

---

ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – GNSO - RrSG Membership Meeting  
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 – 14:00 to 17:00 CEST

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and welcome to the Registrar Stakeholder Membership meeting on Tuesday the 13th of October 2020. 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 proper form, as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair 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 microphones when you are done speaking.

This session includes real-time transcription today. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. With this, I will hand the floor over to Ashley Heineman. Please begin.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hello everybody. Thank you for joining us today for another virtual ICANN meeting from glorious Hamburg. Wish we could all be there, but we are not. Thanks for hosting anyway, Germany. Loving it.

---

***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.***

---

We're going to do things today a little bit differently, but first and foremost, we have—we're on the books for three hours, but it's actually two and a half. We'll have a half-hour mandatory break at 12.00 UTC. That's about an hour and a half in. And we also want to make sure that you're aware that we're going to do our best to track all the questions that come in over chat, but the best way to make sure that you get anything addressed is to raise your hand, put your question in brackets if you do put it on the chat, but we're going to do our best to cover everything and I know Eric's going to give us a helping hand on reading the chat or keeping an eye on the chat.

So for today, we have a pretty hefty agenda. It's going to be a little bit different in the sense that we're going to try to look more strategically at things, and we're going to delve through—this is what we have right now in terms of the agenda. We're going to try and go topically at first, but what you'll see at 14:30 is resource planning, and that's where we're going to touch upon a lot of the stuff we talked about already and go through what our resource needs are and what our priorities should be, and that sort of thing.

We also have open question AOB at the end, so if there's anything that you would like to add for AOB, let me know now or later and we can make sure we get to it at the end.

So, another thing we're going to do a little differently this time is that we're going to incorporate poll questions throughout the session to keep people engaged and keep us interested more than usual. So to kind of get us started in terms of how that is going to be handled, we

---

have some poll questions that I would like to raise now to get us used to it and how it's going to work.

Opening the welcome poll here, first question we have, what is Graeme missing the most about being chair? ICANN meeting plannings, evening calls with ICANN, avoiding food that he's allergic to at meals with members and ICANN staff, RAA amendment, TLD puns, or wielding his unlimited power?

If we could answer the first poll question. It should be fairly obvious here what to do, just click on the answer that you think best answers the question. I will give you a moment and then we'll move on to question two.

GRAEME BUNTON: That's very charming. Thank you guys.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay, you should have had enough time for question one. Let's move to question two. What will be missing from GNSO council and ExCom when Michele is no longer on it? Occasional light swearing, saying things that no one else dare say, someone to speak in the silences, ICANN and industry intel, really brief 30-minute interventions, a soothing Irish accent. Please answer appropriately.

Okay, moving on to question three. Which EPDP team member was primarily motivated to participate on the promise of steak knives? James, Matt, Owen, Sarah, Theo, Volker? Please put in your answer. All

---

right. Now, at the end, you should have a submit button. Hit “submit” please.

Now apparently the magic is happening and Zoe’s going to have to tell me how the magic happens and where the magic pops up, because that part, I don’t know.

ZOE BONYTHON:

Okay. I’m going to end the poll now, and I’m going to share the results. Now you may go through the results.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

I will read them off for you in case somebody is reading challenged. Question one, what is Graeme missing the most about being chair? Wielding unlimited power. Two, what will be missing from GNSO council and ExCom when Michele is no longer on it? His soothing Irish accent.

Three, which EPDP team member was primarily motivated to participate on the promise of steak knives? Matt.

So, thank you, everybody. I think we should all have it now in terms of how to respond to these poll questions and hopefully [this’ll be a little bit] fun.

Any questions about the polling or about the agenda before we get started? I’m assuming there are no hands. We’ll go ahead and get started then. And thank you, Roger, for your patience and flexibility because we had to change this agenda around at the last minute. But

---

transfer policy. Could you please kick us off, Roger, with respect to this agenda item?

ROGER CARNEY:

Sure. This was fairly quiet for the last few months as staff put together the issues report which came out at some point yesterday, Zoe threw it at me. Thank you. This is a very thorough report. Thanks, staff, for doing that. I think all the issues from the past two or three years, staff has at least identified and put in their report. The report is over 100 pages long, so it will be a hefty read, though probably the last 30 pages are just appendix of draft charter for PDP and a Tech Ops whitepaper on transfers.

Anyway, when I looked at it real quick overnight, nothing too surprising, I don't think. Anybody that was in the scoping team or listened to the scoping team discussions, all the topics in the issues report were discussed except for maybe one. I just didn't remember to discuss it. But again, the main topics being to look at is FOAs, auth code usage, change of registrants, the TEAC and transfer disputes, [necking,] reversing transfers, ICANN-approved transfers, bulk transfers, and anything that the Recommendation 27 out of phase one mentioned for transfers, which there were a few things.

Again, I think it fell in line with what the transfer scoping team discussed and presented to council earlier this year and really fell in line with Tech Ops whitepaper as well for those involved in that.

---

So the Org is recommending a two-phased PDP be conducted to address all these issues. The first one, a phase A1, being FOAs and auth codes and anything in recommendation 27 dealing with those, a phase 1B being change of registrant and anything in recommendation 27 dealing with that, and then phase two basically being everything else.

The reason staff broke it into 1A, 1B and a 2 is that their idea is to do an initial report on the A1 items, FOA and auth code, and get that moving forward and then jumping back into the 1B stuff and doing initial report and then rolling those together, just to keep the flow of information moving as quickly as possible.

In addition to that, keeping that flow moving, the final report of phase one, 1A and 1B being done and getting pushed through council and then maybe providing that checkpoint at that time to say, okay, are we on the right track? Is there anything that needs to be added to phase two that maybe had been missed or just needs to be clarified through phase two? And then possibly updating the charter for phase two before that gets started.

But then once that's done, all that phase one work can actually move on to implementation phase while phase two is getting started on the policy side. So just the idea from staff on how that broke out like that.

What else is there? I think the big thing, comment phase is going through the end of November now. I assume that was to account for the fact that we're at ICANN now, so it's a little longer than normal, but public comments will be open until the end of November, at which

---

time staff will then pull those together, do any updates necessary and get their final recommendations off to the council, and then council had to obviously discuss and decide.

I think some of the big things to look for, anybody that's going to be reading this, is there anything missing? I think there's seven big items talked about. Is there anything missing that needs to be reviewed going forward? And I think the other big item is, does that approach on breaking it into two phases or two and a half if you want to call it that, does that seem to be logical and work for everyone? So I think that's the major things, Ashley. If anybody has any questions, let me know.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Roger. Before I start poking people for more questions or comments, did you want to go ahead and pull up the poll question? Thank you. Just ask for it. Can we pull up Q4? There we go.

ROGER CARNEY:

And Zoe and I talked about this the other day as well, before the issues report came out, so this may be a little bit different. I think maybe look at this as, does the approach staff provided make sense to everyone, and does that work for everyone? Two, maybe 2.5 phases.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Before we close out the poll on this one, would you like to discuss further what the advantages of either of these options before we answer?

---

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. I think the advantage of—and I think even staff kind of recognized this when they did the issues part—breaking it out is trying to get some of the more maybe low hanging fruit done as quickly as possible, and not get resolved before it gets implemented. And I think one big PDP with one final report that goes, it'll take obviously some time, so I think the big advantage is doing multiples or broken out as staff has suggested allows us to do not just concurrent work but also get work out the door faster.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Roger. Okay, if you guys had a chance to answer the poll question and submit it, that'd be helpful, see where people are at. I'm guessing I know what the answer is likely to be.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Can I make a comment briefly?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sure. Please do.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I absolutely agree with the concept of having it in the multiples, I just would like to raise one advantage that doing it all in one has, which is horse trading. Basically, give something on one hand, get something on the other, whereas if we have one topic PDPs, then there might be



---

less inclination of trading and dealing and more resistance to any change. So that's one consideration that we probably should think about before we finalize.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Volker. James, please go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi. Good morning. I guess I'm going to lend my vote towards consolidating it into one giant PDP versus breaking it up into phases. I know a number of people on the call, Michele, Volker and some of the other folks remember IRTP A through E and just the different phases. What happened was that we kind of moved work items and chartered items around inside of the different [inaudible]. We're not ready for that one yet, let's kick it down one more phase, let's consolidate everything.

And to Volker's point, we had no opportunity to really compare apples to apples across the different phases because they were distinctly separate PDPs.

Another challenge we would have is we would have one PDP starting and then work and winding down into an IRT concurrent with some of the other PDPs either going or starting up, and to me, it kind of created a bit of volunteer fatigue in terms of the same group of folks being stretched out across multiple PDPs. And from an implementation perspective, I think it did a lot to confuse customers and registrants about what exactly they're supposed to be doing for

---

transfers when these changes would only, in their view, be alive for a few years before the next one came.

So I just feel like—I know it's tempting and it feels like it's more efficient to break it up into phases, but I think when you step back and look at it end to end, it was an overall slower and more convoluted experience to have it into phases and then manage those dependencies.

I also just wanted to throw an idea out. I know there's been a lot of preliminary work on this from registrars, especially on the tech ops folks and Tobias previously. The previous PDPs were like registrars talking to each other. there was a little bit of interest from registries and some other groups, but it was like 80% registrars talking to and negating with each other. So it feels like if we had a very concise Registrar Stakeholder Group position going into a large PDP, we can really streamline the whole process and then just kind of get the other groups onboard as opposed to kind of having a public session where we has those out amongst ourselves.

I know Michele and Volker and some of the other folks were around for that previous marathon of IRTF reforms, and I'd be interested if they have a different experience, but that was just my views. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, James. Just to say a couple of things that Volker brought up, and it was discussed in the scoping team as well, is when you separate them, are you creating dependencies? And one of the thoughts that

---

went through it was the team tried to separate the topics as best as possible not to create dependencies, but obviously still a concern, so I think that's important to look at.

And to your point, James, on the makeup of this, and to Graeme's point in chat about is there anything contentious about this, it's funny because obviously, sitting back and doing the scoping team, I don't think anybody thought there was anything too contentious, but I'm not sure that going into the phase one IRT, everybody thought it would be quite that contentious either. So I'll hold my judgment on that as far as James's point is normally this is going to be done by registries and registrars. So I'm sure we'll get some impacts from other groups. So I think that'll be something to consider as breaking it up or not. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Roger. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I agree with a lot of what James is saying. The problem, I think, with the last set of transfer reforms was that as you got through each phase, you were already kind of doing work against yourself almost because things have moved on and progressed, and by the time you got to the end of the entire process, it was almost like you'd have to start over again.

So I think putting it all together in one and possibly giving it phases or whatever way people want to call it makes more sense to me. I just

---

think breaking it out into distinct individual PDPs won't actually speed things up because you've got the IRT after the fact, and it's basically the same people anyway.

Also, agree as well with that point about it just being a lot of registrars, because a lot of these points very much registrar-, and to a lesser degree, registry-specific issues. Third parties don't really care.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Michele. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: [Everyone said,] I think the first transfer policy was a lot of registrars talking to registrars, because it was fairly contentious. There were some registrars that had an interest in making transfers as easy as possible.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hey, Jeff, we can't hear you very well. Can you speak up or turn up your volume?

JEFF NEUMAN: All right. So I think the first process was contentious and registrars talking to each other because there were some registrars that were interested in making transfers as easy as possible, and some registrars didn't want them to be as easy as possible.

---

We don't have that issue here, so I don't see any of these issues really being contentious at all. And when we say different phases, I don't think we necessarily mean like the rights protection mechanism is in different phases where you have two very distinct start and stop point for each different phase. I think these are more like milestones to complete rather than phases, in a sense where you'd have to have a final report after each one. I think some of those issues are smaller than the other issues. So you wouldn't necessarily need an initial report for every one of those issues individually.

And just to get to the point, there was lots of registrars with expertise in transfers, but very few in the community that have expertise outside of the registrars. And I think if you did multiple PDPs, you'd still likely have the same people participating and complaining the whole way. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Jeff. Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Ashley. Just to follow up and summarize what staff was thinking about, really, Jeff, when I read it, I kind of did think of RPM, sort of, between phase one and phase two, because staff is recommending a final report after phase one and then possibly updating charter of phase two before getting started.

So I did kind of see it that way, but again, to your point, I'm not sure that this is going to be a long, drawn-out process. So I don't think it'll

---

be a time-consuming point to move from that phase one to phase two.  
Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Any other questions or comments on this? Time to see the results of the poll, Zoe.

ZOE BONYTHON: I'll do that now.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: 50-50 tie.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE Perfectly clear.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Should we do it again after that conversation? Because I may have shut the poll off too quickly.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Ashley, I think it confirms my suspicion, is that we have a diversity of profiles here and a diversity of approaches to our engineering teams. And it's not shocking that we ended up split like that.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Let's redo it. Is that possible? There we go, let's try this again. Don't feel like—Do what you want to do.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I think we're going to end up in the same place.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Well, we'll find out, won't we, Jothan? Everybody submit. I'll give you ten more seconds. Everybody done? I should hope so. Okay, let's see what it looks like.

We're so easy to influence, apparently. I'm just kidding.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I'm delighted to be wrong on that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: That's shows the power of thoughtful discussion and hearing other people's views. All right, so in terms of next steps, roger, how do you see this playing out?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Ashley. And again, I think some of the big steps for us as a group is to read it, but really to read it to see if anything's been missed. If we think something else needs to be talked about, we need to get that in there so that it can get chartered. And again, I think to James's point, do we as a registrar group need to get behind one set of

---

a stance on this whole thing as it is? Do we all agree that change of registrant should or shouldn't be part of this? Do we all agree there is no need for an FOA? All those things, do we need to do that?

And again, as far as, I think Berry kind of laid out what needs to be done from the staff side, they're going to get comments, they're going to update the issues report, they're going to issue it to the council and then council have to act on it. But before that, I think those are the big things I need to look at, is there anything missing? And to James's point, do we all agree, or should we somewhat come to agreement on the path forward so that when we do get this running, it's a one sided hopefully view? Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Roger. Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: My thought here is if any of the registrars are capturing legal versus natural, how are we transferring that? We don't have that right now. So obviously, if or when that might be addressed, we'll have to deal with that also within the scope of transfers later.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Something to discuss. Volker.



---

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. I think we absolutely do need a game plan going in. If we go in there with different opinions or starting to form more opinions within the discussions, I think we've already lost. I think we need to have a very clear image of what we want going into this. All the other groups do usually have some image of what they want.

And to Jothan's question, legal versus natural at this point is still registrar choice. So if you as a registrar offer that, the onus is on you on how to implement that. If you don't offer that, then it's not transferred. It's probably as easy as that. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Volker. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks. So to Jothan's question, I think that is a specific example of a broader problem, which is, how are contact objects preserved across transfers, and do we essentially accept the previous registrar's contact objects and all the information that may or may not be accurate, or do we require, as part of that process, creation of new contact objects, including capturing different data points like legal versus natural, if that is something that you're capturing?

I think we have seen certain situations where we just throw out the contacts that come up with the transfers and redo it. But other situations, that might not be ideal. So I think that's a broader question than just legal versus natural. That's a, how much can you trust and

---

preserve the previous contact objects or how much do you just need to just throw those out?

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks for entertaining the discussion. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sarah, please.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Good morning. I'm really excited about working on this PDP. I understand the next step is to read the issues report, and I'm just wondering how a team of us might be convened after that, and will Roger still lead our efforts? Because he's done great so far. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Sarah. That was actually my next question with respect to how do we proceed with this, whether it shifts over to our policy subgroup, or I assume that's how it will work and then we can perhaps talk roger into leading the effort and throwing together a team of folk. Anybody have any specific ideas on this? Owen, did you have any thoughts? Sarah, is that an old hand before I move on to Roger? Okay, Roger, please.

---

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Ashley. And I thought the same thing. I thought that this would just move into the policy and Owen would drive this through to at least the comment phase. At this time, I'm looking forward to working on this, so I'll be around for it. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Roger. Yeah, it sounds like we've got a bit of time. I don't know that we need to put together a hard and fast group today, but certainly, people can indicate their interests if they like. And Owen, I don't know if you have any questions or thoughts at this time.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: No, Ashley. Nothing for now. I'll cover it later during my section.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay. Michele, go ahead, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Ashley. I suppose one thing that'll probably sorted out at council as this is moved forward will be around what model of the working group is adopted in terms of membership. So I think that's something just to keep to the back of people's mind.

For those who aren't following, essentially, GNSO is moving away from completely open working groups to various kind of representative models. It just means it won't be a complete free-for-all. We'll have all sorts of crazy people joining.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Michele. Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Ashley. Thanks, Michele. This was actually discussed in the scoping team as well, is the makeup of this. And honestly, maybe Berry can jump on or comment real quick. And I read it real quick, so I don't remember seeing in the issues report the discussion on this. I know that it was brought up to council with the scoping team about the makeup of what this team could look like in the future. Obviously something we need to discuss moving forward. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Roger. Any other thoughts, comments, questions on this issue before we move on? I don't see anybody.

JAMES BLADEL Sorry, I just have a quick ...

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sure.

JAMES BLADEL Thanks. Just James—and Roger and Owen, I look forward to your updates. I just feel like that council approach to working group membership might not work for this one if we have a pretty

---

unbalanced PDP with 12 interested registrars and really a bunch of crickets from the rest of the community. Hopefully the council will be open to some flexibility on that point. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, James. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, just on that, I think that you need strong leadership on the working group. That's the most important thing. Doesn't matter if there's 100 people from one constituency and one from another, it really should depend on the quality of the comments. So I think more important than whether to conduct a representative model is just—I don't think it works for everything. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Jeff. Pam?

PAM LITTLE: Thanks. I tend to agree. The representative model may not work for this one. So obviously, something for the council to consider. We could also have some sort of hybrid or have some sort of skillset requirements, if you like. So watch this space, and obviously, we will take feedback from this group to the council when the council makes that decision. Thanks.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Pam. And Roger's flagged in the chat that there's a discussion on membership in the draft charter section of the issues report once you guys have a chance to look at it. Theo, please.

THEO GEURTS: I think actually this group is very well suited to have experts onboard and to work on this specifically as opposed to a very open group where most of the members don't have any expertise on these operational issues. So I think this is a perfect example where we should have all the experts on board and should be very open. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Theo. Any other questions or comments? Sounds like we're off to a good start with this one. Unless I'm missing someone. Thank you, Roger. Let's go back to the agenda, please.

We're going to skip along to the next agenda item, which is Operational Design Phase concept. I believe we had Pam slated for that one. Is that correct, Zoe?

ZOE BONYTHON: That's correct, it's Pam.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Pam, do you mind taking this? Thank you.

---

PAM LITTLE: Sure. Zoe, I thought staff was coming to talk to us about this, but I just ... So that's changed, has it?

ZOE BONYTHON: Pam, staff are coming but they're coming after the break. Unfortunately, they had to come later in the session rather than earlier.

PAM LITTLE: Okay. No problem. Well, I only just read the proposed concept or the paper from Org like everyone else, like a week ago. So I know as much as probably most of you do, but just very quickly, according to ICANN Org, or Göran mainly doing the talking or selling this concept to us. Really, this phase is designed or intended for large and complex implementation project like the SSAD and later on SubPro, or maybe SubPro will come before the SSAD based on the conversation the board just had with the council, because those projects will be complex and you'll have to build a new IT system and the cost involved and the complexity.

And according to Göran, they're already doing this within ICANN Org anyhow, just a matter of formalizing this phase. So this phase occurs between when council has approved policy recommendations and before ICANN board considers those recommendations. So basically, Org would have all the necessary information to allow the board to make informed decisions as to whether to adopt those policy recommendations sent to them from the council.

---

And there'll be sort of two tracks. Obviously, the Org path and the community path. ICANN Org would do the policy impact assessment, I guess like cost and whatever other impact they will take into account, and then the community, there is a proposed design feedback group or something that will be kind of appointed.

My reading of the concept paper seems to suggest that group will be pointed by ICANN Org. I could be wrong. So this could be something we should perhaps look into it. So that's just kind of the gist of this design phase concept. ICANN Org keeps saying it doesn't change anything really, it's just kind of to formalize it and also make the process more transparent and allow the community to really have a mechanism to provide feedback and input during this Operational Design Phase.

So I just thought of some preliminary questions, and I will open for discussion later on. I would very much like to know how this proposed phase intersects with existing GNSO process such as the consensus policy implementation framework and how that may impact the GNSO and the council's respective roles. And also, as I said earlier, the composition of the design feedback group is unclear to me. Seems to be up to Org to decide, and maybe that's something we need to think about.

So that's as much as I have at the moment. I see Jeff has his hand up. Jeff, over to you.



---

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. I'm actually a big supporter of this design phase concept. I think we can work on some of the details, but I don't see it intersecting with the GNSO processes and I don't think it impacts any of the GNSO council rules.

When it was initially brought up—and Pam, I know you were on that call as well—it was a call between SubPro leadership team and the executive team at ICANN, and Avri and Becky from the board talking about SubPro. And the way it was explained was that when the board accepted the 2007 GNSO policies for what ultimately became the 2012 round, the board had no clue what it was getting into. The board had no clue about the number of people it would need to hire, the amount it would need to spend, the system it was designing, and it really had no strategic plan for implementing this program at the time the board approved it. It obviously got to that point later on.

So the way it was explained is that, look, before the board approves a big thing like the next round of gTLDs, ICANN staff should be able to explain to the board exactly what it's going to require, both internal and external to ICANN, to actually carry out the program in the way that the PDP has envisioned.

So it would really occur between the time that the GNSO accepts the policies and when the board then has to vote on approving them. The other advantage it has is that it starts the implementation work earlier so that you actually don't have to wait four to six months of a dead period where essentially, the board is not acting on anything because there's a comment period going on. You can actually start

---

implementing the program and cut time away from the actual implementation.

So I think there are some things we need to work on in terms of this draft, but I'm a big supporter of this, and especially in light of the next round of new gTLDs. I don't see it as a threat to the council's role or anything like that.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Jeff. I'm not sure—I put them as question marks there, so whether there is impact, because one thing I could think of is, Jeff, the charter for PDPs, actually, there is a requirement for the PDP working group to come up with the policy impact assessment or something along that nature. I think that's a new thing since the 2016 or something. It's just in the past, none of the working groups actually in their final report produced that part of the impact assessment.

So the question is, should it be done within the PDP working group, or should it be done in that phase? And the other thing I think is different between the last round, the 2007 new gTLD—the policy made then, because this round, I believe the EPDP as well as SubPro, they are actually board members and staff or liaison in those working groups. So they shouldn't really have to wait until the council adopts this policy to know what the impact will be, or staff digging or thinking about what the implementation is going to look like, right?

So I think the environment is not the same or is quite different now. So I'm not saying it's a bad thing, it's just we need to understand better

---

whether it's actually a good thing. Personally, I don't really find it's a bad thing, I just want to understand more clearly what any negative impact at all, and would really achieve the goal it's intended.

So I'll stop there. James, over to you, and then we'll have Theo and Jeff again.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thanks, Pam, and thanks for kicking this off. Just wanted to weigh in with—I'm sympathetic to the statement that the board, with some of these decisions, really doesn't have a good idea of what they're agreeing to or voting on, particularly if there's a lot of—a yes vote for example creates a whole new division of ICANN, a whole new revenue stream and a whole new set of staff like it did with new gTLDs. But I just wanted to point out that a lot of those impacts were the result of changes that were made, that were bolted on to the GNSO process after it had been adapted to council or an expansion of some of the ideas that came out of the original policy. So things like the trademark clearinghouse, for example, was not explicitly called for by the PDP but was kind of inserted later as a way to nullify some of the concerns about a new application round and then translate it into the organization and staff having to build out all these new capabilities and take on all these new costs and contracts.

So I guess I'm good with the idea and the concept of having a check-in to see what the impact of the different policies on the organization, but I would hope that it doesn't turn into another opportunity to kind of layer on new features and functions and bells and whistles to the

---

policy that came out of the GNSO, and it becomes kind of this new battleground to create policies and obligations that are [extraneous] to the PDP, like we saw with the 2012 round.

So if we can keep it narrow and we can keep it lightweight, it sounds like a great idea. But if it turns into another arena, count me out.

Thanks.

PAM LITTLE:

Thanks, James. Theo.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah. Those are actually good points from James. You can actually turn that a little bit around. I wonder if you take SSAC for example, I think we said like we are okay with the SSAD but there needs to be a new evaluation for the cost of the SSAD because they are now way too high, in our opinion. And I was wondering if there would be a cost assessment and that is way too high, how would that affect the entire policy process anyways? Because that could influence the board to say like, oh, if it's going to cost X amount of money, we're not going to vote for it, or we're not going to process it or whatever that process is called.

So my concern is a little bit we've seen some cost estimates from ICANN Org that are usually pretty high and create some kind of barrier in my opinion. Thanks.

---

PAM LITTLE: Thanks, Theo. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Just to respond to a couple things. So yes there's a requirement in the PDPs to consider the potential impact on contracted parties of any policy that could be subject to a consensus policy. That, we as a working group or when you're in a working group, that, we can pretty much do because we have representatives of those contracted parties in these PDPs.

But that's very different than an organizational impact on what ICANN would need to do to carry out a program like this. So it's not for every single PDP, and they specifically say that. It's really for these large scale projects. Completely agree with the notion that it needs to be tightly bound and it can't be like a second chance or fifth chance to add something in. But the reality is members of a policy working group do not have the expertise at all to make organizational assessments on what ICANN as an organization will need to do.

That would be ridiculous, to have some policy works kind of determine exactly what the business needs are or the costs are of these types of things. And here's the reality: ICANN's going to put this into effect regardless of what we do. They're going to do operational analysis prior to the board voting on anything, or of these programs. What this is saying is actually giving us a chance to be part of the process.

---

So even if we said, “No, this sounds awful,” ICANN’s going to do something like this anyway but It’ll just do it all internal, not share its thoughts. So like the SSAD, ICANN came out with, what, a \$9 million startup fee and \$9 million every year fee? A lot of us think that’s ridiculous. But we had no opportunity to really question that cost analysis. But in this new design phase, we have the ability to do that.

So I think we read this, we make sure it’s got the protections in so it doesn’t become a second chance, but I do not see the downside of doing any of this. Thank you.

PAM LITTLE:

Thanks, Jeff. Sounds like everyone agrees, really, we don’t want this mechanism or this phase to become an opportunity for folks to relitigate closed policy discussions. I think that’s pretty clear. And I guess these are all good points, comments and feedback. As a group, I guess what we need to do is form a ... Does this belong to policy or somewhere else where we can start to put our thoughts together and provide the feedback to ICANN Org? I don’t even have a timeline as to when they are seeking feedback from the community. So I guess we can just do that ASAP, or we can ask staff when they come to join us.

[Statton] has a question. “Can a design phase have a set time frame so that it doesn’t delay a vote for months and months?” Jeff, do you know the answer?

---

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, and that's in the paper too. It doesn't specify what the time period exactly is, but it does make the point that this should not, in any way, delay board action on these items. So we can comment that we want it more explicit than that, but that is the intent.

PAM LITTLE: Thanks, Jeff. Ashley, is the time up for this discussion item? I'll hand it back to you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: There's certainly more time to discuss it. I was just going to note that I think it would be helpful to pose some of these questions to ICANN staff when they brief us on it, and then perhaps towards the end of our meeting today, during the resource planning section, we can figure out how better to handle this particular issue. We can talk about it as well when Owen gets the policy to figure out what's the best home for this, whether it's as full membership or within policy.

Looks like Statton has another question, "But there is no specific date, I'd like to suggest there be a specific date." Okay. So something for us to keep in mind.

Any other questions, thoughts, Pam, and want to wrap this up, or raise any other points?

PAM LITTLE: Yes, I think we can wrap it up because there's going to be another briefing from staff, and we can talk a bit more there. Is that okay with

---

everyone? Okay, with that, I think we can move on to the next agenda item.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Pam. That was very helpful, particularly before we'd get into the fuller briefing from ICANN staff. Next on the agenda, we have information and best practices. So the intent here was to kind of talk about an issue that quite frankly came from Graeme and also his activities in the DNS abuse group. I imagine he may have brought it up under his tenure as chair as well, in terms of what else can the Registrar Stakeholder Group be doing in terms of our workload. One of those issues was perhaps providing some more informational documents and best practices, whether it's documentation or webinars or things of that nature for other registrars. And if we do do something like that, what could we be working on? So we were looking at things like data statistics, topics for future whitepapers, statements, anything in terms of informational, registrar capacity building.

I'm going to stop at this bullet point before going any further to see if Graeme wanted to chime in at all here. And apologies for not giving you any heads up. But I think this is something that could be useful as we continue to mature as a group to continue to bring more registrars into the fold, to help the registrars that are currently already members of Registrar Stakeholder Group but perhaps don't best know how to utilize our group.



---

I see a number of different opportunities for us to be more of a resource, essentially. So I see Graeme has his hand up, so Graeme, please, if you have any thoughts.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Ashley. I've definitely been thinking about this mostly in terms of DNS abuse, but I think you're right that there's a lot of applicability outside that remit, which is, broadly speaking there's a lot of expertise within our group but there is also a fair amount of—too many negative connotations to the word, but let's go with ignorance anyway—about a lot of different issues amongst members where they may not have been affected by something or just don't have the capacity to dig into a couple of different issues.

Recently on the DNS abuse call, Theo and Luke brought up the issue of business e-mail compromise scams—DEC I think in common parlance—and that was really interesting to me. I don't personally know a lot about it, but it seems to be a thing that has impacted a number of registrars, and isn't necessarily important in the broader ICANN context but is certainly something that we could be—and we're going to try to do this with these BEC things, which is collect it all together, see if we can put a one- or two-pager together and share it with the Registrar Stakeholder Group members and maybe post it on the website where we've got a registrar-specific angle on an abuse or DNS abuse issue.

And so this is sort of what the DNS abuse group is trying to do on a couple of issues. We're working on a similar thing on incentivization

---

programs. And out of our conversation recently with ICANN staff, John Crain and David Conrad from OCTO, was that when they're doing their sort of spooky cyber intelligence stuff, they come across registrars that just don't understand particular issues. They might be small, and just don't encounter them very often

So what we're going to be trying to do with ICANN—and it's going to take a little bit of work to get there, and certainly post ICANN 69, is to begin to put together some webinars to collect that insight that we might have inside our membership and that OCTO has inside their spooky cyber people's, and begin to really share that.

And I think that is a thing we should really strive for and a huge amount of value that could come out of being a stakeholder group member.

So maybe to bring that into concrete actions, things that we can really do, is if it's specific to DNS abuse, bring it into that group if you have like a topic that you think you're an expert in or you think other people should be hearing about, join that group, [turn into] that group and we can talk about it and being to work on putting something else out that's not specific to that group, and I think just the broader mailing list, to be like, "Hey, this is a thing, I think we would all benefit from understanding more, and let's put those resources out there and that rising tide will float all of our boats and it'll be a better industry for it, DNS will be better, and business will be smoother. "Thanks.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Graeme. So those are some good ideas specific to DNS abuse. Some other things I've been kicking around, do we want, during the prep week if we continue down this virtual approach to ICANN meetings, perhaps we can have something geared towards registrars in terms of just informational capacity building. Because I think at the end of the day, having all of us and our colleagues together and kind of up to speed on a number of things only works to help us moving forward. Whether or not it's DNS abuse—because I would hate to think that there's registrars out there actively looking to attract bad registrants. It's probably much more along the lines of they just don't have the capacity to do what they need to do or don't know that there are certain things they should be doing.

Other thoughts include, do we want to have a session that explains in more detail about what their obligations are under ICANN contracts? Those sorts of things. Operational best practices. Those types of things.

All that being said, it'll take some resourcing on our part, and dedication, so it's something we would all have to kind of chip in and agree to do.

I think in terms of statements or papers, those can kind of CROP up naturally, but I think we could, if with e agree, put some cadence in things like webinars and capacity building if we choose to do that. So that's kind of a kickoff to that idea. Does anybody have any questions or thoughts on that before I turn to more of a website conversation?

---

And I think for what it's worth, going through the exercise of putting together best practices is a useful exercise for us as well, if nothing else, to confirm that they actually are best practices. So Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: I've put this in the chat but I might as well just say it. The lawyer side of me hates calling things best practices. We can certainly figure out another term, but at least in the US, there's a certain connotation when you have something as a best practices, meaning if a registrar does not implement all of those best practices, you get certain strikes against you and negligence claims and other types of tort claims. That kind of fun stuff.

So I think whitepapers on good practices is good to put out there, and I'd just like to stay away from the term best practices.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Fair enough. And I wasn't trying to latch on any particular phraseology.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry, Ashley, somebody just asked me in the chat why do I not like the term best practices. So Thanks.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

No, it's a good point. And particularly these days when we're moving more towards voluntary regulation, you commit to doing best practices and you commit to potential enforcement as well.

So yeah. Graeme, you have your hand up.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Jeff, for answering that question. I don't really feel strongly about whatever we call this. To James's point in the chat though, where he was concerned that there are some things that belong coming from ICANN or ICANN Compliance, I disagree a bit. There are certain things that belong to come from ICANN Compliance, but I don't think we want to necessarily rely on our contracts for compliance for a broad array of stuff. I think there's plenty of room to maneuver, plenty of room to demonstrate that we can do good things, and make some choices that don't end up involving the entire rest of the ICANN community, because they don't have to. They're outside our contracts and it's just things that we can do.

And I think we risk getting bogged down and playing the same game that we've always paid if we're relying too strictly on the guardrails of ICANN land. So this is probably a longer conversation that we can have in another forum, but I wouldn't want to pour all of this into that exact framework. I think. Thanks.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Graeme. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Just wanted to respond to Graeme. I was putting that in the chat, and I raised my hand for a specific comment that was made about having some sessions to help other registrars become familiar with their obligations. I think having the Registrar Stakeholder Group saying, “Here's what we're all doing and that makes us compliant, you should do it too,” and if at some point—now I'm channeling Jeff a little bit—that goes sideways on them, they're going to say, “The Registrar Stakeholder Group told me I was in the clear if I did this,” and/or potentially they could even raise some competition issues if folks believe that they were boxed into or boxed out of particular practices by a group of competitors.

So I'm just putting it out there that some of those things as far as socializing obligations under the contracts should come from ICANN Org.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Fair enough, James. And I certainly wasn't indicating that there should be, “This is how you should be compliant,” by any means, but more of a, “Hey, look, you've got requirements here,” that sort of thing. But again, I realize that probably raises some concerns as well. But just examples of things that we could be doing. Michele.

---

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Ashley. I think some stuff has been done in the past which I think was overall quite useful and productive, which is when some of the Registrar Stakeholder Group members collaborate with some of the ICANN staff from the registrar team—which I now note doesn't really exist anymore, but anyway—and it was that kind of collaborative approach where you were getting the official information from ICANN combined with the kind of more practical day-to-day experience of those of us who are kind of dealing with stuff on the ground. And you then have the structures that ICANN is able to bring in order to actually organize these things, whereas for us as a stakeholder group without any real resources, it would be much harder to do those kind of things on an ongoing basis.

I think that kind of thing can be very helpful and productive. And it needs to be something where it's working on kind of a regional basis globally. It's not just a question of new registrars or anything like that. Some of the conversations that some of us have had at various events, why aren't people engaging all the time? It's because they just get hit with walls of text that hit their inboxes from ICANN Org. It's completely overwhelming and they have no idea what they're meant to do with it. Whereas if they actually have a conversation with somebody face-to-face, you can kind of tease things out, whereas Compliance for example, while their staff individually might be helpful, Compliance itself is not set up to train or educate. A dramatic reading of the RAA has never been particularly helpful for any of us, as far as I'm concerned.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Michele. That's right in line with what I was trying to articulate. And I know other groups have things onboarding or tips for newcomers, or just regular refreshers on certain things, because not everybody wants to raise their hand and be like, "I don't understand." So having that information available to them either in a face-to-face session or a webinar or just documentation is often helpful.

Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES:

The challenge in some of the training stuff, if we do it, is that as stuff adjusts and changes, sometimes we need to go back and revisit the training. So if we're going to commit to things like this with best practices or training, we need some sort of custodian or gardener for lack of a better term that's going to be entrusted with the care and feeding of these and making sure they're up to date, some sort of cybrarian function, if we're going to go down this path.

I agree it's a good idea, but I've seen where it becomes like the wrong information when policies change or things like that, that we need to be thinking about that as well. Like what does it look like to sustain itself?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Sure. Absolutely. I wanted to throw the concept out there because I think it's something we can do that's proactive, constructive, positive, and I think it's time for us to do that. We're a grownup organization



---

and we're now officially an association. So I think it's something we should seriously consider, but it does take time and resources.

So I think there's a number of ways we could approach this. We can make it a standing agenda item for membership. Maybe not every single meeting, but other times as well. But I did want to put it out there. So I think I have exhausted the questions and comments on that. It's something we can continue talking about.

I wanted to also raise utilizing our website. You all should be aware now that we just did a recent revamp of our website. It looks beautiful. Thank you, Zoe, for all the hard work, and Michele as well. What I would like to do though is for us to at least start thinking about how we can better utilize it moving forward, but I think it could be more of a tool for us as well. Right now, it's not completely static, but it's not really a resource, at least for membership. It could be much more of a resource for those just coming into it. But at least some of the thinking that came out of this last revamp was, do we want to have it be more of a clearinghouse of information either externally or internally for us? Those types of things.

I know as an incoming new chair, also fairly new to the registrar world, it would be helpful to have a library of information, not necessarily visible to the public but for leadership and those sorts of things.

So I wanted to throw it out there. We don't have to have a real long in-depth conversation, but I just wanted to see if there was a stomach for it. We don't even necessarily have to discuss it here, because I do know that we are running a bit low on time. But that we have in the poll. So

---

unless folks have some immediate kneejerk reactions to that—yeah, people are raising things like Slack as well. I think there's a host of things that we could be doing.

So next, another question I want to plant a seed as well is how we can improve our virtual meetings. This can be specific to ICANN as a whole, but I'm talking more in line with the Registrar Stakeholder Group meetings. We do a lot of talking to you and we try to encourage lots of discussion, but if this is going to be more of the norm in terms of moving forward, we might want to consider different ways of how we conduct our meetings, just to make them more interesting and constructive.

So that's pretty much all I have on that subject to tee up, unless anybody has any strong reactions to that. And what we can do in lieu of comments and questions is go to the poll questions. Can we pull up the Q5 poll questions?

First question, should RrSG be collecting more data statistics on registrars to help with ICANN community discussion? We kind of went through this exercise, for those that remember, when we did the most recent webinar right before council to kind of inform folks on what we're doing in the realm of dealing with data disclosure requests.

And we got some good information, but it was a very small selection of our membership. So, is this something that we want to continue doing with the hopes of getting more input from more of our membership? And if so, we want to get more in the practice of doing so. Are there concerns that you all have associated with that? I guess in short, if you

---

could hit yes or no on this. And if we get a strong reaction either way, we could talk about that a little bit more. So, yes or no?

Number two, should the Registrar Stakeholder Group be producing more best practice guidance and information? And we did talk about that quite at length. Yes or no?

Number three, do you think Registrar Stakeholder Group should hold regular registrar capacity building webinars? We talked about that.

Number four, what topics should the Registrar Stakeholder Group hold a registrar capacity building webinar on? It would be great if we could select more or priority rank these, but I guess we can only pick one. It sounds like, not to rig the result here, but I think Graeme's a bit further along in terms of thinking. So DNS abuse is an obvious one. Operational practices, operational approaches instead of best practices. Understanding ICANN contractual obligations. And also something as simple as understanding our member benefits. Don't be snarky. I'm sure there's lots of benefits to membership. So please, make a selection.

Number five, how should the Registrar Stakeholder Group website be utilized? It's fine as it is, primarily for external communication, with more publicly available information on our work, or invest in developing a members area for internal communication and work. And it can be all of the above, essentially, but where do you think we should put some focus on right now?

---

All right. And then hit submit when you're done. We'll give you a second. Michele, you have your hand up.

MICHELE NEYLON:

So one of the things you were asking about which I think is pertinent is improvements to the meetings. I think this is something that's incumbent on the registrar ExCom to always kind of look at that. I think just even using the polls this time around, to me, that's actually a nice kind of concrete way of kind of getting some idea of temperature from the room.

I think doing of those kind of things is probably not a bad idea. Maybe there's other things that could be looked at. But at least that, I thought, was welcome.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Michele. Okay, any other thoughts or questions before we go ahead and look at the results of the poll? I don't see any. That's a lot more than I thought. Okay. I think what we should do is start introducing this more into our Work Stream so we get used to it and that sort of thing to get more participation in these things. [I think we're all into that.] Okay, cool. Yes, we should be producing more practice guidance and information. Should we hold regular capacity building webinars? Seems to be support for that as well. Surprised by that too. Seems to be a close running in terms of topics to focus on initially, and that's including contractual obligations and DNS abuse.

---

So those could perhaps be the first two that we tackle in terms of putting together some documentation and other things like webinars.

How should the website be utilized? Looks like staring out more with making more information publicly available on our work. Fair enough. Good starting point. I do know at least from my perspective, I'm still considering how best to utilize it for our internal work as well, because I think it is nice to have a centralized point that we can all go to when we're involved in work efforts. It's always helpful.

Anyway, thank you for your input on these polls. We'll have to make sure that we keep these for the record as we move forward. And yeah, perhaps we can [improve on—] I don't know what our constraints are with respect to the polling. I guess it's a Zoom functionality, but we can see if we can enhance those a bit more to make them more useful.

Any other questions or thoughts on what we just discussed? I think that was fun. And it may not have an immediate impact on us, this issue, but I think this gives us something to be more proactive as opposed to reactive on a number of things.

So anyway, I think what we might do now is tee up the DPA with ICANN. We only have just under ten minutes, but perhaps we can start the conversation and then we'll take our break that we have to take. So I'm going to turn it over to Reg to talk this through a bit, if that's okay with you.

---

REG LEVY:

Yes. Absolutely. I've been a member of the roles and responsibilities team, which was a bit of an ad hoc group that gets together approximately weekly to discuss with ICANN—sorry, a team of contracted party members to discuss with ICANN who is a controller and who is a processor with regards to which data points and what that means.

ICANN objected to being called a controller—no surprise—so we called each other joint controllers and finally, we were at a place where no words are being used but we say the contract shall dictate. Which the contracted parties understand to mean that ICANN is controller and that ICANN understands to mean that ICANN is in no way a controller.

It is a bit of an exercise in futility in the sense that we seem to be going round and round and having the same conversations on a weekly basis, just with regards to different wording, but we are slowly working toward an addendum to our contracts and the registry contracts that will lay this out and perhaps make some of the data collection and data transfer that the ICANN contracts require that we do legal, which would be nice.

To that end, once we make a determination about who is responsible for what, we can start getting a DPA together. The ICANN team doesn't think that a DPA is necessary. This contracted party team does think a DPA is necessary and has agreed that ICANN should allow the DPA to be optional in the sense that if someone is a Brazilian registrar and only sells to Brazilian customers, they obviously don't have to worry about the GDPR, so that's fine, they don't have to sign a DPA. But it is

---

optional on the side of the contracted party as opposed to optional on the side of ICANN.

The resistance to this from ICANN's part seems to be that ICANN doesn't want to have 1500 DPAs, which I sympathize with, but also, it sucks to be them because that's what's going to have to happen. The DPA can be the same for all of them, but they're going to need to accept the fact that they need to enter into all of these agreements, one with each contracted party.

So that's the roles and responsibilities team update. We brought up, again with the roles and responsibilities team, the fact that the audit doth approach, and that ICANN is asking for information—one presumes—within the audit, so it would be nice to have a DPA in place. Our conversations with ICANN Compliance went nowhere with Jamie saying, "Oh, no, we expect you'll redact the data," and us saying, "Can you please make it more obvious and prominent that you expect that? Because otherwise, you, ICANN, are going to end up with a button of personal data that that you 'technically didn't ask for' but nevertheless, you have it, so a DPA would be nice to have in place."

They said, "Yeah, that sounds like our problem, not yours." And my frustration with that is if ICANN gets caught on this, it is going to be the contracted parties on the hook Work Track he massive legal bill that they end up having.

So we don't have a DPA yet. We're working toward it. We failed at the compliance argument and so we took that back to the roles and

---

responsibilities team and said, hey, we need a DPA in place for the audit, and were rebuffed at that juncture as well.

So that is where the DPA with ICANN situation stands, which is to say we haven't yet won but we are working on it. And we tried to come at it from two different tactics and failed.

I am curious what the group—this is a request now for question 10, although I think you're going to get 10, 11 and 12 at the same time.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Why don't we hold off on the questions until after break?

REG LEVY: Okay.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Because I want people to think about—

REG LEVY: Brew on that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: And I'd also like people to think about what are other areas that a DPA is going to be required, because my concern is—not with us, because I think we're all thinking about it the same way. But ICANN as an organization does not seem to be. And it's very siloed and people seem shocked and confused when we indicate that a DPA is necessary.



---

My understanding is that we're looking towards one DPA that covers all the activities that would require one. So I think it would be a helpful exercise. And I'm guessing you guys probably already have, but maybe having a conversation among all of us who aren't as involved, to identify the areas where one is necessary. So if we do get the opportunity to talk to ICANN, we'll get to articulate that clearly and maybe that continues to put pressure on getting this all sorted. But again, it would be nice to have that conversation amongst all the membership.

So when we get back, we'll continue this conversation and we will go over these questions in detail, but again, we are forced to take our brake and you will love it and you will lose it, and then we'll come back in half an hour time if that's okay with everybody.

REG LEVY: Excellent. [Tell us about] DPAs, see if you think it's a smart idea or if I've been wasting my time for the past year and a half.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes. And Eric and James do you want to hold on to your questions or do you need to have them answered now? Eric, you can hold? Okay. James?

JAMES BLADEL: I'll hold. You bet.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Okay. You can leave your hands up in the queue so we don't forget you, and we'll start off with you when we get back. Thanks, everybody, and we will see you in 30 minutes on the dot. Thank you all.

Hello everyone. Thanks for coming back. I know it's just exactly on the hour, but I wanted to make sure that we have time to finish up the DPA conversation because I think it's important, but we are scheduled to have an update right now. So why don't we go ahead and finish the DPA for another 10 minutes, and we can go on from there? So, sorry, apologies for cutting you off, Reg. Thank you for that intro.

Just to recap where we left it, Reg gave us a great update with respect to where we are on the roles and responsibilities team. That group has been doing a lot of work that you're not aware of, at least most people aren't aware of unless you're participating in the group. They're having fun. I think we're at a point now where we need to understand where we need to have a DPA in place, because it's not just limited to registration data. As we found out, we see a need for one with respect to audits, and there are probably other areas as well.

We left the queue off with Eric and James. So why don't we start from there? Since I promised. And yes, I'll turn it to Eric now.

ERIC ROKOBAUER:

Thanks, Ashley, and thanks for the summary, and Reg for giving that update. I was going to add a brief comment just to go in tandem with the roles and responsibilities team. Just a reminder for everyone in the compliance subgroup, we're having discussions with Jamie Hedlund

---

and ICANN Compliance. We're pushing back as well as far as the RFI and the audit. If the membership list remembers, last time we met, there was a rationale statement that we had prepared, we shared for review. We have since shared that with ICANN Compliance and just wanted to update the group that they're acknowledging it and reviewing it. Again, that statement was also the same, providing a rationale why we believe we should have a DPA with [inaudible] or at least reword some of the questions that they want to propose in the audit, make it a little more clear and specific as to what they're asking, instead of these broad statements for full copies of abuse reports that could have PII, personal information in them.

So that was the update I wanted to share. We're waiting for them to come back, but that's in tandem with the lovely work that the roles and responsibilities team is doing. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Eric. I think the overarching issue is that it's hard for, I think, outside parties to relate with those who have the most to lose financially with fines. I think that's part of the issue we're facing. James, please.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thanks, Ashley, and thanks, Reg, for the update. Just a concern here—and maybe I'm stating the obvious, but a number of the EPDP recommendations, I think, are qualified by the existence of a DPA in place between ICANN and contracted parties or those hard fought,

---

hard negotiated tissue paper thin compromises as in EPDP are suddenly at risk if this thing doesn't actually come into existence.

So I'm a little concerned that after all of the hard work by you and everyone on the team and all this time, that we're still dancing around the question of whether we should have this at all. Just noting that there's so many down the line dependencies that are expecting there to be something coming out of this group between ICANN and contracted parties.

And to the point about managing all these extra agreements—and I can't speak for the other folks on the EPDP, but I just envision that this would exist as an addendum to the RAA and the registry agreement. And if I've got that completely wrong, then please set me straight there. But yeah, I'm just surprised that we're still at the state of, should this agreement exist? I think that ship has sailed, we've already built a whole Jenga tower on the concept that it will exist at some point. So hopefully, that gets ICANN motivated a little bit. Thanks.

REG LEVY:

Yeah. I agree, James, and that's something that I was responding to Michele's question in the chat on as well. I don't really understand why that's such a sticking point for them either, to be honest. It's something that has come up a number of times, that they don't want to enter into DPAs with every single contracted party. And we've said, yeah, but that's with what's going to have to happen. And it doesn't have to be a different one. The one that GoDaddy signs can be the

---

same one that Blacknight signs. There's no reason that they should be different.

And to the extent that—neither of those are good examples—there is a Brazilian registrar that does not have any contact with Europe and doesn't need to sign a DPA, fine, it can be voluntary from the standpoint of the contracted party itself to not enter into a DPA if that is a sticking point. But it's not ICANN that gets to make that decision, because there are enough registrars that are in the EU or that have business in the EU that it is a requirement from their standpoint that ICANN have that DPA.

The other is really just a matter of—and I feel like the EPDP suffered this to an extent as well. If we have data, then we must have that data for a legal reason. I have the e-mail address of a customer because I believe that that is a unique identifier and that that means that I'm entering into an agreement with a specific person. That's why we collect it. I only have the mailing address of a registrant because the ICANN contract requires that I have it.

So in the second case, ICANN would be the controller—although they disagree because they think I need that for the formation of a contract. And in the first case, they might also be a controller even though I am a controller. To the extent that I have it because I need to enter into an agreement, but I also have it because ICANN is telling me to have it.

So understanding that there are multiple purposes that may exist for a single point of data is a very difficult concept, it seems, to get across to

---

ICANN staff and ICANN legal, as well as their outside council. They did eventually get an outside, an EU lawyer, who's great, except that she doesn't understand the industry as well as perhaps ICANN does. Sorry, I've been told that we need to move on to the questions.

So I would love to hear if you guys think that I'm wasting my time. Do you think that ICANN is a controller, that the contracted party is a controller, that we are joint controllers—yes, I have many—okay, is ICANN the controller and registries and registrars are processors, are ICANN and the registry joint controllers and registrars are the processors, are ICANN and the registrars joint controllers and the registries are processors, or are we all together joint controllers?

My second question is, do you think we need a DPA? And my third question is, do you redact data currently when you are responding to ICANN requests because there is no DPA in place? And I tried to cover all of the responses there because I know for my part, I redact data regardless of whether there's a DPA in place because they don't actually need it. They have not demonstrated that they do.

James also brought up the fact that the EPDP assumes that there would be a DPA. And there were moments when the roles and responsibilities team ran into “This should be covered by the EPDP” and vice versa. So yes, it seems that we sort of were doing parallel work, but I do think that it was important that the small group of contracted parties and ICANN staff get together in a room specifically to talk about some of these things outside of the PDP process,

---

because it's going to be ... It's going to take some convincing and it's still taking some convincing.

I see the results. Survey says joint controllers. And I've got at least two votes for, no, we don't need a DPA, which is interesting. And most people redact regardless of the fact of the DPA, which is also a fun data point which I will use in the next roles and responsibilities team.

Okay. Thank you, everyone. I'm going to turn it back to Ashley. I've spoken my piece.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you very much, Reg, for cramming all of that into a very short amount of time. I have a few hands here, but just to note, we have invited guests on standby to brief us. I will turn it to you each to identify whether or not you need to ask this question now or can we hold it off until AOB. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON:

I think it's farcical that ICANN are being so slow and so ridiculous about this DPA thing. From an ISO perspective, this is ludicrous.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Michele. Kristian.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN:

Just noting that this is an open meeting and the poll can be answered by any participants, so doesn't necessarily reflect registrars.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Interesting. I'm curious to know how many folks have been participating who are not registrars. Anyway, good point to make. Thank you, Kristian. With that, feel free to continue asking questions in the chat. Reg is here and available, but we can also come back to this under AOB if necessary.

If we could go back to the agenda or to the next slide, please, because next on here, we have an update—well, we have some engagement here with GDS staff. Andee, is it just you today? Or not just you, but is there anyone in addition to your glorious self that we need to be aware of in terms of this part of the agenda?

ANDEE HILL:

Hi. Yeah, we have a few members. I'm going to speak about the registrar fee survey just quickly to make sure people understand why we do that every year. And then we had an outstanding question from this group on contractual compliance and why there's multiple e-mails, so I have an update for you all there. Supporting me in that is a few members of my IT team, Kyle and Juan. They may jump in if I speak out of turn.

Karen's going to speak to the Operational Design Phase, as we went over earlier. I sent her the questions that you guys had, so hopefully, she can help address those and any other ones that you have.



---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:                   Awesome. Thank you. Go for it.

ANDEE HILL:                            Okay. Next slide, please. So, as you probably all know because we've been emailing you nonstop, the annual registrar fee vote is currently ongoing. It's actually ending tomorrow. And I just wanted to make sure that this group—it seems like there's some confusion. We actually, every year, get a few votes of “no” and we try to follow up on why they voted no just to make sure people understand what is this process, why do we keep going through this every year.

So part of the RAA does, in 3.9.2, talk about the variable fee and it does require ICANN to put out a survey every year. What does a yes vote means? It means business as usual, we'll continue to bill you like we always do. A no vote means that we as ICANN have the right per the agreement with the registries that we could bill them rather than bill you.

And I think there's some confusion there because a lot of registrars seem to—especially the ones that vote no when we follow up, they think it has to do with what the amount of the fee. And just looking to this group, how can we socialize that better? We keep trying to really utilize the e-mails that we're sending out. We've changed them quite a bit just in the three years that I've been here to really give you what does this mean, either side. So kind of looking for some feedback from you. Is this an understood process? Is this something we need to socialize better?

---

I think we definitely could have done a better job this year just in contacting this group and explaining it before we send out the vote, but looking for feedback, really.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Andee. And happy to maybe in the future add this to our membership discussion before it goes out, or as it's going out, to make it more clear what the process is. But with that, let me turn to my membership to see if there are any comments or thoughts. Not seeing any hands.

I think what it'll probably require is us having a conversation before the e-mail goes out. And happy to do that.

ANDEE HILL:

Okay. I'll mark it for next year to come to this group. And maybe that's an area on your new website that we could kind of talk about what it is, what it means and why we keep doing this. I see that it's an antiquated process. I agree, Jeff. It's kind of a waste of everybody's time, but we really don't have a choice. It's in the contract so we have to continue to do it. Okay. Next slide, please.

So we got some feedback on the new naming services portal. Contractual Compliance, [that is in there now.] Originally, it was set up so that all of the communication with your tickets would be done within the portal. This group specifically gave us feedback that that is just not going to work for you, you really need to be able to work via e-mail.

---

We made some pivots at the end of release and actually added the ability to work it via e-mail. We kind of pushed out the release of it a week or two—I forget how long—but what it resulted in is having two separate e-mails. and the first one, I think, is a little bit confusing. So the first one was an auto generated e-mail to let you know that there's a case there. This is the e-mail that would prompt you to log on to the portal, because if you're working your tickets within the portal, you would have no trigger otherwise. So it's really just letting you know there's a new case.

The second e-mail was added because we were thinking that these cases were going to be done via post, meaning that you would log onto the portal, you would post your reasons back and forth with ICANN Compliance, and that you wouldn't necessarily need additional information via e-mail. But we heard you, we understood that this needed to be changed, so we added that second e-mail. And it was really just the information of even though the first e-mail had all the fimbriation about the complaint, the second e-mail was, what do we need from you? What does ICANN need from you, registrar, or registry, to demonstrate your evidence of compliance?

So I think there's a lot of confusion going on there. We've really looked at it and we think we can definitely kind of kill that first e-mail so that you're only receiving one notification with all of the information that you need. But we want to make sure that, first of all, all registrars understand and they're comfortable with that, so [I need to] do some polling. I know Zoe shared the polls that you guys are going to be answering. Love the polling thing via Zoom. It's great.

---

So we need to definitely socialize within this group, and then also of course, the registries are affected here too, to make sure that the registries are also comfortable if we kill that first e-mail.

So, looking for feedback. I don't know if anybody has any immediate feedback.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Well, first off, Andee, I wanted to say thank you for being so responsive to our concerns. I know this has been—not to mince words, kind of painful for folks to get used to, and we've been very vocal in letting you know where we have concerns. So I appreciate it.

I'm going to see if anyone has any other thoughts on this. Does anyone want to speak to the idea of killing the first auto e-mail? I believe that's pretty much what we asked for the last time we met. So yay for being responsive. And it sounds like you need to first get an okay from the registry side before such a change could be made.

Okay, Catherine, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

CATHERINE MERDINGER:

Hi there. I might just be missing some of the e-mails, but I have found that if I go make a comment on a compliance case and Compliance comes back to me asking, "Now tell us this other thing," I only get the first e-mail and I don't get the second e-mail. Is that because the first time I replied in NSp? Am I just missing the e-mail?

---

ANDEE HILL: That’s a good question. Do I have Kyle or Juan online who could speak to that? Because unfortunately, my Compliance NSp expert is unavailable today so she wasn’t able to join us, Leticia. Not seeing Juan. And I'm not seeing Kyle. I will come back to you, Catherine. I don't have an answer there. Sorry.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Yeah. Following up later is fine. Thank you.

ANDEE HILL: No problem.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: What might be helpful, while we’re on this subject—and correct me if I'm wrong, Zoe, but I believe our polling questions are very specific to the NSp, so it might be worthwhile going through those now so you guys could see it and be able to respond to it. So if we could pull up questions 13, 14 and 15, please.

There we go. Okay, one, have you had a chance to utilize the NSp yet? Two, are you satisfied with the NSp? Three, do you respond to ICANN Compliance tickets in NSp, or continue to respond directly through e-mail? Please answer. For what it’s worth, I'm not answering because I don’t deal with the NSp.

So, I'll wait a few more seconds. And I think the reason why we asked if folks use it yet is in part because I know there seems to be kind of this rolling access to it. Some people received it, were getting e-mails

---

much sooner than others, I guess because it depends on when [you need] things come in through the process. So I admit that the polling is going to be weird on this one. And we're learning, so perhaps we'll fix the responses to better reflect the questions and people's experience there. So just bear with us this time. So, do we have the results for the poll, please?

A lot of people have been using it. So just over 50% of folks have used it. We are a positive bunch after all. Almost 80% of folks are satisfied. And with respect to whether or not we're using the NSp or e-mail, it looks like e-mail still wins the day, but maybe that's perhaps a factor of people still getting used to it. But I'd be curious to hear if other people have any response to that particular last one.

So, I don't know if that was helpful for you, Andee, if you had any questions as a result of that.

ANDEE HILL:

Yes, it's very helpful. Probably prompts a few more questions. And then in addition, it's not close on the roadmap, but you guys all realize that you will eventually be working your cases, so if you have an assignment or anything like that through NSp, just as the registries do, I really think that the beta test group is very helpful for us. It was helpful to hear your feedback. I think we should have done that much sooner, quite honestly. And when we do make new, large changes, you're going to hear from me and I'll be looking for groups to give us feedback and the things that we need to do a better job of

---

understanding how you work and how you use the tools that we're providing you so that they can be useful.

So thank you, everyone. Huge thank you for the people that participated in the beta test group. It was super helpful. Thank you. Please continue to be vocal. We need to hear how you use this product and we want it to be a value to you. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Andee.

ANDEE HILL: And I think I'm going to hand this over to Karen or Lars. [You guys had an earlier discussion.] So, thank you very much.

KAREN LENTZ: Sure. Thank you, Andee, and thank you, everybody for the invitation to join you for this. I think since you've discussed it earlier, you probably have seen the paper, but there is a concept paper out for discussion concerning potential Operational Design Phase which would take place between the approval of policy recommendations from the GNSO process and the board taking action on those recommendations. So it's focused on developing operational and design information having to do with costs, risks, resources, infrastructure and those types of decisions, and then also includes a feedback mechanism so that the information is shared and available before the board takes action.

---

As you see on the slide, it's not intended to replace any of the existing processes. I did note from your earlier discussion a couple of questions were passed on, so I'll respond to those. Let me put a link in the chat. That's the paper.

But before you do that, let me ask Lars Hoffmann, who worked quite a bit on this paper, if you had anything to add to what's on the slide.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thanks, Karen. No, I think the slide covered it. I listened to the discussion earlier, so I'm sure there's some questions coming up. Nothing else to add at the moment. Thanks.

KAREN LENTZ:

Thank you. So one of the questions that you all posed was, how does the proposed Operational Design Phase interact with existing GNSO processes, for example like the consensus policy implementation framework, which is a really good question.

The Operational Design Phase is meant to be a bridge between the completion of the PDP and the board approving those policy recommendations. And so currently, within the consensus policy implementation framework, which we call CPIF, there are a couple of lines that talk about one of the things that happens during that time period, is that staff is preparing information to inform the board's decision.



---

So this proposal is really to formalize that set of steps, and also add transparency to the work that's happening and what's the information that's being provided to the board. So this is a proposal that's being discussed. Potentially, if it's agreed that this is a phase we're going to have, we would update the CPIF to incorporate what's been agreed there.

But as far as how it interacts with any of the other phases, it doesn't change the PDP. It doesn't change the implementation process. so when policy recommendations are approved by the board, doesn't change how [org] works with an Implementation Review Team to implement what's been decided.

Another question I saw was what's the impact on the GNSO and the GNSO council's role. So the proposal's not intended to change anything there with regards to those roles. The bylaws describe the role of the GNSO in policymaking and the council as the manager of that policy process for the gTLD space.

It's clear in the paper that nothing in the Operational Design Phase can supplant or overtake the policy recommendations themselves. To the extent that the Operational Design Phase indicates that new policy issues arise or issues that belong to the GNSO, that those would be funneled back into the GNSO process. So [inaudible] the phase is not a phase for making policy decisions, so nothing is intended to change there.

Another question was on the composition on the design feedback group. This is also a good question. So we know that there needs to be

---

this kind analysis done, we know there needs to be some kind of feedback mechanism from the community. As far as the composition of the group, it's not specified to that level of detail in the paper, but this is an area that would be really helpful to have some feedback on. For example, the representation, does it cover all SOs and ACs? What are the considerations of size and the role? If somebody is on the group, are they representing—take the role of going back and making sure they're getting feedback from their respective groups? Clarification on that.

Also noting that with regards to the SOs and ACs, the GNSO has a unique role in terms of the gTLD policy and implement processes, and does that get reflected in the composition or how ... Those are all questions that would be helpful to have feedback on.

So we know that there needs to be a feedback mechanism, and any input or principles that you have as to how that should work from the community standpoint would be really helpful.

And then finally, there's a question about the timeline for feedback on the paper. I think Göran indicated when he sent out this paper that following this meeting, we would have a more fulsome community consultation on it, so it would be posted for feedback, potentially also updated based on what we've heard in this meeting.

So I don't believe there are particular dates scheduled for that, but I know we'll be looking to provide any updates or clarifications that we need to the paper as soon as possible after this meeting so that we can start the consultation, and that will be communicated as well.

---

I think that's the questions that I noted, and I'll turn it back over to Ashley for any other questions.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you very much. This was helpful, as we did discuss this this morning, whatever time it was. So this answered a lot of our questions, so we appreciate it. Unfortunately, we're really short on time at this point. Thankfully, we don't have anybody raising their hands, because we need to get going. So, thank you for that.

Do we have anything left on your agenda, Andee? Good? Okay. Well, good, because we need to keep moving. Thank you very much, guys. Always helpful information. Love working with you. You're very responsive. Don't take our grumpiness wrong. We just want to get the job done. So, thank you.

ANDEE HILL:

Thanks. Have a good rest of your week, if we don't talk again. So let's move to really a lot of the meat here that we're talking about today, and that has to do with resource planning. I think we touched on a lot of these issues, but what I would like to do now—and I'm going to be turning it over to a number of folks, starting with Owen, but let's talk about all the work that we see before us and start thinking about what we need to do in terms of resourcing, time allotment, participation, because we have a lot to cover moving forward.

So with that, I believe, Owen, you're going to be covering the upcoming PDPs. Is that correct?

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Yes. That's correct. Thanks, Ashley. So, upcoming things we have here, for the EPDP phase 2A, that's going to be looking towards legal versus natural, as well as the feasibility of unique contracts. That is intended to—we're going to continue with, as far as I understand now, we're going to have the previous EPDP team—joking—get the band back together, but somebody said we really never broke apart. We kind of went on a hiatus.

So there's going to be some delays. There's going to be a new chair. We're going to have to report back in three months about progress and expected consensus recommendation. So you'll get the continued updates for us you've been seeing, and there's really no need for work there.

Another thing coming out of there is the accuracy scoping team. That's one where we actually probably do need to get some resources internally from the team. GNSO council is going to launch a scoping team, so we have to start thinking about what members have relevant knowledge and expertise and want to join it, and then start compiling information, suggestions for that. So I'm suspecting that accuracy in the registration data is something we probably have some passionate thoughts about here, so just keep that in mind moving forward, we'll need to have some stuff there.

As for thick WHOIS, that's still under consideration with the council small team, and there are some conflicts and differences between some of the constituencies within the GNSO council, so that's going to

---

have a vote eventually, but just keep that in mind because it'll be something forthcoming.

Let's see. Recommendation 27, that's from EPDP phase one, and there was a number of policies that were identified in there that may need some tweaks in there, such as the UDRP, WHOIS data reminder policy, transfer policy and others. So those are currently ongoing within the IRT, the Implementation Review Team where we're going over and giving some feedback to that, what the impact it will have later down the road, if there are any changes to those various consensus policies that the registrars will have to take action in order to change their processes and things like that, although we'll probably get at least, I would expect, about six months lead time for those changes before they're required on us. So we'll keep you guys ...

RPM phase two is coming forward. That'll be quite a beast because that'll be reviewing the UDRP, which has not really happened that much since its establishment. This'll also be one that'll impact registrars too for our processes. Not sure where that's going to go out of that, but certainly one that will involve some effort in the policy as well as implementation.

Next is the transfer policy which Roger touched on earlier, so I won't go into the detail, but obviously, as transfers are one of the essential functions of the registrar and our business models, we'll certainly need to have some active participation and feedback from the Registrar Stakeholder Group as well as there will be operational impacts once there's an eventual policy, but that's probably not going

---

to be my best guess, maybe a year or two down the road depending upon how fast we can get that stuff through and work on that. So there'll certainly be some structural changes for registrars there too.

And then for the other ones, the RPM phase one, as well as the SubPro IRTs, those will be upcoming as well. We don't have those final recommendations yet, but there could be some tweaks. The RPMs might touch on the URS and SubPro. We'll see what comes out of that.

So just kind of keep that in mind, that there's going to be a whole bunch of stuff. It's been quiet for a little bit in terms of implementation from ICANN, but we're going to be seeing a lot more policy work as well as policy changes coming up in the next couple years. That's it for me.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

That's a lot. So, as just explained by Owen, we have a lot of PDPs on the horizon as well as IRTs. We're going to need a lot of folks who are able to participate on this. I think this also raises a question of the EPDP phase 2A. Is that an opportunity, do we need to refresh the group? We can't just assume that people are going to continue on. So we need to start thinking about bodies that we have to put at these things who have the time and commitment level, because we can't rely on the same handful of people all the time.

Are there better knives? Come on, you haven't even seen the first knives yet. So, I have a question. I think we're going to hold off on the polling question until the end. But let's go ahead and see if anybody

---

has any questions now for Owen with regards to these varied activities that are going to be coming up that will require our time, energy and thought. Everybody's getting sleepy. Three hours two long?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: They're all just stunned.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: We're stunned. Yeah, perhaps.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE Maybe nobody knew there was going to be a quiz.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Want to make sure people are paying attention. Okay, I don't see any hands, so we can go ahead and turn to Tech Ops. Take it away, Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Thank you. And recognizing people's fatigue, I'll just go very quickly. The basis of wanting to have a moment to speak was really to help people—we're dealing with all this every day, but once these come in, I think we heard from Roger, we heard this also from Owen, that there's stuff coming in and there's going to be quite a lot of it coming in, and we need to make sure that our counterparts, our peers, the folks we work with inside of our companies, are ready for that. So there's some project planning, operational impacts, other things to be

---

communicating to your scrum and agile teams or other project planning so that you've got your roadmaps ready for all the stuff that's going to be coming down the pipe.

This just means making sure your teams understand what's going on. You've got the timelines and impacts and everything planned for appropriately. And there is quite a lot coming towards us, and that's going to affect maybe some of the commercial activities or projects that those folks are planning.

So that's my captain obvious statement. I've got a couple questions that I included that will hit at the end here. And I'll call that done for Tech Ops in respect to people's time, unless there are questions. I think it's some very obvious stuff I'm stating.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Jothan. I think the message of this particular agenda item is we've got a lot of stuff to do and we just need to be prepared to do it. So I don't see any hands raised, but again, I stink at this so flag me down if I'm missing it.

So, engagement. Was I on the hook for that one, Zoe?

ZOE BONYTHON:

Yeah, you are.



---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Okay, because I haven't spoken enough. So yeah, and there's also the standard engagement that we need to continue to think about, whether it's in line with what we talked about earlier in terms of doing some more informational awareness, capacity building, those sorts of things. I think that's really going to benefit us in the long term, and I think it's worthy of us carving out time and making that work. But it will require folks to get engaged. And I really like the idea that folks are on board with gathering more statistics and use it for our messaging. I think that's great.

But of course, we've got internal engagement, external engagement, whether it's with ICANN staff, ICANN board, other constituencies. Webinars seem to be, obviously the way to conduct things at the moment, so we'll continue to be working on those.

I think there's quite a bit of fatigue on DNS abuse, and WHOIS registration data, whatever you want to call it these days. So I think in terms of moving forward, I think we need, certainly from our perspective—unless there's some action forcing event—maybe a little bit less focus there, because unless something has changed or is new, I think everything that needs to be said has been said at this point. We'll see how the webinars go next week on that subject, but it's not something that we actively supported, but we are engaged in.

So I won't continue to drone on. I think we all know what engagement means and that we need to make time to do it. So just a friendly reminder.

---

So, anybody have any questions before we go to the poll? Which seems to be a good way to spur conversation. I don't see any hands. So, that being said, could we please go to the questions for consideration on Q16 through 20, please?

Questions are, have you started planning internally for registration data policy implementation? Yes or no. Number two, how much time does your technical engineering ops team typically need to properly develop and deploy projects? Zero to three months, four to six months, seven to nine months, ten or more months.

Do you actively participate in PDP, IRT and working groups? Yes or no. I certainly know who actively participates. Number four, on average, how much time per week do you—or could you—spend on a PDP IRT or working group-related work? None, one to two hours, two to four hours, five to ten hours, or as we have seen with the EPDP, ten plus hours? That's a tough question because I don't think anybody's going to fess up to being able to spend ten plus hours.

Number five, what should be RrSG's priority? And this is kind of a crappy question to ask in a poll, at least in this construct, because I think what we're trying to capture here is, what do we as the Registrar Stakeholder Group need to focus our time and attention on? It'd be great if we could rate these somehow. We're stuck with kind of just picking one, but I think also, what are your interests as well? They're not always the same. Like you might be personally interested and willing to participate, say, on some made up issue, but you realize that the real pressing issue is something else.

---

So feel free to answer this the way you want. I think the intention here is that we just really want to kind of get an idea of where people's interests lie, while at the same time, where we think we're going to have the most difficulty. So those are kind of contradicting things to try and assess here, but just fill it out as you can. We'll figure out a way to make these questions better.

So the options here are accuracy scoping team, EPDP phase 2A, recommendation 27 impacted policies, RPM phase 2, and that's it. So those are your questions. Please fill them out. And once you're done, hit "submit."

Do you have to answer every single questions to get to "submit," or am I just having problems?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Yes, you do.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

All right. It doesn't like me. Anyway, carry on. Okay, everybody should have had a chance to fill this out. Let's see what kind of response we get on this poll.

Have you started planning internally for registration data policy implementation? 61% said no.

How much time does your technical engineering and ops team typically need to properly develop and deploy projects? Looking like somewhere between four to six and seven to nine.

---

Do you actively participate? 70% say you participate in PDP, IRTs.

Good for you.

How much time per week could you spend? Five to ten hours. You guys are pretty cool. That's pretty good.

What should be the RrSG's—transfer. I knew it. I guessed it was going to be transfer policy. Okay. So it looks like transfer policy is going to take a bit of our time next year, at least in terms of what we want to focus on. My guess is that everything else is definitely going to take up a lot of time as well, whether or not we like it.

So, the purpose of that exercise was kind of just to let it sink in a little bit what we're talking about, so at least we're prepared in terms of time commitments, what you're available to do. Clearly, we weren't going to get anything terribly concrete, but just to get you guys thinking about it.

Do we have any questions about—have we missed anything? Are there other issues that we need to be considering, either for next year, longer term? We try to take more of a strategic eye on this, but recognize that we don't have the time to get too specific.

You guys are tired, aren't you? Come on. We've got to have one comment. All right.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: I've got something.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Oh, Catherine. Come on, bring it.

CATHERINE MERDINGER: Jeff mentioned this in chat, the RA/RAA amendment group is back up and running now. That'll be going on as well.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes, it is. And we didn't talk about that today, and my apologies. We did talk about it this morning with the CPH ExCom in terms of what we're going to do there. We have a few minutes if people want to discuss that, but it sounds like, just to bring you all up to speed on that particular issue, it got delayed. We thought it would be much longer.

JEFF NEUMAN: Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes, sir.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry, but there's people on this call that are not part of the stakeholder group, so can we save that discussion for maybe an update on the list?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sure we can. But just to note that it's back up and running, and we'll see how things play out.

---

JEFF NEUMAN:                   Okay.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:           So with that, any other comments? You don't have to leave, Russ, this is a meeting open to observers. So I think unless anybody has any other comments, we're going to be done with what I thought was going to be the main driver of conversation. So perhaps I've learned another valuable lesson today, which is put the meaty stuff up front.

All right. Zoe, let's go back. We're on AOB now? Something tells me we're not going to have much, but I see Jeff's hand up.

JEFF NEUMAN:                   Yeah, so although it's related to the RAA negotiation, one of the items—and Russ is on here, so it's good—that we were talking about potentially is ICANN is doing some research on potentially running the RDAP lookups through their current system. So you can go to [lookup.icann.org](http://lookup.icann.org) in order to run an RDAP query or see a user interface to RDAP queries.

So one of the things that Russ has asked us to convey is that they may reach out to certain registrars to get data. They're trying to scope out the project, and to do that, they want to talk to some of the larger registrars to just get an idea of the amount of queries that they can expect. So I think that it's important—so if ICANN does reach out to you—they won't for a few weeks, I'm sure, but if they do, it is

---

legitimate, they are trying to scope the project out, and if you are comfortable in discussing that kind of data to them, I think it would be a benefit to all of us. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Jeff. Is there anything else anybody would like to raise to talk about, that we've missed? We covered everything to your satisfaction. Pam just asked for the GNSO review. Yes.

So apparently, we got a letter today from Chairman Botterman basically informing us that the GNSO review is slated for next year. I admit that the details are not at the top of my head at the moment because I am a bit drained. Thank you, Pam. Please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

No problem. I'm nearly asleep because it's almost 2:00 AM, but I'll be very brief. I think the board really is asking whether this review that is due next year should be postponed and also, there is a recommendation from ATRT3 that all these organizational reviews and some specific reviews should be paused because there are simply too many reviews, and some of the recommendations from those reviews have not even been implemented.

So I guess we just have to think as a group whether that is a good idea, and I tend to think so because simply, everyone is burned out and tired. But we can discuss that on the list. And I believe there'll be further dialog between GNSO SGs, Cs, and the board's committee that's in charge of all the reviews. That's it. Thanks.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Pam. Thanks for remembering that. I meant to flag it and I didn't. So, appreciate it. We are out of time and I have one more thing to say. James, you have one minute.

JAMES BLADEL: I'll just agree with Pam, the reviews are starting to stack up like delayed flights, so I agree we should do that. It would be nice if we could do what ALAC does and just pass on the review entirely. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, James. And we'll have time to discuss this further at our next membership meeting, so we still have some time. But yeah, so much stuff to do. And perhaps that's something we can do, Graeme, is do a stock take of the reviews. Perhaps a stock take of everything, really, timelines, at least anticipated, so we can have a clear understanding of what's going on.

So with that—and I'm sorry to rush things at the end, but I did want to take a moment to recognize some changes that we're having. First and foremost, Michele is stepping down. He is, I guess, termed out of the council, and he will be sorely missed, if not just for entertainment purposes.

And I hope this doesn't mean what you have been saying, which is that you're going to be stepping back from ICANN-related work, because we need you here, we need you to be an active participant in the



---

Registrar Stakeholder Group. So if you could please bless us with your presence. And we hope that you will continue to be amongst us for a while.

That being said, I also want to welcome Kristian on to council. I'm sure Michele can tell you how wonderful and fulfilling it is and how it'll make you smile every day when you wake up. So something to look forward to.

And then also, last but not least, want to welcome Tobias onto the NomCom. Graeme has given us a bit of insight in the last couple of weeks as you had to step in as Caroline had to step out due to new job opportunities, and I hear it's wonderful. I hear it's also an incredibly lovely task and he's going to have fun. You won't be thrown in the deep end as much as Graeme, but good stuff. And I'm really happy that we have this great, wonderful team. I'm looking forward to working with all of you.

That being said, I expect to see Michele continue to participate in these meetings. If not, we know where you live. If they let me fly anywhere, I will find you and hunt you down and drag you back.

So, with that, we have a couple minutes to spare. If anybody has any parting words, you've got two minutes. I'm not aggressive. Come on. So you can take this time, if you wish. Otherwise, that is a wonderful place to let your thoughts be known.

I think this meeting went very well. I thank you all for participating. I like these polls. I hope we continue to use them and improve upon

---

them, and let's just see how it goes. Anyway, with that, I can give you back two minutes of your lives. I don't see any hands.

Cool. That is our membership meeting. Thank you. Appreciate it. I'll see you next time. We've got a lot more meetings. Talk to you later.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**