
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: CPH Membership Work Session
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

TERRI AGNEW

The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Hello and welcome to the Contracted Party House Membership Work Session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during the session and as time permits and when directed by the chairs of the session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Bowen. Please begin.

BETH BACON

Terri's tired of just going someone. Hello, friends. This is Beth Bacon, the Registry Stakeholder Group Chair. We're going to get going. I have a random question perhaps for our friends online. I know that we have a larger than normal online contingent. Is our

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.

regular video fine or do you prefer for folks to put their cameras open and you feel more connected and you can see exactly who's talking? It's a weird question, but someone said they liked it the other day, so I'm just asking. If you'd like us to turn on our cameras, please let us know.

Sam, you had your hand up. Was that a boo-boo? It feels like a boo-boo. Jeff, you like cameras? All right. I'll turn on my camera. Just for you, Jeff. You get to look right up my nose. Great. All right. Owen, you have anything to say? You good?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

No, I'm all good.

BETH BACON

I think it might be we have the ICANN Board stuff, so do we want to start with that and then we can -- with what time we have left? I don't think it should be too much. Okay. So, we could put up our notes document. That would be stupendous. Oh, that's too much.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

There's way too much of us.

BETH BACON

That's too much. All right. We'll just wait one second. Okay. So, no, the Board notes document, the CPH one? No, the one that's -- yeah, there we go. Oh, it's all the way down. Okay. Okay. So, you guys should all have this. Yeah, I'll drop it in the Zoom. This is the

shared one for registries. It's linked in our agenda document that we sent around, but it's also I just dropped it in the chat. It's a little bit easier to see what you're doing. I hate this.

Okay, there we are. Awesome, all right. If you don't have this, again, the link is in the chat. We've been working on this for a couple of weeks since we got our questions from the Board. We went through it during our starting our very first session of the very first day of the very first day of the week and have started some general responses for question one and two.

Thematically, we are focusing on kind of weaving through efficiency as well as Review of Reviews concepts. I'm going to get that eventually. Specifically, for -- and, again, these are proposed responses and conversations will flow as they flow, but these are kind of the guiding principles for the first two questions since those are generally joint CPH responses and the rest of our topics are broken into registry and registrar.

The first we have, again, approached thematically of ensuring efficiency, implementing effective reviews, and ensuring ICANN is able to show progress in policymaking. We do have one registry suggestion from our discussions earlier in the week, yesterday perhaps, just noting that considering we have review-over-review outcomes that are going to look at examining ICANN itself, and this also bumps into the themes of the second question, they are asking what are the external pressures.

Would it be reasonable for ICANN to, say, do an independent assessment of external factors instead of relying upon just us to flag issues as the community? So, is that something that they could take on as an organization? So, that's a suggestion from the registries. Open for comment or discussion? Nailed it? Okay, thank you. All right, great. Registrars, do you have anything to add to that? Did we capture everything from our previous discussion?

For the second question, it's very specific to the self-assessment that's outlined in the CIP or the Continuous Improvement Program. I think that the discussion has centered around the fact that CIP is really a pilot at this point, and so the self-assessment may happen, but we don't yet understand what the weight and outcomes of those recommendations or self-assessments will be because, again, it's a pilot.

So it's hard to respond to this when, say, oh, we think the self-assessment's great, unless, of course, someone's telling us to aggressively change our structure and break us into 32 very distinct parts all named after colors. Who knows? So, I think that's a challenge, and we were just going to note that with the Review of Review work still pending, that maybe this is something that we can come back to at another time. It's maybe just not the right cadence for this question. Does anyone have questions, comments on that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Not that it's classified. Just had a thought, which is always very dangerous at this time of the morning. On this? Yes, sorry.

BETH BACON

Interrupt you for one second. So, the folks online can't hear at all. Is this better if I am, like, getting very personal with the mic? Can folks online hear better now? Go for it, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

There you go. We're a bit louder now. Cool. It just struck me that in respect to the CIP stuff, what might be useful feedback, and it will certainly be helpful from the Reviewer of Reviews perspective if the RySG is minded to do so, what would be helpful feedback, I think, is the CIP program is a pilot. The idea is it runs for a cycle or a couple of cycles, and then you see how it goes.

So, I've been thinking over the last few days that actually having a review bucket that actually reviews the output of the CIP is probably not sensible, and what we probably should be recommending is that there is a review of the CIP itself once, and then that review decides how the ongoing assessment of CIP work or review of CIP work should happen.

Now, I haven't populated. What's the right word? Told people about that. But if you thought that was worthwhile mentioning, I'm happy to mention it, and if it's something that the registries think is sensible, we could perhaps bring it up in that meeting. Thanks.

BETH BACON

How'd that go? Okay, Swiss watch. So, folks, can you, folks online, is this better? Can you hear us now? Anybody? Yes? Okay, all right. Thanks, Sam. Great. Perfect. Wonderful. I'm glad you guys can hear.

Were you able to hear Chris's comment? So, we can move along. Anyone have any comments or questions? I just dropped that note in the chat. I think it's easy to casually kind of mention. Right now, for these questions, generally, so I have registrars, Owen, and usually the joint questions are responded to by, we kick it off with chairs. I put Chris on there because he is all-knowing on reviews and we'd like his voice if there's more discussion.

So, if there's anybody from the registrars to indicate, again, we found a little extra room on the dais because there's not a lot of registries right now. You guys okay with just you? Owen says he can't wait. Yeah, just to make sure that the right folks are up there. If you guys are good with Owen, I think, because usually we'll kick off with the first and second ones. Okay.

All right, well then, Owen, that seems like a you problem. Okay, well, so I see Prudence right there and they're saying your name. Do you want me to? I just want to put this on here so folks know what to expect and no one has any surprises. Do you want to chit-chat about reviews and things? No, no, no, no, in front of the Board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN I have several questions for you, Prudence, right now that I want you to answer.

BETH BACON I mean, I could just talk to Prudence all day.

PRUDENCE MALINKI Funny enough, Chris, we did prepare some input, but literally it's being finalized right now, but yeah, I'm happy to speak to the Board.

OWEN SMIGELSKI Thank you, because I'm just looking at the input now, so Zoe's telling me about it. I'm like, oh, I didn't know that, so apologies for missing your message at 1:40 in the morning, which is, you're a machine.

PRUDENCE MALINKI What is sleep? What is time?

BETH BACON All right. Prudence proving that she is the best of us at all times. So, I'm just going to go ahead and accept all this stuff. Again, you guys should have the document. I just want everyone to, no surprises. So, then for the topic, we do have the question to the Board, and that's just in there for information. Hopefully this

makes it more of a discussion. You can see it's right there. You guys can read.

Then into the community processes and topics. These go around, because we do have the CPH time, but we do like to occasionally remind them that we are different groups. So, these are broken out specifically by registry and registrar. So, the registrars have done talking points or points for their issues, and registries have not hazarded to comment on those or add or change, and I don't think the registrars have done the same for the registries, but there's a couple where obviously we're going to overlap, so I think we can walk through really quick and make sure we have assignments.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

You need to speak directly into the microphone, apparently.

BETH BACON

Into your soul?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's the way to do it.

BETH BACON

Okay. This feels aggressive. Okay. So, for Review Of Reviews, this is very loud, we have Chris again, and I've been carrying on those themes, some of the updates for Review Of Reviews, we don't have any talking points in there right now, but essentially our support as registries, our involvement, we have several folks who are

participating actively, and then obviously we've got our GNSO folks who participate both at update registries and registrars, so we have a really nice robust process.

I didn't know if registrars, I think this is one of those topics where we both have comments, so I don't know if it looks at prudence, if we have any, do you want me to put you on there for that? Do you have any thoughts or feelings from the registrars?

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Largely we're supportive, we just wanted to seek some further clarification on certain elements, but largely we're supportive.

BETH BACON

Would you like to share what elements, upon which you would like clarified?

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Where there were two options, we just wanted a little bit of clarification with regards to what this substantive -- right into the mic, okay, thank you. We just wanted a bit of clarification with regards to the implications of both options, so we could make a kind of clear decision as to which option we should go for with regards to one of the buckets.

BETH BACON So, I think, I wonder if that's a question for the Board or for the guy right here.

PRUDENCE MALINKI It's more for you as opposed to the Board.

BETH BACON Great. Chris, can I put you on the spot?

CHRIS DISSPAIN I'm happy to deal with it now, we can always talk about it, I don't know elsewhere, but the option runs in the structural review and option one is that, so structural review in either option, structural review is a review of ICANN's structure and that's why I'm suggesting that we encourage ICANN both from a strategic planning point of view and also for getting ready for a structural review point of view to do an external landscape assessment because that would enable the structural review to have independent input into things like should, and I'm obviously making this up, should Web3 domains, should blockchain domains become part of ICANN, should hosting companies become part of ICANN, not suggesting they should, but we need to do an assessment because if you're doing a structural review, you're looking at the whole structure. That's not the problem.

The option arises in respect to the structural review, reviewing the SOs and ACs. The SO and the option one is that it reviews the

structures, the internal structures, the SOs and ACs only in the event that an SO or AC asks them to do so.

Option two is that the structural review must review the structures and that option is being put forward, is being supported very strongly by some aspects of the non-contracted parties house who want the structural review to be the fix for the structure of the GNSO.

I have said in every meeting I've been at so far with folks on that side of the fence, we cannot create a review process just to fix a GNSO's problem and if the rest of the community says under no circumstances are you going to review our structure unless we ask you to, which is what I suspect, I know that RSSAC says that because they've said it, I suspect the ccNSO will say it, I know for sure the GAC is going to say it. So, therefore we need to find another way of fixing the GNSO structural problem, but we put the two options on the table because part of the CCG is in favor of having what is referred to as a mandatory requirement to actually review the structures. Does that make sense? Cool.

BETH BACON

Yes, thank you.

VOLKER GREIMANN

A short question though, what is the GNSO structure plan?

BETH BACON

Can we make sure there are lots of remote people, can you make sure to just use your hand and notify yourself, Michael was in front of you in the queue and then Volker. I know we have a lot of extra, we have more than usual online, so I just want to make sure that we're being fair. Thanks. Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Yeah, Michael for the record. So, Chris, I actually believe that having this, if you will, review is not necessarily a bad thing and one of the things I've been doing is in Florida, which is where the registry constituency is legally incorporated, there actually was some changes to Florida law that I think potentially impact the RySG. I'm still researching this.

I will be discussing it with Craig and Heather before sharing it with the full list, but I do think there is a benefit to having that review, even though that may align or support with what some of the other stakeholder groups within the GNSO are supporting, but I do think that is not as unreasonable as it sounds, particularly given that the ICANN Board has signed off or approved the individual constituency charter.

So, I just wanted to raise that as an issue. Again, I'll work with Craig and Heather on putting out something more formally, but there we go. Thank you.

BETH BACON

Okay. Thanks, man.

VOLKER GREIMANN

Finally. Thank you. I may be a little bit slow, but what is the GNSO structure problem and what are they trying to fix? One could argue it is working as intended.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

You can argue that if you'd like to and you don't need to argue it with me. You can argue it with them. The issue is that there are two issues. There's the issue within the CSG. The ISPs are very uncomfortable being lumped together with the IPC and the business constituency. I think everybody knows this. I don't think I'm telling you stuff you don't know. They don't like that and they want a different way of structure. And then there's the overarching issue on the non-contracted parties house where the NCSG side is always concerned about parity of seats and parity of votes and they don't like the fact that there's only one Board member and all of that stuff.

So, all of that stuff is encapsulated in the sort of expression of we think our structure needs work and we can't fix it internally because we can't get the GNSO as a group to agree to fix it internally and so therefore we need a structural review. In essence, that's the answer to your question. Thanks.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Chris. Michael and Volker, your hands are still up. Do you have follow-ups? Michael, your hand is up. Do you have another

question? No? Okay, it's me. All right. So, I appreciate the comments. I don't know that that means we need to, I think it's good for us to discuss this. I don't know that it means we are changing anything with regards to how we're engaging with the Board other than saying we're supportive, looking forward to a flexible review structure. Words, words, words. Great.

Everyone understands the technical term. Words, words, words. And I think, and just as an aside, this is not a TPH, but registries, Michael, if you have comments on the, I think you mentioned the NTAG charter, it is wide open for comments. We have some comments from Heather in there. The document's still open and we are refining it. So, please go in and do stuff. Make comments. Okay, so the next is a registrar.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thank you, Beth. This is Owen. Hopefully everybody online can hear me. So, just going to be following up with ICANN to see the Board, see if they have any updates from when we talked to them in Dublin about underrepresented regions and also give them an update about how, what the registrars have done.

We have an outreach program, which I think is Thursday, which is about how to become an ICANN accredited, or becoming an ICANN accredited registrar and trying to get more involved. And also, we'll be announcing, or we announced this week, that we have approved

a membership discount program for registrars in underserved regions.

We're going to be reducing the fee by 75%, or sorry, 75% discount to those in those regions to encourage more participation. And we'll be working with ICANN staff as well as reaching out to registrars to see about getting more involved. I think there was like, what, 80 registrars that could, or how many?

Okay, about, yeah, there's, you know, we'll look at the number, you know, 60 or so registrars, existing ICANN accredited registrars that would qualify. So, hopefully we can get them out there and get more involved. And it has to do with a combination of where they're located, number of domains under management, and things like that.

So, hopefully that can get more, encourage more participation in ICANN and the registrar stakeholder group. I see Eric, you've got your hand up.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Owen. Okay, trying, hopefully the mic works. Yeah, just a quick clarification. So, Wednesday is the session, but you were right that Thursday we are also going to have a, I don't want to say booth, but we have a table that's going to be in the Jasmine Hall in the morning, yeah, during the morning where we're going to be able to just have a chance for anyone to ask questions about being a registrar, about being an RySG member. So, that's also

something that we can plug, just to showcase the work that we're trying to do and the efforts. Thanks. Okay, thanks, Eric. So, I'll make sure, so it's the strategies for registrar accreditation participation as well as the booth on, you said that was on Thursday. Oh, table, sorry, table. Okay, thanks.

BETH BACON

I don't see any more hands on that one, so we'll move on other than we're trying to upgrade Eric's scrubby test to a booth from a table. Don't undersell yourself. Don't undersell yourself.

So, the next issue is a registry issue. It's SOI implementation. You can see the registry comments. Those haven't changed or evolved all that much. Just noting that registries and registrars, I won't take your name in vain, registries in particular have been very supportive of the Code of Conduct. We're happy that it is now in place. And part of having that in place is making sure that registries have a process in place to deal with any concerns that are raised.

So, we are working on developing that for the registries, putting in place a predictable process. And again, just noting that we are working on that as an extension of the SOIs. Pretty general update. Questions, comments, concerns? Seeing none. The next is registrars. Looks like Sarah.

SARAH WYLD

This is Sarah. I've been sitting here the whole time and yet I'm not sure what I'm supposed to say now. Hi, this is Sarah. So, we want

to talk about the Ombuds Framework. And what we've planned to raise is first, of course, starting with the positive. We're happy overall with the framework. There's a scope. There's a path for complaints. Expectation of public reporting, which we like a lot.

And then the concern that we wanted to raise was about the access for ICANN staff members to the ombuds if they have a problem, which they don't have right now. But I'm noting that there are two other ideas.

One was from Michele, a concern about the complaints officer and overlap, which is inefficient and may be increasing costs. And then separately, Maxim in the Zoom had mentioned that there's no recourse outside the ombuds for ombuds problems. And I sort of feel like we need to pick one thing. Does anyone have thoughts on that? Or we don't have to just pick one thing. I don't know why. I just felt like that was a good idea.

BETH BACON

Owen has his hand up.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

I would think just for me, I would go with the complaints officer ombuds overlap because I've never understood that. I applied to be the complaints officer when I worked at ICANN, so even I'm

confused by it now. So, it's certainly good to get a little more clarification on what that is. I see Michele is stepping up to the mic. Perhaps he can be a little bit more eloquent than I am.

MICHELE NEYLON

Can you hear me okay? People remotely? Okay, so this thing around the duplication overlap, the complete lack of clarity around the difference between the two, I would have had some experience of trying to lodge complaints with ICANN around certain processes.

And what they've managed to do is create a wonderful system whereby your complaint goes in one place, gets bounced to the other, then bounced back to another. So, you basically either get told politely to get lost or told that no, no, that's not within our remit. And it's this kind of thing where they move you around from between one place and another until eventually you lose the will to live and give up. So that is one part of that.

Now, obviously, we can't say that in so many words because they would obviously find that highly offensive. But the ombuds was meant to deal with a lot of these issues, people having issues within the community. The complaints officer was meant to be some kind of weird backstop, but it was never very clear what that was. And if you look at the output from the complaints officer, I think that's the thing to focus on. When was the last report? How many complaints have they actually dealt with? How many of those complaints were

real, tangible issues that couldn't have been dealt with somewhere else?

One might also wonder what is the cost of maintaining that role? Because it's not zero. It definitely is not zero. And ultimately, ICANN likes to complain about its finances and the cost of running the entire shooting party. But then when we actually ask questions about something particular and tangible, they get very, very defensive.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, Michele. I see Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Yeah, thank you, Sarah. Brian Cimboric, PIR. I think actually Eric just answered my question in the chat. I was going to ask if anyone had any sense as far as the volume of complaints that were handled by the complaints office. But it looks like they're -- oh, but you're saying -- sorry, now I'm seeing you in the chat, Eric, if you don't mind putting you on the spot. So, this publication of reports was last updated two years ago?

ERIC ROKOBAUER

This is Eric. Yeah, that's what I'm seeing. And I think there's maybe an opportunity to understand why is that.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

I think that's totally fair. Fully support that.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Let me just jump in on that. This is Owen. I've read some of those. It gives you a summary of what's in there, but also the individual complaints. And I don't see anything happening with them. They come through the follow-up and say, well, that's the compliance process or something. So, I really don't see what additional extra benefit.

Sometimes they go to the Ombudsman when they want to have a problem with the compliance, or sometimes they go to the complaints office, and I didn't see either doing anything. So, I wasn't able to distinguish from looking at those. And again, it's been a couple of years since I've looked at those. I wasn't able to distinguish what was the difference between a complaints officer thing and an ombuds thing. Thanks.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, Owen. And I'm trying to update the document as we talk. Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So, to answer your question specifically, Sarah, and then I'll just glance off the complaints officer thing, I think the answer to your question is, if you want to be, if the most effective. I'll start that again. The Board is listening to a huge amount of information today to be most effective, delivering a single point on a topic is by

far the best and most effective way because you are delivering a request for action on one thing rather than saying, I've got three things I want to talk about under the heading of complaints officer.

It'll all get lost in the general kind of melee of information. In respect to the complaints officer and the ombudsman generally, there is a fair whack of information on the ICANN website about the difference between the two.

If you want to bring it up as a topic, I think the topic of reporting is a more useful input to the Board than what is the difference between the two because the answer to that is go read what it says on the website. And so, the reporting thing is a real point and I think that's the one that you should make if you choose to bring up the complaints officer. Thanks.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, Chris. That is quite helpful. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA

Maxim Alzoba, for the record, do you hear me?

SARAH WYLD

Yes.

MAXIM ALZOBA

I think we might ask why the redundancy is required here because if ICANN is trying to save money, like firing people, et cetera, for

example, in our reason, they effectively didn't extend the contract of the engagement manager.

Maybe it's a way to save some money and also, it's going to be interesting to ask for the actual costs of cases for the complaints office, like the number of expenses for the year divided by number of cases. And if we see that cases cost like more than you expect in the court, most probably something wrong there. Thanks.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, Maxim. Beth?

BETH BACON

Thanks. This is Beth. This is along the lines of Chris. I think there's a lot of, we're going through identifying a lot of questions or issues. I think if we can narrow it down, something that we have found in the past is if you have a very specific question for an action or a next step, I mean, obviously there's discussion points and saying why you're concerned, obviously important. But what is the resolution of this or what's the next step? Tie the Board into doing some work or some feedback I think is important, and that can help target the focus of the conversation.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, Beth. Yeah, so I'm going to try to emphasize the updated reporting. I feel like the earlier part of what's purple on

the screen needs to be shorter, but I'm not sure what to remove. Thoughts would be helpful. Michele, please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks. Michele, for the record. I think Chris's point is well made. It's very easy for them just to punt across to, oh, but that's explained on our website. Whereas focusing on the cadence of the reports or the complete lack of them, I would also say thank you for the explanation on your website where you underline the transparency and then fail to actually report anything.

Maxim's point about the cost per complaint is also valid. I mean, again, ICANN loves to say that they're concerned about their costs. If that's true, well, how much is it costing them to do zero reports per year? That really fascinates me as a KPI.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, Michele. Okay, so I feel like we've gotten to a good place with the text on screen. Does anyone have anything else on this Ombuds Framework Comment? Okay. I do really want to keep in the staff point. Yeah. All right, thank you.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Sarah. The next is a registry issue. It's a little late in the game to remove a topic, but because staff is staff and they're great, we had brought this up before and now it's fixed. So, we've been bringing this. This was a carryover from the EPP, sorry, RSP issue, which we addressed in Dublin, and then there was some testing

issues and noting the status of the RSP testing, and I've checked with the folks that had raised this issue and wanted us to pass it along, and they said that we are good to go.

So, I think that because, again, it's a little late to take something off, we can just say, hey, thanks, we really appreciate it for listening. You fixed it. Does anyone have any issues? Or we can simply remove it and just say we don't need it. We can skip it, but it's nice to say thank you once in a while. Yeah. Or they just want a nice thank you.

Michele, your hand? Oh, okay, it's left over. Okay, thank you. Okay, so I don't see any other hands on that one. Great. The next is registrar. It looks like Sarah.

SARAH WYLD

Okay. So, this goes back to a Public Comment we'd also left on the topic of the Board's ability to revoke policy that has been approved but not yet implemented. I'm so blurry. That's how I feel. Okay. So, we're going to say that we support this creation of a process that does allow the Board to reverse adoption of policy recommendations, but it needs to be in limited circumstances with guardrails, which was in the proposal, so that's great.

We've got a few suggestions relating to information that should be gathered and that decisions should be made collaboratively with the community, which we hope the Board will consider as this process gets finalized. And then finally, any reversal decisions need

to be reviewed on an individual basis for that particular policy recommendation that is reversed as well as something more-broad to consider if there are perhaps systemic issues or some reason why policies are being recommended, approved, and then revoked, right? If that happens more than once, that's weird.

So, we would look for what the Board thinks about that, especially with regards to regular Reviews of Reviews. Let's just add in more reviews of things. Thank you. Thoughts? Michele, you have a hand up.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks, Sarah. Actually, my hand is not on this specifically, so if somebody wants to speak on this specifically, let them go first. I'll take that silence as no. I think a few people noticed in the chat, and I think it's very important that we pick this up. We've got too many topics, so we need to probably cut a couple of them out or punt them to a later date or punt them to a follow-up via email or whatever.

SARAH WYLD

We do have 90 minutes, and usually in the past I think we don't use all of that. Sorry, Beth.

BETH BACON

No, it's okay. No, so Sarah's correct. So, we do have several. Some of these are updates, but the conversation we've had is more in-depth than what we're going to have with the Board, and some of

them is just going to be delivering the point or delivering the update.

We generally do not use the full 90 minutes. If we don't get to all the topics, then we will follow up in an email. But I think that in the past we've sort of, it's petered out in about an hour, and that's not a good use of our time. So, I would rather have more topics and follow-up, as you say, and keep them in our pocket than have crickets at the end.

MICHELE NEYLON

Okay, Beth, that's fine, but I think one of the points that Chris was making and from talking to other Board members, I believe it is something that we should be conscious of. They get the entire circus coming to talk to them and raising all of these different topics. The likelihood that they're able to engage actively in all of the topics that are presented to them is slim to none.

So, focusing on a smaller set of topics when you have the people there in the room, even if you use less time, could be more constructive. But that's just my own personal opinion.

BETH BACON

So, I don't disagree, but also this has been a discussion we've gone through when we've had a CPH discussion on developing this agenda, and these are the topics that we had. We did note that we had many. We had this discussion. So, I think keeping in mind for

future, if we want to be more robust in a discussion of one or two topics and we feel we're prepared to use that time, that's great.

I think we've done that in the past. But again, if we have topics, and I think these are all fairly robust, and they're good topics to, again, a couple we don't expect a lot of engagement on, simply it is nice to say, this is our position, this is what we like. This is the time with the Board, and I don't know that we should leave time on the table. But again, points taken, and we can take that into account. Oh, and I think when we do our next CPH round of this in what, like two months? Buckle up. It'll be great. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah, thanks, Beth. I raised my hand just to signal boost a suggestion Jen made in the chat, which is it probably makes sense for us to go through this list and order the topics in order of priority, but maybe a better way of saying it is in order of things that we expect will generate a lot of discussion and that we want to generate a lot of discussion and then move the items that are purely updates or individual points for the Board to the end of the list.

And that way, when we're actually in the meeting, if time does start to run short, then those are ones that we know we can just quickly follow up over email. It also makes it easier if we have a little extra time to kind of tick through those without worrying about losing runway for the topics that do need a bit more discussion and back

and forth with the Board. So, just plus one to Jen's idea and putting a little bit of a finer point on it.

BETH BACON

Yeah, thanks, Sam. And thank you, Jen. I apologize. I missed your -- as I went through the chat, I think it's a great idea. If we can, just a time check. We have it's now 40 after. We have 20 minutes to go through the other topics. Let's go, again, clarify and agree that we're good with the positions that we're going to take here, and then let's do a quick reorder and prioritization. I'm super happy to do that. I think it's a great idea. Owen? All right. Let's keep cooking.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

All right. Next is transfer, adoption of policies. Specifically, transfer is one that the registrars had had a concern with because that went to the Board a year ago, and there's still no action. So, we've just been saying it every single time that we can. We should be getting an update. We met with Tripti yesterday. She said that it will be on the Board agenda for the next Board workshop in Manchester, so it will be something soon thereafter.

And the cause for the delay was because SubPro was already in the queue, and there's a certain amount of resources that ICANN has to implement policy, and those are being implemented there. So, the concern was, go ahead with transfer policy and delay the Next

Round or finish up the Next Round and do transfer policy. So, unfortunately, the transfer policy got stuck in there.

So, I'm not sure how much of a contentious kind of thing we want to bring here other than just this could probably be really quick. Hey, thanks. We understand it's moving along. Please keep going. We support it. Please do this fast. Thank you. And not really kind of become too much of a pain on this. So, this will be a pretty quick one. But I don't know about the answer. It's important we need to mention it. I don't know anything about ideas. Oh, I see Marc's got his hand up.

MARC ANDERSON

Thanks, everyone. Marc Anderson. Did I hear you correctly that there was a conscious decision not to proceed with transfer policy in order to focus on Next Round?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

There is, like I said, a certain number of resources and SubPro was already in process. And so, they couldn't the only way to get transfer moving was to get rid of, you know, the Next Round stuff. And so, yes, the decision was to prioritize the Next Round as opposed to the transfer policy. The first time I heard that was yesterday from Tripti.

MARC ANDERSON

Okay, that's interesting. And I'm not necessarily opposed to that. It's just, that seems like something that should have been

communicated or agreed on by the community, maybe before yesterday? So, if this is all the case, like that's fine. But you're sort of teeing this up, sort of teed it up, or maybe there's nothing here. But if I'm hearing you correctly, maybe there's something here that we need to drill down on more.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Sure. Yeah, I agree, Marc. I think the waiting a year to tell us the reason why everything was delayed was perhaps not the best approach on this. We should have been a little bit more discussions, as opposed to it just going into a black hole and us being told that it would happen at some point.

So, certainly a good suggestion. And maybe that's something we can bring up and just say, hey, we need to have a little bit more communication and community involvement when ICANN is going to intentionally delay something because of, you know, bandwidth or whatnot. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks, Owen. Michele. Now I haven't memorized the ICANN compliance statistics, but I do have a reasonably good memory. And from my memory, the subject that generated one of the largest volumes of complaints wants transfers. Now as a, as an informer employee of ICANN, ICANN's compliance department, but maybe your memory of that is different to mine or, or not, I don't know.

It does strike me as a little bit odd and actually quite farcical that instead of implementing a policy that had been decided, litigated through the entire PDP process, instead of doing that, not only is it a failure to actually complete something, which ICANN does get criticized for, but it's also a failure to address topics that have a tangible impact on existing and current registrants.

That they would prioritize a new TLD round, which has zero impact on existing registrants and is just another way of ICANN to raise funds. Does strike me as a little bit imbalanced and it seems to be a very strange way of choosing what to move forward with and what not to move forward with, especially as the same entity while they were supposedly downsizing were actually going off and hiring staff for the New TLD round.

I don't know, maybe I'm just a cranky old dude over in the corner, but you know, I do wonder about that. Maybe somebody else like Chris who's much better kind of framing my, my cantankerous thoughts in a diplomatic fashion might be able to convert that, but I don't know.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I would like to state for the record that I am not prepared to accept the role as a Michele whisperer.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Michele and Chris, and nobody puts Michele in a corner. Couldn't resist that one. So yeah, thanks for the feedback and

transfer were second or third highest complaint volume. When I was at compliance, but it was not a quick and easy one such as who is an accuracy about, and that's what they used to be called. Those are a lot quicker. Transfers are can be very involved, but so they noted and I'll take that under consideration. We're discussing with the Board. Maxim? I just want to be cognizant of the time. We have 15 minutes left. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA

Maxim Alzoba, for the record. I think we could mention that you're going to launch another round, which is going to be affected by the lack of proper transfer policy too. So, what's your opinion on this? And that's it.

BETH BACON

I'm sorry, Maxim. Can you say that again?

MAXIM ALZOBA

Do you hear me now?

BETH BACON

Yeah.

MAXIM ALZOBA

I think we might ask the question. Are you ready to launch another round with not working transfer policy and the Next Round is going to be affected by it too. What's your opinion on it? Thanks.

BETH BACON

Thanks Maxim. This is Beth. I think that we want to ask questions that they are going to be able to answer. That's going to require a lot of prep, which we did certainly did not tee up for. I do think that just in the -- and I apologize for jumping in queue a bit, because again, we're getting to time and trying to round some of this out.

We have the, can the CPH offer anything to make this process more efficient in general? I think there's a way to jump from that to say, you know, this is something that there's been no input or notice to the community. And we would love if we could be able to make this more efficient. And maybe there's a way to build in a step or build in just a moment where you say, this is what we're thinking with regards to prioritization of the current pending policies.

And if that is an easy thing to do, say this is the order in which they are agreed. This is the order in which, because based upon the technical work required to implement, we've maybe put this one second. I think that is a reasonable question that they could engage on in the spot without the preparation. And I am going to say, so Sam is next and I apologize for jumping the queue again, just trying to round things out. So, we'll go to Sam and then we have Becky, a hand? Yes, okay. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah. Thanks, Beth. I think I'm pretty aligned with your larger point here, which is, when we bring this up, I don't necessarily think it

makes sense to jump in with the understanding that the Board put this off for SubPro. I think that kind of puts us at a, a bit, a bit on the back foot if they change that messaging at all.

I know that sounds a bit cynical, but I think it makes more sense to tee this topic up and ask the Board and give them a chance to say on the record, what they believe has been the delay in getting to adopt these policy recommendations and then kind of take the conversation from there.

And at that point really emphasize why this is an important policy topic, why we need to get moving on implementing it. And also, the kind of broader point about everyone in the ICANN community, the GNSO specifically, the contracted parties within the GNSO specifically is looking for ways to be more efficient in all of our processes, because we understand how important that it is to the entire multi-stakeholder model. And this is an opportunity for the Board to do the same thing. And they really need to kind of be putting their skin in the game on this as well. So, I would say, let's maybe start from the perspective of answering or asking an open-ended question and then going from there.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Sam. I agree. Let's let them deliver their own bad news. Becky?

BECKY BURR

So, I agree with your point. Let's not go in and say, how could you have prioritized the Next Round over the transfer policy? The other thing is, the Board doesn't decide on launching an IRT. That's a staff thing. And the Board may not have even realized that it was being put off, but I do think your point about sort of when policy implementation comes up, it needs to be prioritized in a transparent way. So that is totally fair, but let's not get into this is more important than the Next Round or not.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Becky. Jen. And then we're going to draw a line under this topic. We need to move to Urgent Request to close this out and then reorder our topics. Thanks. Jen?

JEN CHUNG

Thanks, Beth. I wasn't going to speak. I'll take 10 seconds on this. I know everyone's really pissed off about the transfer policy taking this long, but actually there is one thing at the Board level and it's the IDN and the PDP Phase 2 recommendations just sitting there hanging out. Yes, there you go. But phase one, there's, you know, it's largely done. It's in the AGB and there's only two that's left somewhere. It's on fees. So, thanks.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Jen. And I think that's, I mean, that's good supporting information. So, when we go into this, we say these two top, these two items are hanging out for lack of a better term and this, and we

really would like to understand more about can we have work on prioritizing this in a transparent manner and can we help in any way from the CPH perspective and then let them tell us that they've prioritized this in a poorly publicized way. Although Karla is sitting behind me and I don't think she's going to let him say that now.

Okay, let's move on to Urgent Requests. I have eyes in the back of my head. We're going to move on to Urgent Requests. Right now, the registries, and again, I've noted this as a registry, thought open to hearing from registrars as well. And I think this is one of those that we probably take these bottom three topics, move those to the top and wiggle a little bit. And that'll be good.

For Urgent Requests, I understand that the GSO and the Board have had some conversations about kind of like three buckets of options on how to move this forward. The registries are, and I think the flavor of that might be able to mesh with the registries of thought, which is we have a lot of disparate conversations going on about now that the policy implementation work is done, what happens to this branch of policy implementation work on authentication, what it's hanging out there.

And at this point, it's with a very small group in the GAC and that's not a community-based process. So, how do we take all these conversations, pull them together to then decide what the correct path forward is and what work we can do and should do.

And again, keeping in mind that Urgent Requests is a very narrow topic and the recommendation that is applicable is notes. And I

don't think we should get into this level of detail with the Board, but just for us, the recommendation that is applicable is I think 18. And it does say create an authentication mechanism. And I want to make sure that we are focused on the fact that we have a very specific Urgent Request, law enforcement authentication requirement for this particular project. And that is the one that we're trying to move forward. And I don't know that we want to use it as a vehicle to solve for all the rest of the authentication thoughts that are floating around.

So again, noting that we would like the policy language that we've worked so hard on published just as a forcing feature of then saying, okay, well, we now have this other branch. Can we, in some way, maybe ICANN pull us together and combine those disparate conversations so we can find a path forward, acknowledging that they're being very thoughtful about this and they've engaged with the GNSO this week on some options and thoughts. Thoughts and feelings, Sarah, and then Sam.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you. This is Sarah. Beth, I feel like you said something important that I don't see represented in our notes, which is about the Ad Hoc group that's working on creating that authentication mechanism and that that should instead be a more-broad community effort rather than GAC and friends.

So, I'd like to see if there's some way that we can work that into what we do say to the Board. And then not for the Board, but just

among us, I have heard somebody mentioned an option of reversing Recommendation 18. And I do not think that's a good idea because Recommendation 18 is not only Urgent Requests.

That's a little piece. The rec, it's the whole disclosure request process, which overall is working fine. We should leave that alone. We should not go down the route of reversing that whole recommendation. So, if that is suggested, that's my warning. Thank you.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Sarah. And Sam is next. And then myself.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Beth. I'll try to be quick cause I know we're running low on time. I just want to maybe encourage us to put this one at the very bottom of the list, just because to your point, a few Board members have brought this to the GNSO. We as council need to discuss the options. We also need to discuss the options with our individual stakeholder groups. We haven't had a chance to do that. I think we're going to be discussing it during our membership meetings later today.

So, I would maybe put this one down at the bottom of the list to get to only if we end up having extra time, just because it is so much in flux right now, not disagreeing with the points you raised, but just this is something that could kind of quickly be overtaken by events. So, that would be maybe my recommendation on this topic.

BETH BACON

Yeah. Thanks, Sam. I appreciate that. And I do note in our notes again, there aren't any specific registrar comments here that the Registry Stakeholder Group looks forward to discussing this, these options and yet we have not. So, we will cover that.

I think, Sarah, to your point, I don't know that our comments here to the Board should get into the nitty gritty of Urgent Requests or any of that. I don't want to talk about actually many and like the options just say, I understand that you're discussing options. I don't want to talk about those. I don't think that to Sam's point, we haven't discussed that for registries at least. And I don't think registrars probably have gotten together on that. So, it feels like we're okay if you're okay with that thought.

SARAH WYLD

I can live with that. Thank you.

BETH BACON

You can live with that, okay. We'll save it for another good time. Becky, and then we're going to draw a line under this and close this.

BECKY BURR

Can I suggest that we not use the phrase 'community-based process'? That is going to make the Board think we need ALAC in the room. We need the affected parties who are largely registrars

to be in the room talking with law enforcement about the implementation.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Becky. And again, Sarah, I don't specifically have that language, but it's again, I don't think that we should get into the actual discussion of any of the solutions. Just can you bring the disparate conversations together? What is the next step? And I think we're just flagging that.

To Sam's point, I just really want to quickly try and order these. I do think maybe it's the Board's adoption of policies, board's ability to revoke. And then we can look into, I think perhaps the Ombuds framework is going to take a moment. And then I would say Urgent Requests as the last of the more substantive discussions. And then the updates. Does that sound reasonable folks? I know I'm going quickly.

Okay. So I think it would be adoption of policies, Board ability to revoke, and then the Ombuds, Urgent Requests, and then the rest in whatever order they fall in. We can fiddle with that. I think the rest are more update based. Is that reasonable?

Guys, I'm pretty proud of us. I feel like we have had good, good, good discussion. Okay, I'll remember, I hope. Okay, so I think we're going to push. We also had on our agenda to discuss CP summit and Board prep. I think we can do that at another time or online; or not Board prep. We just did Review of Reviews. I think we got

into the Review of Reviews a little bit as part of our Board prep. So, hopefully no one's a little upset about that. CP summit we can plan and come together during some more offline interim things, I think. Does anyone have any issues with that? Okay. And then, so Owen has one AOB update. So, I turn to Owen.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Beth. Were you able to send that email to the registries? Okay, thank you. So, registries, you received an email from Beth on my behalf and registrars. You got it. That was about our meeting we had with ICANN the other day. Just to let you know that in response to those conversations we've had, MeitY, which is the Indian -- let me get this here correct -- the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology would like to have a meeting with us on Thursday at noon. I've reached out to some people about whether they want to participate. If you would like to join us for that meeting, please contact me directly and I'll be sure to get you on that email list. We have limited spots, so I'm not going to share a general invite, but if you're interested, please reach out to me and I'll be sure to get you that information to make sure you're on the list and get past the velvet rope. Thanks.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Owen. This is Beth. If you're a registry and you don't have, for some reason, Owen's contact information or can't spot him in the hallway, feel free to reach out to me. I'll let Owen know. We

have one AOB from Jeff and you have two and a half minutes. Go for it.

JEFFREY NEUMAN

Okay, I'll try to do this really quick, thanks. Many of you may know or don't know, there's an IRT on the curative rights for IGOs, basically implementing some changes to the UDRP just for intergovernmental organizations to allow them to not have to waive their immunity.

The IRT has been working. We're sort of getting towards the end and the question is whether we need to put the plan out for Public Comment. The IRT was comprised of just a few individuals that were invited. So there were no registrars on there, I don't think. There were a couple of registries. There were no non-commercials. So, it was mostly IP owners, and then Chris Disspain and I, and a person from the ICA.

So, I'm always of the view that I think we should put this stuff out for Public Comment, better safe than sorry. But since very few people actually commented on the policy when the policy was out, some people are of the mind that it may not need to go out for Public Comment, but there are some changes in there for registrars for IGOs. So, just wondering what people think really quick.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Jeff. Very, very quickly. I actually, it seems weird that they're making a choice to do a Public Comment. I think that every

IRT I've been in, once you have a draft policy, you put it out for Public Comment. I don't actually think that's a choice that to be made.

JEFFREY NEUMAN

Well, the policy was out.

BETH BACON

Then what's the harm? If there's changes, they should probably be out. We can add a little more time to this discussion. Is there a deadline for this decision or discussion?

JEFFREY NEUMAN

Well, if it's going to go off for Public Comment, it's going to be in the next couple of weeks. So, if it doesn't need to go out to Public Comment, it'll go to the next stage. I happen to agree that it should go out for Public Comment, by the way.

BETH BACON

Okay, thanks. We can continue and add this to later conversations. But we are at the top of the hour. We are currently reordering the topics as we discussed. And I thank you, thanks to everybody for the discussion and really great input on all of this. So, I think we're going to have a nice robust conversation with the Board. Oh, and do you have anything before we close and everyone gets mad because we're a minute over? All right. Thank you, friends.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]