there are adjustments we need to make, not only just for the future of the stakeholder group but also in response to this setting that we’re in.

So I want to just echo Donna: any and all thoughts and feedback and suggestions—we want to hear them. So I hope everyone is awake enough to be open and engaged on this.

So that’s all I’ll say for now.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Sam. Ken?

KEN: Yeah, Donna. First of all, I’d like to thank you for the [inaudible] job that you’ve done the last two years. I don’t think people realize how much time is taken up in the planning process. You really have just gone that extra mile to make sure that we were prepared properly. I personally wanted to thank you for that.

I basically had one more thing I wanted to discuss, and that is that I think we need to concentrate—this is just my own thoughts—on trying to make the meeting time more effectively. I know, when ICANN people come before us and all they do is repeat a slideshow that they could have sent us two weeks ago that we could have reviewed, we all get a bit frustrated. I think we need to concentrate on trying to get

reports and updates out to the group before the meetings. Then, rather than spend the time “going over the report,” let’s spend the time answering critical questions about the report. Really, the onus is on the members to make sure they do their homework in advance. If so, I think we’re going to find we would have more time at the end for constructive discussion, and we would not have a situation where we “run out of time.” Just two my cents.

But, again, thank you so much, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks very much, Ken. I agree. If there’s a way that we can find to have constructive conversation rather than adversarial ones, I think we’d be much better off. The last twelve months has thrown us for a bit of loop, being the virtual meetings, and I can’t tell you the frustration I’ve had in the last six weeks with the planning for this meeting. It has been quite extraordinary. Some of it was—well, actually most of it—ICANN-related. So you’re absolutely right; it takes a lot of planning, and still at the last minute we’re putting stuff together. So I don’t know how we can get better at that, but we have to find a way.

Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON:

Thanks, Donna. I will take this opportunity to say more nice things about Donna. It’s been a pleasure to work with Donna for these past two years, and I think that we’ve made a lot of progress with the

stakeholder group. And we've got a lot of substantive things done, as well as internal administrative things that we've cleaned up really nicely that maybe you guys don't see but you feel the smoother operations of. So that's the way that's supposed to go. I would like to warn Donna that this means she has a lot more free time on her hand, so we will be assigning her things. So I would recommend showing up to meetings. No vacation time.

With regards to how we could move forward, I do think one thing that we do—it's simply a function of, as you say, that there's a finite level of resources with regards to time, people, and expertise that seems to get spread rather thinly—perhaps the ExComs could also develop a strategic approach looking at the themes and issues that run through not just assigning people to work on a PDP or making sure that we have representatives to an EPDP—whatever phase that may be for that EPDP—but making sure that the issues that are captured there we have a strategic approach for—maybe just a couple bullets—that the registries can rally behind and use as a baseline whenever that topic or set of issues will arise so that we speak with the same voice, at least on a few of the agreed points. I think that that is something that other groups well and we don't do as well. Because there is a lot of expertise and there are experts in this group and so much experience, people will go off the cuff. While they are accurate, it's not necessarily the same voice. If we can approach issues strategically throughout those different venues and different working groups and PDPs, I think that that will serve us well in the long run. So that's one thing that I think

we could dedicate some time as an ExCom and also work through that with the membership in the years to come.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Beth. I agree it would be really helpful if we were able to do that. I'm not saying we can't do it. We certainly should find a way to do it.

One of the challenges is the amount of work that ICANN seems to generate and being able to keep up with it. As the incoming Vice Chair of Admin—sorry, Policy; Beth—you'll probably see a bit more of that. But I definitely agree. I think it would be helpful if we were in a position to be able to provide a cheat sheet for people on different topics that we know are going to come up during meetings. I think it would be really helpful.

Sophie, go ahead.

SOPHIE:

Thanks, Donna. I just want to say this. I think it's been really great as you as Chair have really been able to embrace the diversity of views in the Registry Stakeholder Group. This is something also I've noticed drafting comments with Sam in her role of Policy Vice Chair. It's been great that we've been able to actually consider the different priorities, given the different business models that we have in the Registry Stakeholder Group. I know Gigi and Mart[in] mentioned this on the list, but it's something that I find particularly important as well,

particularly given I represent a dot-brand in this group and we do sometimes have conflicting views.

So I think it'd be really great if we can continue this work moving forward. I don't mean to contradict Beth's comments she just made about having baselines views. But, yes, I have complete confidence moving forward that this will continue, given how Sam has been working in her role as Registry Vice Chair of Policy. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks very much, Sophie. I am aware that you're a relative newcomer to the SG, and I know that Sam has appreciated your input on the public comment processes.

One of the things that I became a little bit conscious was what we would lose people—people that would do the work. And I don't mean that it in a terrible sense, but, when Kristine Dorrain said she was moving on somewhere else, that was like, "Ugh." And Crystal Ondo. When Crystal said, "Okay, see you later guys," it was like, "Ugh. Really?" Even Reg stepped away, and we lost Stephanie. All people that made a really good contribution to the work that we do. But it's terrific to see that we have Sophie that's come along and is contributing and helping out with the work. And, of course, [Crystal has] come back to help us. So it's really important that we provide opportunities. I think we've said this before: participating in that comment process that Sam has been leading for the last couple years is a great way to get involved in the work that we do, particularly now in this virtual setting, just to get to know some of your other

colleagues. So, Sophie, thanks for your comments, but also thanks for the contribution.

Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. I don't think we can say enough positive things, Donna, so I'd like to continue the thanks for all the work. I know how tough it is to be a Registry Stakeholder Group chair. Although it was many moons ago, it's a hard role, not just because of all the work that it is but also you have to maintain your neutrality. And I certainly have seen your neutrality throughout the years, knowing when your company may have had a position one or the other. But you've certainly done a great job in making sure that you are conducting everything fairly, even if it was something that your company had a strong view on. But we wouldn't necessary know it with your operation as Chair, so I think that's really important.

With respect to PDPs, I agree with Beth that we can become more coordinated. One thing that I was trying to do in the SubPro PDP—but it got kiboshed a little bit a couple years ago—was ... Most PDPs are not like the EPDP, being that they're not representative. It's open to anyone, and specifically people are there not to be represent their groups. But, that being said, what I tried to do in the SubPro PDP—not successfully at all—was to get one or two people from each of the constituencies/stakeholder groups to be the person that does in some way the official view of the stakeholder group or constituencies or to

act as the person that would take responsibility for getting answers and things.

So I think, combining Beth’s point with how a lot of PDPs are completely open, we should try to designate at least internally one or two people in that PDP from our group to be that person if the view of the stakeholder group is being solicited that can speak to that or at least bring back what they need to bring back to get the stakeholder group view.

I think, Donna, you played that role well early on. Well, I mean you played that role well, but early on was when I think it came more into play because you did bring back those things to the stakeholder group probably better than any of the other groups because I remember that’s how we got things like the plural and singular proposal and a number of other things where the Registry Stakeholder Group did take the lead. So I think that that’s was another point—a long way of making the point that you certainly have taken the role and done some really great things. We’re going to miss you, but we certainly are looking forward to the leadership under Sam and also to getting a lot of future leaders as well, like Sophie, who has jumped in. And I remember Reg, when she first joined, jumped in and did a great job. It’s our job to try to get the new talent so that us old people can move on to other things or maybe even retire at some point. But thanks. Thank you, everyone.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jeff. It's a great point about support because I remember, when Chuck [inaudible] would tell me that I was doing a great job, I felt that I grew an extra foot. So it goes a long way when you have ... Well, I never thought of Chuck as my peer. I always thought that he was ... I don't know. Chuck seemed to have special status. So it meant a lot to me to have that, so I think it's important, as Jeff said, for us older guard, which is what I feel like, that we take the time to mentor and encourage others to come along and be involved in the work that we do. Anyway, thanks, Jeff, for the kind words.

Old hand, Jeff? No hand? Old hand?

Okay. Kurt, go ahead.

KURT PRITZ:

Donna has done okay, but remember, behind everyone woman, there's a great ... Well, anyway, I think we should just give credit where credit is due.

I think, going forward, we might do a better job of outreach to smaller registries. They don't quite get the value-add of the RySG participation. Maybe we could do a better job of demonstrating that. They certainly don't have time to participate in multi-year PDPs or even in an expedited PDP for that concentrated effort, but there's lots of value there. For example, Jonathan Frost isn't at this meeting, but when he presents on our behalf, it's always golden. My conversations with smaller registries about what they do about abuse is sometimes eye-opening; that they're very aggressive on it. So I think that, even

[with] registries that aren't members, we need to find a way to solicit their opinions on issues so that we benefit our whole side of the industry. And, maybe, in reaching out to those that aren't even members, they'll see value, and the membership will increase. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Kurt. Yeah, I'm not going to go there.

One of the things that I did try to do early on is, because I'm very conscious that we have members in the APAC region—this is the time that we usually have our calls, which isn't really APAC-friendly; I have colleagues in Melbourne, and the time isn't friendly for them ... I think, Sue, we might have started off on a monthly basis. We would do calls with the APAC region. I think that the first one was well-attended, and maybe the second one not so well-attended. But the attendance just dropped off. I'm sure that's as much a language thing. I was very fortunate that I had Pam Little, who would help me and encourage participation in those meetings. With Pam being Chair and also on the council and also as a registrar, we'd usually share information. The attendance faded away, so I stopped doing it. But I think Kurt's right. To the extent that we can't help the smaller registries who are struggling to—well, not struggling; I shouldn't say that; but are more focused on the business at hand—and to the extent that we can make membership of the Registry Stakeholder Group meaningful to them, I think we should try to do that.

Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Whoops. Sorry, Donna, I was struggling to get my mic. My mic icon was covered by a little bit of another window. I was going to mention the drop-ins, actually. I don't think anyone has mentioned the drop-in calls at this stage, and it kind of links to your Asia-Pac outreach because they were on quite a different time zone. It may be that one can kill two birds with two stones there because ... I haven't been a great recent attendee of the drop-ins for that exact reason. It happens to be like 9:00 at night, which is just when I'm wrapping up dinner and stuff going on at home. But my experience of the few that I did attend was that they had a completely different atmosphere and tone to our main stakeholder group meetings, which is a good thing, because the stakeholder group meetings are, by definition and by necessity, very structured and organized, and we go through a systematic agenda. But, on that opportunity to workshop an agenda with whatever is on people's mind in quite an informal setting, my impression was A) it has been good in terms of the whole working-from-home thing and creating just another forum where we can work together, but the other thing was it created an opportunity for slightly more diverse participation, both in terms of who participated and how it participated. So I would love others to add to that or not if there's agreement. I know it represents work, right? You, Sam, and Beth have taken the lead in running those calls and facilitating them, but nevertheless, they do seem to have been useful. So I think it'd be useful to hear from others.

I see Jeff seems to have been positive about them. It'd be good to hear from others on how they feel. Thanks, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jonathan. It's good feedback. So how do people feel about the drop-in calls, and also, do we need to have biweekly calls? Let's have that conversation as well. It would be good to know whether that's a good cadence. We always have good attendance. We're always above the 40-mark for those meetings. So I think that's an indication that, yes, we should continue, but maybe it's fear of missing out. That's why people are turning out. But maybe people have thoughts on that as well.

Ken?

KEN:

I think, to some extent, we're victims of inadvertent discrimination here, and I think we could solve this problem to some extent. It would be easy for Donna, who has this sabbatical [and] understands what I'm talking about. We have a very talented, articulate group in the Asian area. And I honestly think that we might consider the possibility of having regional groups that meet, even if it's once every two or three weeks, and discuss their reactions to the problems and the issues that they see in our overall meeting and also items that affect their perspective in a much greater way.

Then, when we have a meeting, we would ask one of their representatives to take some time and bring us to speed on, what are

the issues in Asia, what are we missing here, are we really working hard with effective outreach, and are there political issues? Because, when I look at the makeup of these calls, it is almost biased towards time. I think that the only way we're really going to get the kind of participation is to get them to set up their own little interest group and feed into us. It's just something to think about.

Donna, you can comment on whether [that] makes sense or not, but it's just one of trying to be a little more cohesive. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Ken. I guess I did try to do that and, at the end of the day, not particularly successfully, I don't think. But certainly maybe it's something that we could reenergize.

I will say that, since I've been part of this group, which is probably six or seven years now, every time we've had a discussion about changing the timing of our registry meetings, [we] overwhelmingly keep as it is. That seems to be our go-to.

I have conversations I've had with Pam Little. She has said that the virtual nature of the ICANN is probably leading to a drop in participation from the APAC region because they did actually value being able to come to a meeting and see what was going on but also for members of the APAC to come together. ICANN, I think, does a pretty good job of APAC region stuff, and I have occasionally provided updates to that group. So we need to think about leveraging that group a bit more.

Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. Two points. I'll start with the last point about moving times. I think it's interesting, but SubPro does move our time around. We have three rotating slots. I'll tell you that, when we go to the Asia-Pac-friendly slot (the UTC 03:00 hour), attendance does drop off dramatically. I've also been a little surprised that some participants from the Asia-Pac region don't necessarily join, partly because it's during their work day and they have other commitments, even though they've known about the timing of the call for a long time. It's been on their schedule. So I have not noticed that, when we did Asia-Pac-friendly times, we've gotten more attendance, even from the Asia-Pac. So I agree with Donna that we always seem to come back to that.

And Edmon is right: maybe 10:00 A.M. is tough. So perhaps something not quite as drastic as what the SubPro group does.

But on the other point, on the drop-ins, I really do want to support what Jonathan said. I think that was a great creation. If nothing else, I think it was at one of the first ones that I just remember being really comfortable at bringing an issue to that group. It wasn't well-thought-out as far as the issue. It didn't have a position on it. It was something that we were afraid of it coming up. I don't think that issue reared its ugly head, but we had a great discussion on it. It was one of those meetings where we could put things aside and just brainstorm on something that had just arisen. So I really like that. Like I said, my comment ... The only problem is that I have my own fear of missing-

out issues and can't always make that time. But I do value that drop-in, especially ... I don't think we necessarily need to have Registry Stakeholder Group calls every two weeks. I think maybe twice a month is more than enough—well, maybe that's every two weeks. Even once every few weeks is fine. But those drop-ins I like just because it's informal and we can bring up any issue and feel free to just discuss it. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jeff. Karen?

KAREN: Hi, Donna. Can you hear me?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, I can.

KAREN: Okay. Well, unfortunately, Donna coming in as Chair coincided with my getting changes in my job and going from being a very part of the ExCom to very inactive. But this conversation is very interesting, and I want to thank Jeff and Jonathan for bringing up the point about the drop-in calls because, quite honestly, I have not attended the drop-in calls because I had a vision that they were going to be the exact opposite of what it sounds like they had in fact been. And I regret that.

But let me just say, since my job has changed and I don't have the time and I'm not all in on ICANN anymore, the biweekly meetings, because they are time-constrained and because there's been so much to accomplish with the EPDP and everything else going on, you come into a biweekly meeting and, if you are not fully abreast of the issues, it's very easy to feel like you're just completely out of touch and you're out of the loop and it all goes over your head. I've heard this from fellow members, like in the BRG: that we encourage to come to the RySG meetings. If they're not all in, then it just goes over their heads.

Well, I thought that the drop-in calls were going to be even deeper dives into these issues that were being on the agenda in the scheduled meetings, so I was like, "I'm lost as it is. I'm trying to keep up. I want to keep abreast." I mean, it still my job to keep my registries going, but I can't handle ... I'll drown in those calls. So there's no point in me just working.

But it sounds like totally the opposite. So, Sam, I would really encourage to you to promote that fact. If these are going to be more casual where you can just say what's on your mind and ask questions in a different atmosphere than our biweekly meetings, promote that fact. The most freeing thing to me early on—probably five year ago; I'm sitting here wearing my Dublin t-shirt—was I when I asked Donna a question off the side and she said, "Just ask it in the meeting. Let people know that you have this question. Don't be afraid. Don't feel like you have to wait until you can get somebody in private. Don't be afraid to just talk during the meetings."

So, if we promote the fact that we got this alternate atmosphere at this call-in meetings or whatever form you set them up, Sam, I think that would go a long way in keeping people like me, whose main job isn't a registry, at a level where we can help because we want to help but sometimes ... I, last year, just felt like I would be useless. So I would encourage that.

Again, Donna, thank you for everything you've done. Sam, you're going to be brilliant. March on.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Karen. That's really good feedback. I do have a confession to make: the drop-in calls I stole from the BRG because I think Mart[in] introduced something similar. He didn't call it a drop-in call. He called it something else. Also, the format of the calls, for those that aren't familiar with it, is what [Carla] would use for the roundtables with the registries and registrars. And we have those at the ICANN meetings. So the calls have been chaired by either Sam or Beth. So they rotate. At the beginning of the call, they will ask for topics that people want to discuss. So we'll put those up on the screen. Then we'll prioritize them, and then we'll get into the discussion. So it is very informal. There's no agenda going in. We have used the drop-in call to repurpose, so I think the discussion we had with the SSAC we repurposed a drop-in call for, and also, when we had the interviews for the elections, we used the drop-in calls for that. So they are, Karen, to your point, intended to be a little bit more laidback and casual and just about having a conversation.

We also encourage using, although we haven't done it more recently, your cameras just so that we can see people because we don't get that opportunity to see one another three times a year. So we try to encourage that as well. So, Karen, thanks. It's really good feedback.

We do have a bit more time for this discussion, but we don't have to belabor it unnecessarily.

Sam, any questions you have for people?

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Donna. This has all been really super helpful. I'm taking actually really vigorous notes so that I don't lost any of it. I did want to ask everyone—I dropped it in chat—as we're talking about the meetings and the value of the meetings and the ways to structure the meetings, about their thoughts on things like timing, duration, and frequency. I'm loving the support we heard for the drop-ins. Do we think, though, that a registry meeting on the calendar every week is too much? Is it just right? I think we as the ExCom are more than happy to make ourselves available for as much time as members want, but we also don't want to put extra strain on people to show up for fear of missing out, as Jeff and others pointed to.

So I think that there's a lot of options we could consider. One could be scaling back the bi-weekly to maybe 90 minutes, or scheduling some time in that two hours to be a more unstructured attendees-drive-the-agenda format of the drop-in call. Or we could continue to keep them separate.

One thing that we have done occasionally is use time on the bi-weekly to do deeper dives into specific topics, usually around a public comment, usually because I demand that time because I don't have the availability to schedule a separate call on an issue.

So, if anyone has thoughts about that, about what level of commitment they would like to see, I would love to hear that as well because—Donna is completely right—right after we finish with ICANN69, we're going to have to hit the ground running on the next biweekly and everything calendared and scheduled. So we have an opportunity to make tweaks. So, if folks have thoughts, I'd like to hear those, too.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Sam. A couple of things. I think Beth brought up earlier that, to do some strategic thinking about issues, where can we find the time to be able to do that?

Also, to Karen's bit about, how can we do a better job of explaining to those who aren't as deeply involved in issues what we're actually talking about? Because we do talk in shorthand.

One of the things that I've been conscious that I don't think we've done a particularly good job on is providing guidance to our councilors. Maxim does a terrific job of pinging and saying, "What do we think about this?" and then we have to scramble to understand what it is we do think about this. But, unfortunately, it's ad hoc.

Because we know that the council meetings are every month, the council lead seems to be pretty heavy at the moment. To be honest, I get confused about the different subjects because a lot of it seems to be focused around EPDP or WHOIS or other policies that are associated with that. So even I'm pretty confused about what's going on at council. But finding a way to be better at providing guidance to councilors I think would be maybe a good topic as well.

Craig?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Thanks, Donna. Can you hear me okay?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, I can.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Great. Thanks. Along the lines of the meeting times and the frequency, one of the things I think we could do better, both within the stakeholder group but also just more broadly across our interactions with the rest of the community, is being more action-oriented and results-oriented. I feel like, on some topics like DNS abuse—I know it's not always spurred by us but by others upon us—that there can be some circular conversation about this. I never know where we're going to get spit out. But, if we can have a more action-oriented deliverables plan, other than on things like public comments, because those are pretty well-structured now, I think it'll make it easier for people to

participate, particularly the smaller registries that just don't have the resources to be as available for as many meetings are often required.

So I don't know what the silver bullet is to this, but, to the extent that we can get out of some of those circular conversations and be very specific on what we need to do and when it needs to be done and then assign some resources or get volunteers, I think that will serve us well.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Craig. I do agree that it is very challenging to be results-oriented or -focused. I know, when we've had conversation with Goran or senior staff about DNS abuse and we say, "Well, what's the end game?" the response we get is, "Well, the community will decide." That's pretty challenging for the community when there's no—I don't want this to come off as a criticism, but I think one of the challenges with the model is an inability for some ... So there's no real leadership. So ICANN Org says, "Well, it's for the community to decide," and the Board says, "Well, it's for the community to decide," but the mechanisms available to the community and the resources available to the community to try to have a conversation in a cohesive and logical manner is a challenge. It's very difficult to do.

I would say that I was going through some of the transcripts with the Board and some of the community groups this week, and I think it's unfortunate that we all have these separate conversations with the Board around similar topics, but there's no opportunity for the community or the Board to come back to the community as a whole and say, "This is what we heard this week, and this is what we think

would be a reasonable way for us to go forward on this issue,” and then see if the community can take a path forward because, without that, what’s the benefit of having these conversations with the Board? I think we see the Board as the decision-makers, but they’re not the decision-makers on all issues. So DNS abuse has been a really difficult topic because I know it’s been around longer than when we had the Compliance audit, but there was a lot of activity through the consumer safeguards. So Brian—I can’t remember his name—did a lot of work in the community about community safeguard. We were often surprised that these conversations were happening and we had to become involved in it. So there was a lot of activity created by ICANN, and then they walked away and said, “Okay, you guys go off and fix the problem.” But it takes a long time for those waves to calm down and for us to find the path forward.

So I think the multi-stakeholder model is a difficult model to navigate in terms of being results-oriented because there’s no natural part of the model or entity that steps up and says, “We’ll take this on.” So, anyway, that’s, for me, a bit of the challenge.

Any other suggestions on this? I think it has been a pretty good conversation. I guess Sam and the new ExCom will take it all onboard and ...

Sam, go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Donna. I just wanted to say that this absolutely doesn't have to be the end of this conversation and that you can feel free to reach out to me at any time with suggestions or feedback. Or, if you think I'm doing something terribly, I'd love to hear about it.

DONNA AUSTIN: I know Sam says that with a smile, but I would encourage you all to provide feedback to same along the way about how you think she's doing because it's actually really important: what I said previously about when Chuck said I was doing a good job. That meant the world to me. It doesn't have to be a lot, but if you can get some positive reinforcement along the way, it does certainly help. So I would encourage folks to, even if you think she's doing a crap job, at least provide her with some constructive feedback as to how you think she could do it better. But I don't think that's ever going to be the case, Sam. But please take the time; if you think Sam is doing a good job, let her know. I think it's important.

Okay. So I think we'll wrap up that session. You good with that, Sam?

Alrighty. So, given that this is an AGM for us and changeover in leadership, we thought it might be—well, I think me and Sam ... Actually, I'll give credit to Sue. This is actually Sue's idea—I think it's a really good idea—that we have people working throughout the year and we don't have an opportunity to recognize them. It's a little bit challenging in the environment that we have at the moment. So, following this meeting, I will be sending out certificates of appreciation to the following people.

Next slide, please, Sue. Erica Varlese was the Chair of our EVO-4 Working Group. I think the EVO-4 Working Group was supposed to be a reasonably short effort, but it went on and on because of challenges that we had with incorporation in Florida. So, to recognize the efforts that Erica did for us, we will send her a certificate of appreciation on behalf of the stakeholder group, also recognizing that Beth picked up the bat when Erica had to step down. That process in terms of our amendment and charter, is with ICANN at the moment. So we're getting [that].

Rick Wilhelm. Rick has been Chair of the RDAP Working Group for some period of time, and they did a lot of heavy lifting to get the RDAP profile developed and approved by ICANN. It's the one that the registries have, I think, were supposed to implement in August of last year. So thanks to Rick for your leadership in that working group. I know that you don't meet as frequently anymore, but it is an effort that's ongoing and is one that's really important to us. So thanks, Rick.

Kristine Dorrain and Jim Galvin, our Co-Chairs of the DAAR Working Group. We threw stones at the DAAR for a long time, and Kristine and Jim decided to pick it up and see if we can do something positive with it, which resulted in a report being provided to OCTO in the last six weeks or so. So many thanks to Kristine and Jim for their leadership on this one. Not only did we get a good result, I think, in terms of a product, but it was also an opportunity to develop a good relationship with OCTO, which was a bit of a side benefit for this effort.

I would also recognize that Kristine and Jim ... We did coopt this group to put together a letter that we sent to the community on DNS abuse, and I thank Kristine and Jim for their flexibility in allowing us to coopt their working group for that effort. But, again, it was a good result.

Mar[k], Alan, and Matt for their participation, leadership, and contribution to the Registry's EPDP team. I know we talk about this a lot. It was a huge effort simply because they're representing all of us and they had a finite timeline. So thanks again to Mar[k], Alan, and Matt, and good luck again for when you have to all get together and start with Part 3.

I also want to recognize the efforts of Beth to the EPDP as the #1 rah-rah supporter. I know that Beth did a hell of a lot of work in the background that we didn't necessarily see. So, Beth, I wanted to recognize that. So thank you for that.

David McAuley, who was the Chair of the IRP-IOT (the Independent Review Panel Implementation Oversight Team). David, I know you stepped down recently, and Susan Payne has taken over that role. But I know you were in this role for a very long time. So we just wanted to recognize the efforts that you did and the leadership involved in that work that is ongoing. So thanks for that, David.

Next slide, please, Sue. Dmitry Burkov and Guarav Vedi, who are our representatives on the CSC. Pretty much unseen—the work that they do—but very important, again, as customers of IANA. Having representatives on the CSC was pretty important in the development

of the IANA transition work. So thank you to Dmitry and Guarav for your continued participation and representation at that effort.

Dennis Tan, as our resident IDN expert. We're really fortunate—what can I say?—that we have Dennis. He's always at the ready and understands what the next step is with IDNs because it does get pretty confusing. So, Dennis, we just wanted to take the time and recognize your efforts in that regard.

Sheri Falcon, Chair/leader of the VP Group. This is a small niche group, I guess, Sheri, but I just wanted to recognize your efforts in this regard and also your ability to get in front of the GAC on this in the last couple of weeks. I think it's an important step and one that will benefit all of us if we can get this one up and have some mechanism that we can amend [inaudible] going forward.

Maxim Alzoba for Maxim's contribution to the GNSO Standing Selection Committee. That's the group on the GNSO does the selections to the IRT and other efforts that require GNSO participation. Maxim I think did the role for a couple years, and then Erica stood from this community, and Maxim volunteered to step up again. So, Maxim, thanks very much for your contribution to that.

We're getting into the changeover, and I'll have a little bit more to say about this.

So certificates of appreciation for Sam for your role as Vice Chair of Policy. I don't know how many comments you've responded to, but it must be a lot. I'm sure that you'll be happy to send it this way.

Beth for your contribution as Vice Chair of Administration. Getting the bylaws and amendments over the line was a pretty significant effort. So thank you very much for that but also [for] a lot of other work. So, at a time when we had to submit travel support and all that kind of stuff, Beth was looking after that and also our supplemental budget requests. Beth looked after that for us as well. So thanks, Beth, for contribution.

Keith Drazek. Five years on council. Most people only get four, but Keith has been really lucky. He's had five. The last two years has served as the Chair of the GNSO Council, which has been an extraordinary effort, given everything that's been going on at the council level. So, Keith, I'm sure the council will thank you at the end of this week, but I just wanted to recognize and thank you for your efforts on our behalf.

Kristine Dorrain for the Nominating Committee. As I said earlier, we lost Kristine halfway through the year because of a change in job, but Kristine stayed on as our Nominating Committee representative, which was a little bit of a challenge this year, given that they had to go virtual. So thanks to Kristine for your efforts.

So thanks, everybody. We will be sending those out via e-mail. It might not seem like much, but we really do appreciate your efforts, so we wanted to take the time to recognize that. So thank you, everybody. Thank you.

Well, I guess we've done part of it. I'll just [sink] myself: job well done. Thanks, everybody. Now I'll ... I didn't really think about how we would do this logistically but I guess we'll work on the new ExCom.

So, Sam, I guess I'm handing the batoning—batoning? there you go; that's somewhere between a bat and something else ... So, Sam, congratulations. Welcome, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Beth Bacon, congratulations, Vice Chair of Policy.

Craig Schwartz, welcome to the ExCom. I think you'll be a terrific addition as our Vice Chair of Administration.

Kurt Pritz—"Behind every good man is a good woman"—who is stepping up to the GNSO Council.

And welcome back, Paul Diaz, who will step up as our Nominating Committee representative.

With that, Sam, I think I'll hand it over to you. You can close out the meeting.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks so much, Donna. This is Sam Demetriou, your new Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, officially taking the batoning from Donna. I really regret that I can't shake your hand and give you a hug, Donna, but I want to save the official thank you and recognition for when we do our wrap-up meeting on Thursday because I want to just let everyone I think that's going to be a really special event. So, if you were maybe on the fence about whether to dial into that, please

consider coming. We're going to recap this week/two weeks/two-and-half/three weeks of ICANN69 and also look back at 20 years of the Registry Stakeholder Group and everyone who has been a critical part of making this group what it is today, up to and including the great work that Donna has done as Chair. These are definitely big shoes to fill, only metaphorically, though, Donna. Don't worry. And I'm excited and nervous and very happy to do be stepping into this. I'm so looking forward to working with all of our other ExCom members and you all as our Registry Stakeholder Group members going forward.

So I guess, with all that said, I will open it up to any AOB, any questions, comments, or concerns, or anything else folks want to cover while we have this time here today.

All right. I think, with that, we can go ahead and draw this particular session to a close. Thank—oh, sorry. I'm actually ... Maxim is reminding me. I got a little caught up in the moment and he's reminding me that we're going to cover one thing. Donna noted that Maxim is stepping down as our designated representative to the SSC (the Standing Selection Committee). We did want to make one note that we had discussed as an ExCom, and going forward, that the Vice Chair of Administration will be taking on that role on a running basis. So whoever the new Vice Chair of Admin is—in this particular instance, it will be Craig Schwartz, as we noted—is going to step in and be the designee to the Standing Selection Committee going forward.

So, Craig, Maxim also wanted me to mention that he is available and happy to transition with you and give you any support that you need

going forward as you get used to that role. So one last piece of business, I guess. All right. So Maxim is [saying] that he'll connect with you. So that's great, looking forward.

With that, I think now we have really covered everything. Thank you all for the time. Can't wait to see you in two more days at the wrap-up and the 20th-anniversary celebration. Thank you all so much. We can draw this meeting to a close. See you all down the road, folks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]