ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - RySG Membership Meeting
Tuesday, March 23, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 EST

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello, and welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group membership meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if you put it in the proper form, as noted in the chat. Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the Chair of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking. This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcript, click on the live transcript button in the Zoom tool bar.

With this, I will hand the floor over to Sam Demetriou. Please begin.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Andrea. Hello, everyone. I am Sam Demetriou, the Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I'd like to welcome you all to our group meeting here at ICANN70 on March 23rd, 2021.

Just for everyone's understanding and advance notice, we're running this very similarly to our normal bi-weekly working meetings, but this is an open meeting where other members of the ICANN community are welcome to attend. So I think, as I quickly scroll through the attendee list, we have some folks from ICANN staff. We have our colleagues from other parts of the community. I want to send a welcome to you all who have joined. You guys will get a little flavor for how the registries go about our regular work.

I also just want to remind all the Registry Stakeholder group members that this is an open meeting, so if there's anything you prefer to discuss offline, we can circle back to that during our next meeting or next drop-in call. So thanks very much for that.

We're about a day-and-half into—so a little less than halfway through—ICANN70. I think, so far, it's been a fairly productive meeting. We've had a number of CPH(Contracted Party House)- and Registry-Stakeholder-Group-run sessions, including what I thought was a very successful outreach session on DNS abuse and the work that our working groups in that area have been conducting yesterday.

So, as we go through our policy work and discussions today, we can touch on how thing have been going, what sessions you guys have liked and disliked, and reactions to what's been hosted so far.

With that, I think we should just dive right into our policy discussions. We'll go through those. We'll go through a GNSO Council update. We'll cover public comments and then we'll move on into some administrative business to wrap things up.

Before we get into the substance, is there anything anyone wants to add to the agenda for today?

All right. Not seeing any hands or anything in the chat, we'll start off with an EPDP update from Marc, Matt, and Alan.

MARC ANDERSON: Hello, everyone. This is Marc Anderson, one of the RySG representatives to the EPDP. I'll kick things off with our update.

Sue, do you have the slides that Maxim sent?

SUE SCHULER: I did not see any slides from Maxim. I'm sorry. Let me go look.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay. Maxim had forwarded them to the RySG list. I'm putting the link to them in chat. I'd like, if possible, to just walk through those as part of our update.

SUE SCHULER: Okay.

MARC ANDERSON: While Sue is pulling those up, I'll get started. For the EPDP Phase 2A work, the initial work as intended to have a checkpoint after three months. The instructions from council on Phase 2A was that, after three

months, the Chair and the council liaison for the EPDP are expected to report back to the GNSO Council.

Thank you, Sue. Could you go on to Slide 2? Great. After three months, the Chair and the council liaison are supposed to report back to the GNSO Council on the staff's deliberations and provide an update on the likelihood of consensus recommendations.

These slides that Sue has up on the screen now are the slides that the EPDP leadership team put together and have been provided to the GNSO Council. I believe the intent is for these slides to be presented at the upcoming GNSO Council meeting. So, for our update, I thought it'd be good to just run through these slides and give everybody a taste of what's going to be in that update and an overview of where we are in the EPDP Phase 2 Working Group.

If you could go to the next slide, please, Sue. Thank you. We have to main topics for Phase 2A. The first is looking at differentiation between legal and natural persons, and the second is feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized e-mail address. Most of our work so far has been focused on legal and natural person data; in particular, the second item on there: what guidance, if any, can be provided to registrars and/or registries who decide to differentiate between registrations of legal and natural persons? You may recall, from EPDP Phase 1, that the recommendations from that phase were that registries and registrars are permitted to differentiate between legal and natural persons but are not required to. So this task for the

Phase 2A Working Group is to look at what guidance can be provided, if any, for those that choose to differentiate.

By way of background, there's a little bit of a background on this that I think is important. The first is that, as part of the Phase 1 recommendations, the Phase 1 team asked ICANN Org to undertake a study on the differentiation between legal and natural persons. Now, it was hoped that that study would help inform deliberations in Phase 2. However, that study was not completed until after Phase 2 had essentially wrapped up its work. So one of the drivers for Phase 2A was for the EPDP to reconvene and look at that study and consider that and determine if any changes were necessarily.

Another driver for that was legal guidance provided by Bird & Bird. While that legal guidance was available for the Phase 2 group, it was not available for Phase 1. The Phase 2 Working Group did not have meaningful time to devote to considering that guidance. So that was another driver, as were public comments received during the comment period.

So our instructions as part of considering the legal versus natural persons question is to review the study, legal guidance, and public comments and make a determination of whether recommendations could be made on these two items.

So that's where our focus has been so far.

If you go the next slide, Sue. This convers achievements to date. Again, this has been put together by the leadership team. This is not my work.

It was put together by the leadership team and delivered to GNSO Council.

Sorry, I'm trying to read chat. "Would such guidance have liability impacts on the individual CPEs that may adopt the recommendations?"

Crystal, absolutely. I think almost everything about this has liability impacts. So that has certainly been a main focus of both the legal guidance—the guidance we've received from Bird & Bird—as well as the deliberations of the working group. So I think the answer to that question is: absolutely.

For our deliberations, we've considered proposals for possible guidance. So each of the groups participating in the working group were given the opportunity to provide proposals for possible guidance to the contracted parties. Some of them have been more fleshed out than others. So the bulk of our work has been on the development and deliberations on those proposals that have been submitted. Obviously, going through that, our instructions from council were to review those three items.

We received a presentation from ICANN Org on the study and discussed that. We have a legal subcommittee that looked at the legal advice that has been received so far. They came up with some definitions in relation to the feasibility of unique contacts to guide our work and also developed some additional legal questions to submit to Bird & Bird to help inform our work.

Next slide, please, Sue. So, work remaining. Our next step: I think, at Thursday's meeting, one of the tasks of the working group is to focus on the guidance for contracted parties who want to distinguish that between legal and natural person data. Staff has taken a first pass at distilling all the discussions we've had so far and the various proposals from the different groups participating in the working group and tried to develop a single document for us to work from. So our task this week on this week's call will be to dive into that document.

We still have to go through the new legal advice. So we have, in addition to the existing legal advice that we've received, new questions—some follow-up questions—submitted to Bird & Bird. At some point—this slide says within approximately four weeks—we expect to get that legal advice back and be able to consider that for our work.

Then we have a task to come up with an initial report. I'll touch on that a little bit more in the next slide, but the development of that initial report is tied to whether or not we'll be able to come up with consensus agreement on recommendations.

If you go to the next slide, Sue. This is the timeline developed by staff that they had previously submitted to the GNSO Council. If you look on there, there's a slide between Step 4 and Step 5. That's a 31 May target to develop an initial report for public comment. So the group has been working towards that target for developing an initial report. That target date—if you go on to the next slide, Sue—would be when the EPDP leadership team expects to be able to make a determination on if consensus recommendations are possible.

EN

So that's sort of a preview of what we're going to hear from the leadership team when it reports to the GNSO Council. The leadership team, I think, is going to essentially say that it's too early to be able to make a determination on if consensus is possible for a variety of reasons, some of which are tied to the fact that we have yet to receive the follow-up legal guidance from Bird & Bird, which, for many groups, is considered a key step in the working group's deliberations. But also, we're just not far enough along in our work to be able to make that determination.

However, what you see here is that, based on the timeline that staff has laid out and that the working group has been proceeding under, towards having an initial report ready by the end of May, the expectation is that, by the 20th of May GNSO Council meeting, it will be possible to make a determination on whether consensus is possible at that point.

So that essentially asked for a little bit of an extension in that three-month checkpoint as to whether it's possible. I'll let Alan and Matt correct me if I'm speaking out of turn here, but I think this is reasonable. I think it is premature to make a determination. I think also that making a determination before we've had a chance to receive additional guidance from Bird & Bird and process those and discuss the guidance that we receive … I think it's premature to make a call before we've had that opportunity. So I think this lays out a reasonable path towards us proceeding and still having a checkpoint so that we're not spinning out wheels unnecessarily if consensus just isn't likely or possible.

EN

I'll stop there. If anyone has any questions, I'm happy to get into it. If anybody—Matt, Alan—would like to add anything or correct anything I said, please jump in.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Marc. I do need to remind folks that we only have 80 minutes for this meeting, though. So, if there is a follow-up on the EPDP, just since there is a lot to get through, maybe let's turn that to the chat.

So, Sue, I think at this point we can pull the agenda back up. The next update is going to be a DNS Abuse Working Group update, and Jim is going to lead that one. So I'll turn it over to Jim Galvin.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Sam. What I'm going to focus on here is the Q&A session that you mentioned already that we had on Monday. It was joint session with registrars. So each of the Registry Stakeholder DNS Abuse and the Registrar DNS Abuse Working Groups to an opportunity to give a review of all the work that they've accomplished.

I'm just going to focus on one element of that here, in the interest of time, and that is that one of the programs that we are undertaking in our Registry DNS Working Group is outreach. In fact, the session we had on Monday was the first in what we hope is going to be a broader series with the community at large. We've done the request of all of the SOs and ACs within ICANN and asking for an opportunity to sit down and talk to them with the same three questions that we had up on the screen during our session on Monday. We are interested in what they

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

use for abuse and how they assess abuse and what they see that's going correctly and going well, and, of course, most importantly in many ways, what are their paint points? What is it they're really looking for out of DNS abuse?

So we've met with NCSG and ALAC. We have a meeting scheduled already with the BC, and we have scheduling requests pending with the SSAC, IPC, and ccNSO. But Monday's session was about outreach to the community at large.

I thought we had a very successful session. It really was quite interactive. We had over 200 people at one point during that meeting. It really was an open floor, an open forum, for people to bring whatever questions they had for us. We are going to have to take some time to go through that and organize it, along with our other sessions that we've already had. But we do hope that this program is an ongoing dialogue. This is not a one-and-done thing. We're very much looking forward to continuing dialogue.

So, rather than trying to summarize some of the elements that we got out of that, I'm going to pause there and give Brian a chance if he wants to add anything in. Of course, if anybody has any questions, I'm happy to comment. But I think most of them were probably there on Monday, so that's enough for now. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Jim. I will just chime in that I thought it was a good session. I had several people reach out after the fact, saying that they say some, too, from other constituencies. I think that it really marked a really

constructive tone, both on the registry side and the registrar side, where there wasn't a blame game. It was trying to understand common ground. I think the more we can use this session and the outreach sessions as a basis for these kinds of communications moving forward, the better served we're going to be. I don't think we are well-served as far as sniping in the comments in different sessions, and I think that the model that we used yesterday is probably a pretty productive way to move forward on things like DNS abuse.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks very much, Jim and Brian. I similarly have been hearing some good feedback to the session yesterday. Graeme is noting some in the chat as well. So I think: really great job. Kudos to you guys and the folks on the registrar side who planned that and then ran the session. I'm really glad it was very productive. I'm glad it was perceived as being very productive because I think, sometimes, in this discussion, both the substance and the perception as equally important.

All right. Next item is an update on the IDN policy work that's going on. For that, we'll turn to Dennis Tan.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Sam. Hello, everyone. Just real quick, for the benefit of those hearing this for the first time, I'm going to be giving a quick update on the IDN EPDP on the GNSO side. This has to do with the two broad topics. One is the management or the introduction of IDN-variant TLD—so variants at the top level and how to manage that relationship

at the root. The second topic is the evolution of change process of the ICANN IDN implementation guidelines, which refer to the second-level labels.

So, on this topic, the GNSO IDN EPDP team has been working and is on track in their work to draft the charter and the EPDP request for the GNSO PDP. We basically went over all the issues that the next working group will be discussing. Our workplan really had dealt with [three] bodies of knowledge, which are the SubPro recommendations. As you know, the SubPro PDP already looked, discussed, deliberated, and issued recommendations on a number of IDNs items. So we are taking those as a baseline. What the next working group will do is to look at other issues that need to be addressed as well. The IDN EPDP drafting team refers to those as gaps. So it really is working from SubPro and building on top of that work.

So we have gone through the major items there: developing, trying to balance that work in terms of building on top of SubPro and filling those gaps. We have gone through discussing what are the relevant policy considerations that the next working group will look at.

Now we are discussing what's the best structure to form the PDP—for example, representative versus over or the combination of those. I think the working group is leaning towards the combined model, which is the representative, and open model.

So that's where are today. We are on track to finish our work by the end of April so that the GNSO Council is ready to review in their May meeting. So we are targeting for that to happen in that timeframe.

EN

The other item—sorry, I keep saying "the other item." So the first broad topic is the IDN management of top-level variant. Then the next one is the evolution of the ICANN IDN guidance. As some of you know, the ICANN IDN guidance are contract obligations for gTLDs. They are referenced in their registry agreements. Because of the nature of contract obligations, it's not clear as to how they need to be changed or updated. So this IDN EPEP will look at what's the proper vehicle in order for that to happen.

And that's where we are, Sam, on the IDN EPDP. Maybe I could touch really quick on the operational track. I think that's an outstanding item for us to respond to the GNSO Council request. The letter for responding is out there. I don't think it has received any more comments or observations, so maybe it's up to us to get that letter [referred] back to the GNSO Council so that we can move on to how to implement Version 4 of the ICANN IDN guidance.

I want to say, though, on that one that [Donal and I] were exchanging communications as to why this operational track has taken so long to happen. Perhaps, before our in tandem with sending the letter, we have a conversation with the GNSO Council and explain what are the issues that we are raising because the level of issues that we are identifying here is really the overlap between future policy work and implementation, just to avoid duplication or repetition of what contracted parties may do or not do in terms of their contracts. So potentially the way the GNSO Council characterizes next steps might not be the best way to deal with these. Therefore, maybe having a conversation just to explain what the issues are here might be able for

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

us to understand the issue, what we're solving for here, and what are the really proper next steps for that to happen.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thank for that, Dennis. I think that is a really good idea. I just have a quick follow-up. Are you saying that we should do a deep dive with our councilors, or should we look to be having this conversation with a broader representative group of GNSO councilors?

DENNIS TAN: Good question. Maybe we can raise this issue with our councilors and they can, in turn, deliver that message to the council. But I defer to you for what the best way to do this is. But I do think we need to have this conversation so that everybody understands, everybody is on the same page, so that we are trying to solve this in the best and most efficient way possible.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks for that, Dennis. I think then a good place to start on this is that, the next time we have our biweekly meeting, which is going to be on April 7th, we should dedicate a portion of the agenda to do a deep dive on this. That way, we'll have the general regular attendees from the membership, but we'll also have our councilors present for that conversation. If you think that that is timely enough, if you think that that's not too far away, then I would suggest that be the first place where we start where we can really dig into this and allow people to ask follow-up questions, clarify points, and things like that.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Sounds like a plan.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay, great. So we will make sure that we include that on the agenda for the very next biweekly call that is taking place after this meeting, which, like I said, is going to be on April 7th. All right. So look forward to lots more work on IDN stuff.

Oh, and just to circle back to the topic, Dennis, of the letter, we'll send that around and make sure it's at the top of people's inboxes. You all have already, within the stakeholder group, have seen this. It's been out for a while, like Dennis mentioned. But if anybody has any last-minute concerns or issues, please just go through and review that document and get in touch with Dennis directly. I think he mentioned that Donna has also been engaged on this. You can reach out to Dennis and Donna on this. All right. Thanks very much for that, Dennis.

Next we'll go over to Beth for an update on the Roles and Responsibilities Discussion Group.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Sam. Hi, everybody. I am going to give a very short update, seeing as we are getting to the end of this section's time and I want to make sure that Sam has some time to cover those last issues.

As you guys know, we've been updating you biweekly on the efforts that the contracted parties—the small working group—have taken with

ICANN to work through and develop a data proceeding addendum for the contracts. This is all out of the recommendations from EPDP Phase 1, where we were specifically directed to do so. So we are undertaking that task.

We have made fairly significant progress. We have locked down a couple of sections of text. We are more comfortable with the vehicle. We had had some questions with regards to: is it a separate agreement, is it specification, and how does that work? So we're hammering out all of those details and making sure that all the things that we develop complement the agreements we have and don't contradict and also make sure that we are operationalizing the recommendation appropriately from EPDP Phase 1. So right now we are working through that. We have a discrete list of issues. We are checking some of them off. We've made some good progress there.

Obviously, when we get to something that is much more final, which hopefully will be soon, we will bring that to our stakeholder groups to review and make sure that everyone is comfortable with it. Then we'll also, once the stakeholder groups review, allow the IRT to take a look at it and comment and make sure that they feel that it does implement the recommendation as it is written. Then it'll be included in the public comment, along with the consensus policy as drafted out of that IRT work.

But, again, we are making some significant progress. We've checked off several big issues that we've been discussing, and we are moving on to some other big ones, like data transfer, data [separate rights]—those

sorts of things; kind of the standard building blocks of a data processing agreement.

I'm happy to take questions, but, again, I just wanted to be pretty quick so that we can not blow our schedule completely apart. So I will turn it back to Sam and say that I'm happy to take questions or I'm happy to have folks reach out to me and chat offline. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Beth. Does anyone have any questions for Beth at this point?

All right. Not seeing any. So we can move to an update on the ongoing registry agreement and registrar accreditation agreement amendment discussion from Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Sam. Just a brief update, as we're running short on time. The Contracted Party House has been discussing and negotiating with ICANN Org with this for a while now. I don't even actually remember how many months it is. The current set of topics is working on Port 43 sunset, the responsibility for a web client, and the process to update the RDAP profile as changes need to get made to that. We're meeting very regularly with ICANN, although there is a break that we've been taking here for the meeting. There's been a couple spots where ICANN has needed to pause the discussions in order to work on consolidating its positions.

Right now, some recent progress has been made and is related to Port 43 sunset. One of the questions here was, are contracted parties required to turn off Port 43 when it comes to sunset, or do they have the ability to turn off Port 43? In other words, it is a "must" or a "may"? What we're coming to now is that it's a "may turn off," but if it is going to kept running, it needs to be operated under certain conditions for the output, although there will be no performance SLAs on that.

Some other things that we're working on are responsibility for the web client. Here, one of the things that's under consideration is that ICANN could take over responsibility for having a publicly accessible web client—basically having lookup.ICANN.org, which many of you may have used already, which is a very nice frontend to RDAP—be the central point for all users to access registry and registrar data for RDAP.

So that's under discussion right now, as well as the process for updating the RDAP profile, which is going to need to happen periodically because, of course, the RDAP profile is a technical reflection of policy decisions that get made.

Probably one of the key discussions points that is outstanding that we really haven't made a ton of progress or we're stuck on is the response time SLA. But right now, that one has just been tabled. A key question there is what exactly that number should be, how many milliseconds it should be? So that's off to the side right now. We're not working on that one and trying to get some other things discussed and agreed on.

That's probably enough of a summary. I can certainly take questions. But thanks to all the members of the Contracted Party House—they've

EN

been working very hard at this for a sustained pace for months—especially Donna for leading it. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Rick. Definitely a lot of credit goes to the folks who have been sticking it out on this one.

Okay, that brings us to the next item on our agenda, which is a few work efforts that we have coming up, which we either have solicited or are in the process of soliciting some volunteers for. So the first item is a working group which we pulled together over e-mail to work on some feedback on new features that ICANN's technical services staff is planning to introduce to the Centralized Zone Data System (CZDS) sharing. So the folks who were on our last biweekly call will remember that ICANN is exploring the possibility of rolling out a feature that would allow for automatic renewal of the approval to grant access to the CZDS files for registry operators. We have a group of folks who have volunteered to come together and put some feedback together on that. So, for those who have not yet, just a reminder to respond to the Doodle poll. That group is going to getting the bulk of its work done over the next two weeks so that we submit something to ICANN pretty speedily so that they can begin their development process.

I mentioned this in an e-mail to those volunteers and I'm going to mention it a little bit more broadly here for folks, just to keep in mind, and that is that we're working right now on feedback solely related to this particular proposed feature edition. This is not the time to be reviewing the CZDS system overall. If there is an interest in doing that,

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

we can discuss how to do that on, I think, probably a longer timeline, and we can work with our colleagues on ICANN staff to figure out the best way to pull that together. But for right now, just to set expectations, it really is just feedback on the new features that ICANN is planning to introduce.

Okay. Second item. For this, I haven't issued an official call for volunteers over e-mail, but I will be following up today's call with that call for volunteers. And that is for a group of Registry Stakeholder Group representatives to work with ICANN Org on changes and updates to the WHOIS conflicts procedure.

So, for those who aren't familiar, this is a procedure that has been available to contracted parties to use in the event that national law conflicts with the WHOIS and registration data obligations in our contracts. It's a procedure that preexisted—"predated" is probably a better word—GDPR, the EPDP, and the temporary specification that made adjustments to the registration data services requirements in our RA. So it's a much older procedure that, per conversations with the GNSO Council and ICANN Org, there is going to be an effort to update and bring a little bit more up to speed. I don't, at this point, have further details on that but we do have some folks from ICANN staff if anyone has questions. They're on this call and they can probably field those.

We're looking for, I would say, not a huge group but a small group of volunteers for this who are well aware of privacy laws and natural laws and who are willing to work on this particular item with ICANN staff. Like I said, if you are interested, please get in touch. I will be sending

out a formal call for volunteers on this particular topic shortly following today's call. So be on the lookout for that if this is something you are interested in.

There is one other item that I'm going to note that I forget to put on to the agenda, but it dovetails into the discussion about meetings that are taking place during ICANN70. Yesterday, there was a session on the upcoming policy development process to review the transfer policy. This has been approved and initiated by the GNSO Council. During the council's meeting this week, I believe they intend to vote on the charter and whether to approve the charter for this PDP working group. Once that's approved, the Registry Stakeholder Group is going to have the ability to appoint three representatives. It's going to be a representational model, kind of like the EPDP has been.

We have the opportunity to appoint three representatives as well as some alternates to work on this working group. So I had some one-on-one conversations with individual members who may be interested, but just know that that call for volunteers is also going to be coming probably following this week. It's probably going to be a little bit further out. So just something to keep in mind, be aware of if you have an interest in contributing to the transfer policy. This is an issue that operationally is a little bit closer to registrars, so registrars are going to have more representation on this PDP working group. They're going to have, I think, the ability to up to ten members. But just keep that in mind if it's something you're interested in. It's something we'll be looking to appoints folks to.

All right. So we are running a little bit long on time, but Kurt graciously mentioned that he could shorten the GNSO Council update slightly. So I'll pause right here and see if there's any questions or any reactions so far to the ICANN70 sessions that folks have attended. If there's anything that folks want to flag for us to follow up on or discus more later, this, I think, is a good time to do that.

All right. I'm not seeing any hands, so we can table this discussion. There might be a better time to do it after we finish this week and we can react to the week overall.

I do just want to issue one public service announcement, if you will, and request, really. There are a lot of different sessions going on at ICANN70. A lot of these sessions are open to the public, but they're run by specific community groups. I just want to urge and ask our members who are in attendance in those, since the one thing that's really nice about remote meeting is that there are fewer conflicts and it gives us the opportunity to be able to dial in and listen into other groups' working sessions, to be respectful of the chat feature in those meetings. I think we would probably feel a bit put off if members from outside the organization came in and were dominating our chat pod. I just want folks to be mindful of that when you are also participating in sessions that are being run by other community groups. Okay? So just a plea and an encouragement to just maintain levels of professionalism, especially when you're a guest, if you will, in another group's meeting.

I know that we're all really sick of remote meetings. I personally am really sick of remote meetings. I am excited and looking forward to the

day that we're back in person. I know everyone is tired of only being able to meet over Zoom, but just know, guys, that we will be back there one day. It's coming. So, in the meantime, just keep it together. We'll get through the next couple meetings in this remote stance.

All right. Thank you for that. Thank you for giving me the moment to soapbox a little bit on that. With that, I'm going to pause here so we can get … I think Kurt has some slides. He can get those loaded up. And we will turn over to our councilors for an update on the upcoming GNSO Council meeting.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks very much, Sam. I hope that comes through. If there's any queue, you could manage it. That'd be great. I'm presenting on behalf of my fellow councilors, Seb and Max. I'll read the slides and then they'll contribute some knowledge at the end of each.

So the purpose of this presentation is to review the council agenda for the meeting tomorrow and also to, as best I can, preview GAC-GNSO Council consultation. That will also take place tomorrow.

So the agenda is quite ambitious for the two-hour meeting. There's routine-ish items that should not be controversial at all. There's the confirmation of the recommendation report to the ICANN Board regarding the Subsequent- Procedures-approved policy recommendations. So that's an administrative step that formally communicates the approval of the resolution and the report itself to the Board.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

There's a council vote to amend the IANA naming functions contract. So, in that contract, whenever they make a certain report, they also have to refer to the policy that supports their action, which turn out to be a real time-consuming pain in the neck. So it makes sense to review that one sentence.

As Sam pointed out, we're going to vote on the charter for the inter-registrar transfer policy. For ICANN arcana reasons the charter is 28 pages long and very detailed, but, regardless, it's a very important and timely effort, actually. It's a couple years later than it needs to be. So we're looking to move ahead with due alacrity there.

From the Department of Redundancy Department, there's an agenda item named the Nominating Committee Outreach Subcommittee Outreach that I call on one of my councilors to explain more fully if need be. But it is an important item for the Nominating Committee to fulfill their slots.

Finally, there's an item on the GNSO framework for continuous improvement, where we're going to talk about really non-PDP-related stuff that we have to do, which is a lot of stuff. Hopefully, there's some opportunity for streamlining council operations there, we don't have to do as much work that doesn't result in much output.

Seb or Maxim, do you have anything to add to that or any questions on this first part of the agenda?

Okay, cool. I'll talk about these more detailed discussions on the subsequent slides—the status update on EPDP Phase 2, a consultation

the council had with the Board on the financial sustainability of SSAD, an ICANN briefing paper the council received on accuracy requirements and what the next steps for that are, further work on how the EPDP is affecting other policies, and then the GNSO Council consideration of the well-known SAC114.

So, taking these individually, I think Marc has already checked this box ably—that the top part of this slide is the direction that the GNSO Council gave to the EPDP Phase 2A team regarding timing. So I've lifted this from the slide that Marc presented—that the bottom line is really in advising in the Chair and council and liaison, advising the GNSO Council, whether to continue with this work. The gist of it will be that the team had a slower-than-anticipated start, partially due to legal questions that were sent out for expert opinion and other things.

And then it goes to say, although it may be difficult to come to consensus on all issues, it's kind of too early to tell. So the RySG leadership and the EPDP team had quite an extensive discussion about direction here and had a sense that these conclusions should be supported, that we should our team in continuing the EPDP work until a later date, as Marc pointed out, and until it becomes clear: whether or not consensus can be achieved and what the timing of that should be.

So this is just to say that the EPDP team knows people that are working really hard on our behalf. And the RySG leadership supports this.

Closing and then going forward, the GNSO Council and the Board had a consultation on SSAD and the ODP and the operations design process, really to discuss how to take forward the GNSO Council's resolution to

approve the SSAD recommendations but ask that a cost-benefit analysis be undertaken before the Board approves the implementation of SSAD. And then the council requested a consultation with the Board, which the Board gratefully accepted and we had this consultation on February 22nd.

One of the items that came out of this was there was some confusion between the council's expectations of what ODP would accomplish and the ICANN Board and ICANN Org, and that confusion was not resolved during the meeting. So a follow-up consultation is scheduled as part of this meeting. There's going to be a Board-Council meeting, and both the Board and the council have agreed we're going to talk more about this and try to resolve the confusion that's there.

The Board has in fact sent a letter to the GNSO Council committee to engage further on this issue. The council small team has drafted a letter reiterating the council request. So what the council requested and still requests is a cost-benefit analysis for the SSAD to determine how best to take it forward and has made some suggestions about how that cost-benefit analysis and the implementation may take place and also asked for a determination of whether the SSAD will be self-sustaining. So the SSAD, remember, is to be done at, other than some set-up costs, no cost to registrants and so should be self-sustaining.

So the idea on the council side is: let's not talk about what the ODP definition is anymore if we're confused about that; let's just talk about this cost-benefit analysis and get that underway so it can inform the potential implementation of SSAD.

EN

One of the questions that came up in the past consultation and will come up in the future was, once this analysis is done, then what happens? The Board and the ICANN Org are loath to make policy, so there's a question about whether to do the analysis and turn the issue back to the GNSO or not. The council is kind of of a mind that we're asking the Board to do the analysis and then decide whether it's in the best interest of ICANN, as the bylaws say, to implement the approved policy. If they decide it's not, that would trigger GNSO Council consultation anyway.

In any event, that's way too much on that. But we'll be meeting with the Board and pressing them to go ahead with the cost-benefit analysis for SSAD before continuing it.

Seeing no questions. The council—I might need some help on this one—requested a briefing paper from ICANN staff describing current accuracy programs that are in effect. So that paper was forwarded to the council recently. ICANN, all the supporting organizations, as well as the GNSO stakeholder groups, were requested to think about whether these groups would be interested in participating in a scoping team on accuracy requirements. Again, I don't know if the potential for this is to lead to some sort of policy development process or something else. So we and some others have identified potential volunteers with the relevant knowledge and experience. So it's for discussion, and there's five minutes in the agenda for this discussion in the meeting. So I don't expect too much to take place, but any other information or recommendations you have for how we would respond in this discussion would be helpful.

I C A N N | 7 0
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

SAM DEMETRIOU: Folks, does anyone have any initial thoughts or feedback to share with Kurt on this specific item regarding the accuracy requirements, aside from observations about the time it's going to be taking on the agenda tomorrow?

KURT PRITZ: I'm willing to take up three or four of the five minutes.

Then there's a couple more items for discussion on the agenda. One is the EPDP Phase 1 Rec 27. That recommendation says that there's bunch of other policies that might be affected by EPDP Phase 1 recommendations. So staff has addressed this in one of their wave reports and how it affects privacy and proxy accreditation services. So there's ten minutes on the agenda for this.

And then, remarkably, there's five minutes on the agenda for the consideration of SAC114. Maybe in that five minutes we'll discuss whether or not there should be a GNSO Council reply or response or other report on the SSAC114. Given the disparate nature of the council makeup, I think it'd be a tricky thing to write.

Hi, Marc. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Kurt. Sorry. This is a question back on the scoping of the accuracy PDP. I think you mentioned you've identified some potential volunteers with knowledge and expertise. I would think the scoping of this particular PDP would be very, very important to registries and registrars

as well—something that we'd want to be closely involved in. So could you share who you've identified and how registries and, I guess, registrars, too, might be impacted by this?

KURT PRTIZ: Well, I don't know who has been identified engineer—certainly, a potential volunteer. But certainly there are accuracy programs in place with which registries and registrars comply. Accuracy is mentioned in the GDPR, and registrars and registrars, we believe, comply with those requirements. But there is a tension among the various constituencies and stakeholder groups within ICANN about what the duties of contracted parties are with respect to verifying registrant information. So that becomes very important for not just business reasons but for Internet and DNS policy reasons. I'm not sure I'm answering your question, but I do want to agree with you that it's a really significant issue to which we should pay attention.

MARC ANDERSON: If I could, Kurt, the second bullet point says SOs and ACs were asked to start thinking about interest in participating. Then the third and fourth bullet points sort of suggest that volunteers have been identified and that the next step is to brief the volunteers for the scoping team. So I guess I may be asking, has the scoping team been formed already or not?

KURT PRTIZ: No. So the boat has not left the dock. I'll ruefully admit that I pasted the last three bullets out of the council agenda that recited the history as posted by those who make the council agenda. So I'll ask Maxim or Seb if they have anything to add here, but I certainly take it as my responsibility to make sure that the RySG is up to date and has full notice of any opportunities to participate in this and make sure that we're involved in a timely manner.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Kurt.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Just to jump in, we, via the SG&C leadership mailing list, haven't gotten any official call for the volunteers for this. I'm assuming it's because it's still pending additional conversations and discussions at the council level. But, Kurt, whenever the time comes, I will obviously be available to help corral the volunteers and make sure that we are fully represented on the future scoping team. So we'll keep in touch on that one.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah. I'll take good notes [in] these five minutes. Oh, and then I was just closing with that there's also five minutes devoted to the SAC114. So I'm not sure that will be affected.

I wanted to touch on one more thing in my last minute. There's a GNSO-GAC consultation, and the council received a letter from the GAC,

posing specific questions on the agenda items for this consultation. So I posted them here and I won't read them, but they essentially take what are nuanced issues and put them in fairly stark black-and-white terms that make it awkward to discuss in a meeting such as a GNSO-GAC consultation. And there are questions to which the GNSO Council, being a diverse group, will have different responses, but I'm not sure it even pays for us to try to make that nuanced during the discussion. But you can see from the questions that are sort of paraphrased but pretty much cut and pasted that they're looking for nods of the head from the GNSO Council. So we'll see how this consultation goes, but it's a somewhat awkward set of questions.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Jonathan?

KURT PRITZ: Hey, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Sam. Hi, Kurt. Thanks very much for that comprehensive update. Kurt, one thing that, in my experience, never does any harm to do is to perhaps think about how to remind the GAC of the scope and charter and workings of the GNSO Council because putting these GNSO-type questions, when really it's a GNSO Council-GAC consultation … That may be an opportunity that you can take advantage of. I accept that, as you said, The Forum may be difficult to work with, but that's just a suggestion: to define and remind the GAC because it never does

harm to go back to first principles and to remind of the scope and the capabilities of the group they're talking to. Thanks.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Yeah. I think Jeff Neuman wrote similar to that in an e-mail he wrote to the council.

SAM DEMETRIOU: And, Kurt, there's a suggestion from Brian in that chat that, as it pertains to the DNS abuse topic and the questions about the SSR2 recommendations, it would probably be helpful to make sure you guys have a copy of our stakeholder group comment on those specific recommendations, as well as the letter, because I think we spell it out pretty clearly and it's something that came up in our conversation with the PSWG just a few days ago. I think it was Friday that we had that meeting. So we'll make sure you guys have copies of that that you can point to as well.

Also, for anyone who wasn't on the CPH outreach session yesterday, the question and a conversation around, as it's worded here, more robust Compliance efforts and whether there's room for contracted parties and the community to work with Compliance was another one that was pretty extensively discussed. So maybe that's something else to point to when this conversation happens as well.

I've got a little bit of a queue. I think Jonathan's hand is old, so first we'll go to Beth and then Maxim. But, Jonathan, if I'm incorrect, just let me know.

KURT PRITZ: No, it's a former hand. Not an old one.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Oh, prior hand.

KURT PRITZ: Mm-hmm.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Okay. Beth, over to you.

BETH BACON: Very youthful hand. I will follow the youthful hand. So to add to everything—I agree with Sam and Brian—just as our councilors go into this session, I think some context and background on what the GAC is thinking and what their goals are … They very clearly laid out their strategic priorities with regards to DNS abuse as well as other issues, specifically on what they would like to see out of contracts and improvements; I will use their word. So, if you look back at the slides from just today's session—the PSWG on public rounds—it's very clear.

So I think that would be, as Jonathan noted, going back to basics. I think framing some of their strategic goals in what is actually possible might also help and looking towards, as Sam and Brian say, those community things/collaborations that we can do maybe outside the

contracts. But I think it's a helpful list of their strategic priorities. Thanks.

KURT PRITZ: That's right. And I think what we're trying to do with the registry-and-registrar separate and joint DNS abuse groups is provide leadership in this area because more progress comes from seeing how far we can push things as individual and group sub-registries and registrars rather than trying to negotiate things in the contract. I think that's the path for faster progress on the issue.

Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we need to start mentioning that cybersecurity companies shouldn't be conflated with law enforcement. Also, they can't offer the same level of security. They cannot offer the same level of protection in terms of protections from leaks of information. Their ranks potentially could be penetrated by bad guys. And we don't know who those guys are because basically any individual proclaiming that he or she is doing cybersecurity work about something may be doing some abuse or may be countering some DNS abuse. There should be a difference between those entities.

And we need to repeat a couple of times that all of us are law-abiding companies and we do interact with law enforcement in our countries. But we cannot disclose it all because it's against the law, actually. What is good this time? I hear less ideas about a proactive approach because,

effectively punishment before the bad deed is itself a violation of law. Yes, we need to repeat a few things here and there because, without it, we will just look like a dull bunch of guys trying to earn lots of money and [giggle].

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Maxim. Jim, 30 seconds for the last comment.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Kurt. I think, in all of this discussion, we keep talking about the GAC and the GAC consultation. Having been to a number of the GAC meetings here—in particular, all the PSWG-related ones—something that we have to keep in mind is that they're getting advice and a lot of updates from the PSWG. The advice they're getting from the PSWG—in particular, Laureen—is not completely aligned or consistent with our position and what we're after. Frankly, [we're] getting mixed points of view from even [Gabe] and Chris Lewis-Evans. I think we need to keep that in mind. I'm not exactly sure what to do about that, but it is something for us to consider as we go forward here in advice that we give. We have to find a way to address that particular issue, too. Thanks.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, James. So we've clearly taken up enough of everyone's time, so thanks very much for your input. Have a good meeting.

**ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM**

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Kurt. Best of luck to you, Maxim, and Seb during the meeting tomorrow. If there's any additional follow-ups, please just let us know and we'll reconvene at the next Registry Stakeholder Group meeting.

Okay. The next item is a public comments update from Beth. So I will turn it over to Beth.

BETH BACON: Hello, again, everyone. So I'll just quickly run through. We have several public comments open. Thank you, Sue, for popping that up. You'll all have seen that Wim very helpfully sent around the list with all the links. He does that for us before every meeting and it's a treasure. So if ever you were confused and you can't get into the website or anything—I think I've had a few people say, "Where is this on the website?"—it's in the members only section. Also, we do provide the links to make it even easier.

Right now, we have the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendations for Board consideration—a very pithily named one. We have already, with the EPDP team, pulled together quite a bit of text. It references our previous Registry Stakeholder Group comments that were really well done to the second phase and then also augments those a bit. So it's open now for everyone else to continue working on, but it is a work in progress, as we've been up to the wire. Folks have been busy. So please go ahead and add comments/edits—whatever you like. That closes on March 30th. So we will close the comments on that, I believe, on Friday. But I can send around an update with all of the due dates as well.

Next, we have the ccNSO PDP n the Retirement of ccTLDs's initial report. I don't know that we have any interest in commenting on a ccNSO PDP, but if anyone has any insights there, please flag.

There's also another root zone label generation rule comment that is due, again, in the middle of April. We've been generally just providing some supportive comments there. So if folks are interested in doing that, please let us know. Wim can start a document for that as well.

In addition, we have the comments to the SAC114—the comments on the SubPro final draft. There are a lot of comments. Some people have put in some additional text, and there have been quite a few comments and discussion there. Sam, I think it might be worth putting some time aside on our next drop-in call to discuss those comments so that we can decide the path forward and some due dates for that. That is outside of a public comment. It's just something that we would likely send a letter or due some sort of communication on. So we have a little bit of leeway with that one. But, again, thanks to everybody going on and A) just putting in some thoughts and pulling them together into some more cohesive comments or communications. So please feel free again to go in and continue the conversation on SAC114. I think we should put that on our drop-in call, and we can talk about those and the path forward.

I believe that is all we have. I'm happy to take any questions or comments. If anyone has any questions or concerns, please reach out to Sue, Wim, or myself if ever you have any issues getting into comments or have questions about due dates or deadlines.

I see Jim's hand.

JIM GALVIN: Sorry. Old hand.

BETH BACON: You mean you're not riveted by my public comment update? Hmph!

JIM GALVIN: Always, Beth. Always.

BETH BACON: [Eh, I'll take it.]. Thanks, guys.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Beth. I will note that Donna sent a note to the list and provided some additional thoughts and edits to the draft response on the SAC114 document. So just a reminder to folks: because this doesn't have a deadline, I know it can kind of stretch out a bit, but let's definitely take the time to review that. Let's see if folks agree with what's written in there or if they do not. We will absolutely set aside some dedicated time on the next call to make sure that we do a deeper dive into this and make a final decision as what we're going to submit and how we're going to submit it and whether we're going to submit and all that fun stuff. So just an initial plug [for Beth] to please take the time and go through that information as well as all the other drafts that are currently up for public comment that Beth is dutifully working to get finalized and submitted.

All right. We are looking great in terms of times, so thanks, everyone, for sticking to the agenda pretty well. The last thing that we have on tap for today is a couple of administrative items for the stakeholder group. Jonathan is going to lead us off on this one with an update about the budget. So, Jonathan, whenever you are ready.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Sure. Thanks, Sam. And well done for all of you for getting us back on time. I was a little skeptical that I'd even be able to give my small update here. But great. So we're back on track.

I don't think there's a lot to say at this stage. Our financial year runs from the first of July, as you know, so we're in the existing financial year, which will then restart on the 1st of July. What is required for that Is to have a budget in place by the start of that—a budget that's proposed to the leadership by the executive group. It's a cycle we've been through each year. It's not a particularly complicated budget. There's around 50 line items, and the total value of the membership dues is around $130,000. We've made a small surplus in prior years and built up some reserves. Actually, our expenditure has been substantially lower this year for obviously reasons, and in some ways, that creates some slightly more interesting challenges as to how we deal with that that we need to talk about.

So really at this stage we'll be looking for expressions of interest from one or more members to join a group to review the budget led by myself and working together with Sue. We'll go through that and just really review the key points and make sure that our budget for the

forthcoming year is something that we can satisfactorily propose to the group.

So I guess what we're asking you now for is to think about coming forward to participate in that group if you've got any interest in the finances and operations of the group at that level. We'll probably put out a call to the membership very shortly. It will require two or three meetings. It won't be a particularly complicated process. So it'd be great to have one or two interested people come forward, or even three or four, to help with the small group to review the budget.

I think that's it. I'm happy to take any questions or comments at this stage, but we'll be reaching out to the membership for some volunteers shortly. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Jonathan. Looks like you've got a couple volunteers already noting their interest in the chat. So, folks, if this is something that interests you, like Jonathan said, put your hand up. We will get that work kicked off very shortly following the ICANN70 meeting.

All right. Next, we'll go over to Beth for a very quick update, I think, because there's a not a ton cover, on how we're doing with incorporating the changes to our charter that we've been working on to bring the group up to date with our existing operations. So, Beth, over to you.

BETH BACON: Thanks. Hello again, everyone. Yes, a very quick update. As you all remember, we went through an extended process—the Evolution 4 Working Group—to update our charter and operational procedures. The next step in that, after we voted on it, was to send it over to ICANN and have them review. The staff is reviewing prior to sending it to the Board for their review and approval. So we are just waiting.

We've had a few questions for clarification and overtures from ICANN staff that the are working on it steady. We appreciate their time and attention. So hopefully that will get done soon, but we don't have any sort of timeline or view into a timeline from ICANN right now.

But if you guys have questions, let me know. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right. Thanks very much for that, Beth. Hoping that we can make some progress on this since we were waiting a little while for ICANN staff. So, if anyone is listening, please take that hint.

All right. The next item is a website update from Craig, who has been overseeing and very successfully leading that effort, if I do say so myself. So, Craig, over to you.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Sam. So I'm going to share my screen. So, late last year, we undertook a survey of members and a broad group of stakeholders about how they use our website and solicited recommendations for making improvements. Over about the last six or eight weeks, Sam,

Beth, Jonathan, and I have been working with a designer on making some changes, mostly to refresh the way it looks, to add functionality, and increase searchability, just to make finding all the old historical information easier.

So I'm going to log in so you can see what it currently is looking like. So you can see it looks totally different. Now, like most websites, it has a cookie statement at the bottom. Once you click Okay, I don't think you'll see this cookie statement again for 30 days.

We're trying to simplify the archive. It used to be a long scrolling list of documents and dates, and now everything is collapsed and also searchable.

What we haven't done yet is create the Members Only page, which has all the password-protected information. Currently, those three pages have had, I think, the same password for … Well, I don't even know how long. Everybody uses the same password. So we're going to be setting up a system for each user to create their own credentials. I think that that will probably happen sometime in the next couple of weeks. What Sue will probably do will send the link out to each RySG member and then have the member share that with their colleagues, simplifying what our roster looks like, including the information we display. We used to have names and contact information here. All of that can still be obtained by contracting Sue, [who] didn't really think it needed to be so [miserable] on our website anymore, particularly given so many privacy concerns.

So, once we get this up, we'll ask people to drive around it a little bit and let us know what your experience is. If you think anything looks really great, let us know. If you think anything is terrible and needs to be changed, that would be good to hear, too.

Otherwise, I'll give everyone back time, unless there are some specific questions on this.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Craig. Just to echo something that Craig brought up, the biggest pieces of feedback we heard is that everyone wants the website to look a bit newer and fresher and also to make it a lot easier to access the content that folks go to the site for. So, in the case of our members, a lot of times that's looking for past statements or comments that we as a stakeholder group have submitted. So, in addition to organizing that content a little bit more intuitively and making it cleaner, there's also going to be increased search capabilities. The actual PDFs of our comments and statements will be able to be indexed so we can use the search feature a little bit better.

So I've been really pleased with the progress so far. It's still underway. There's still some stuff that we are ironing out in terms of the layout and how the content is displayed, but we've been making very fast progress, which is just a real tribute to Craig and Chris, who was the designer that Craig found and hired to help us with that. So major props on that one, Craig. And thank you very much for everything you've been doing on this, as well as to the rest of the ExCom and to Sue for contributing and helping push that forward in terms of getting all the content indexed

and all that kind of stuff. So, for anyone who has been clamoring for a refresh, it's coming and it's coming up pretty fast. So we'll keep you guys posted on that.

Okay. We only have a few last-minute items here before we let you guys go—we might be able to let folks go a couple minutes earlier—and that's just a couple of calls for volunteers and nominations. The first is that the GNSO has launched a second expression of interest period for the … I think I just realized that I think we put the wrong item on the agenda. That's my fault. I apologize for that error. This is for the Community Representatives Group that is going to select the Independent Review Process (IRP) standing panelists. There was a call for expressions of interest at the end of last year, but it was pretty short. It happened to overlap with some of the year-end holidays. The GNSO only got one expression of interest, where they had the ability to appoint, I think, at least two members to this Community Representatives Group.

So the group has decided to open that call for volunteers a second time. That is currently ongoing. It runs through the end of this month. So, if folks are interested in serving on that group, now is the time to put your hand up and submit your expression of interest.

Then the last item to note is that the nomination period is currently open for the Community Excellence Award. So, if you know of anyone who you may want to nominate that you might want to filter up through the Registry Stakeholder Group and for us to nominate as a full group,

just reach out to Sue and me, and we will give that some consideration and we'll work that through the proper channels.

All right. We have reached the end of our agenda for today. We have seven minutes left, so I'll just pause here and see if there's anything that anyone else would like to cover or discuss while we are all together.

All right. Well, I'm not seeing any hands, so I will just remind everyone that the next biweekly meeting is going to be on Wednesday, April 7th, at 15:00 UTC. We're giving folks a break from full Registry Stakeholder Group meetings next week. There will be some working group meetings. A lot of the working groups that we gave updates on today are right in the middle of some important work and need to keep the momentum and keep progress going, but there will not be a full stakeholder group next meeting. We'll resume meetings on the 7th and then we'll get back to every other week for these biweekly calls and then the drop-in calls on the off-weeks. Those will continue to take place later in the day.

With that, I want to thank everyone for joining us today. I want to thank everyone for the good updates and discussion and wish you a great remainder of your ICANN70. I think, with that, we can adjourn. See you all down the road, folks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]