

---

ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - RrSG Membership Meeting  
Wednesday, March 24, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 EST

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello, and welcome to the Registrar 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 put 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 transcription, click on the Live Transcript button in the Zoom tool bar.

With this, I will hand the floor over to Ashley Heineman.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hello, everybody. Welcome to ICANN70. I guess we're over halfway through it at this point. Hope you're enjoying yourselves. This is the Registrar Stakeholder Group membership meeting. So welcome again. I have the pleasure of seeing you all about once a month, so this isn't new for us. We have a lot to talk about still. I'm looking forward to the

---

***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.***

---

conversation. You all will be very happy to hear that we are using the polling questions again to keep it interesting, perhaps a little spicy, but at least to make sure we're paying attention, if nothing else.

I think there was one other thing I wanted to talk to you about or at least have ICANN in on, Andrea, about captioning. Would you mind explaining that for us?

ANDREA GLANDON:

Absolutely. If you go down to the bottom of the Zoom tool bar, you should see Live Transcript. Another option may be clicking the More button. You can do Show Subtitles—that'll show it at the bottom—or View Full Transcript. It'll show it over to the right.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Okay. So there you guys go, if you want to use this feature on Zoom.

All right. Just, once again, to remind you all, this is your opportunity to weigh in on issues and speak your mind. If you got any bright ideas, if you have strong objections to some way we're doing things, please, this is your moment. Do you not be afraid or hesitate to speak up.

So, with that, why don't we go ahead with the welcoming questions, Zoe? All right. So, to get our juices flowing, what have you learned from one-plus year from living in a pandemic? "Homes make better offices." "I don't enjoy living in my office." "I will never take seeing people granted again." "Pets are better than people." Please answer now. Can

---

we also add, “I don’t enjoy sleeping in my office now that I’m relocated to my bedroom”? Harr, harr.

Okay, last two seconds. Don’t forget to hit the Submit button like I did. All right. Why don’t we go ahead and see what the results are? Aww, what a nice bunch of folks you are. Yes, I must say, as someone who doesn’t really like being around people (a bit of an introvert), I’m going to come out of this as an extrovert. But we’ll see.

Okay, I think it’s time now to go to the agenda. Ah, there it is. So we’re going to hit, right off the back here, a good, juicy, meaty one, which is a transfer policy review PDP. As you probably have noticed, this has been a subject of conversation. There as a panel on this. Owen and Roger, great job in keying this up. I think we can all say that we’re a bit surprise that this is getting the attention it is. Not a bad thing, I suppose, but as we all know, this is very important to registrars. This is something we’ve been wanting to look at for a while, and now is our moment.

So, with that, I’d like to turn it over to Roger, who has been kind of watching this for quite some time, just to give us an update—not an update, but just give us an overview—this respect to how this PDP has been scoped so we’re all working off the same page before we go to the next part of the conversation. So, Roger, you there?

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Ashley. So, transfer policy. I think that, before the end of the IRTTP—what was it; A through D, or did it make it to E; I don’t remember—for the last review of this, I think everybody was under the

---

same thought of, “Oh, we should probably redo this again.” So I don’t know of this is actually a review of a continuation of that. But it kind of got really pushed into the front when we scrambled to get GDPR in place, now almost three years ago, with the temp spec. We had to make some small adjustments to the policy and the temp spec, which had led to several years of discussion on should transfer policy be changing and what should be changing. So there’s a lot of good information out there.

The CPH Tech Ops Group has done quite a bit of work—nothing real recent, but ever since the temp spec, they did create a white paper detailing what they thought the items to be looked at should be and all of those things.

Then, finally, just recently—I don’t know if we can say “recently,” but yeah—staff have put together an issues report for council and basically detailed, in an issues report, very similar things that the Tech Ops group had found. But the issues report continue don and supplied possible breakouts for the upcoming work and then also a draft charter the council has looked at and is supposed to be, I think, even today—yes, today the council meets—voting on moving forward on that with that draft charter or not.

It basically got broken up into three big groups of work. The goal was any immediate problems first and then however the other two work out, grouping them together to get the work down iteratively. But the two first big work items were the FOA, for which we modified the policy when the temp spec came out. So we had to make the gaining FOA an optional/almost non-existent item. The losing FOA—I don’t know why

---

it's called that; but the losing confirmation—still exists and is still being used. But the gaining is a big question.

Along with that in this proposed first group of work is auth codes, any changes needed, any changes, and, if changes should be done, where (at the registrar, at the registry?)—items like that. Just a holistic look at auth codes and security mechanisms around them. So the two big work items. I don't remember exactly. I think there were maybe eight charter questions total for the first group of work. Basically, is the FOA needed? If so, [are] there are any changes needed? If not, is there anything needed for replacement? Do auth codes do that?

So basically that's all of the first phase of work.

Again, staff broke this out to be pretty iterative and hopefully get work going in parallel. So the first two chunks of work were supposed to be done serialized and then put out for comment. The last big chunk of work around [TIAC], TDRP, and everything else is ...Theoretically, the policy work will run in conjunction with the implementation work of the prior work.

So I think that's the big items. Again, council is supposed to be voting on the charter tomorrow or later today. So I think that's about it, Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Roger. I don't know if we have available to us the breakdown that has been proposed for how many representatives will be on the PDP.

---

ROGER CARNEY:                    Yeah.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:            If we can pull that up.

ROGER CARNEY:                    I don't know. Zoe, do you have that? That's a good point, Ashley. The staff did recommend running a somewhat representative group for the PDP. Obviously, it's very slanted towards registrars and slightly towards registries and then all other groups. Jothan put in chat, [""] Yes, I think that's how it broke out.[""]

I think the key to that is I don't think all those positions are going to be filled. As Ashley mentioned, there's probably a little more interest than I thought it would get, but I don't think that we'll see ... I don't even know what that adds up to. 30 people in the group? I don't think we'll see that kind of number.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:            I also suspect, if people ... Because I think it was the GAC, and maybe even ALAC said that they wanted three reps. I suppose what'll likely happen is they might assign three reps, and then, as they realize how exciting this subject is, they might just not participate. But we'll see. But does it really matter so much as to what we're going to do and filling our seats. I believe, when we presented this at our last membership meeting, there seemed to be some, I guess, initial shock at the number

---

in terms of our ability to fill them, but I think we're going to be in a good spot. At least we're going to definitely have enough interest, I believe, to make sure that we have a diversity of representation in terms of types of registrars.

But what we would like to do is start the conversation as to how we're going to fill our slots but also chairing the PDP. I'm not sure how—I apologize; I clearly did not read the charter—the chair role gets filled, but I think it makes good sense to have a registrar be a chair. I think we've got some candidates of people who would really fit that bill.

But I see Pam has her hand up, so I'm sure she's going to correct on something. So, please, Pam, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Oh, not at all. Hi, Ashley. Hi, everybody. Good to see you all. I might as well turn the video on so you can all see me. Hi. So, just to process this, I guess, the council will be voting on the charter in a couple of hours. Greg and I were in the Council Small Team, finalizing the charter. Basically, our role was very limited. Roger and the scoping team did all the work for us. So the charter was very much in good shape, apart from the composition of the team.

So that was a bit of a juggling act because the RrSG and RySG responded to the council chair's call for expression of interest and indicating how many representatives the group is likely to send. Only the Contracted Party House responded in time. The others indicated they are not interested. But the late responses received from ALAC and

---

GAC sort of threw a bit of a challenge for the small team and the council, I guess, because they both (GAC and ALAC) asked for three. We're trying to really keep the size, the overall total number of the PDP working group, manageable. At the moment, everyone feels the maximum allotment will be around 31, but I think you're right: not everyone or every group would be filling all the allotments, I guess.

So there'll be two processes. If the council approves the charter later on, then there will be a call for SGs, Cs, SOs, and ACs to confirm the representatives. That will go out publicly. But there will also be a call for expressions of interest, seeking a chair. The chair is supposed to be impartial and independent. Sort of like the EPDP, you're not supposed to advocate policy positions or views and all that. So just that. So to separate chairs.

Obviously, the council will be appointing a liaison to the working group. I am also suggesting maybe one of the RrSG councilors will be suitable for this role.

I'll stop there. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY:

And, Pam, my understanding was that council will pick the chair, but then the chair or the group will pick the co-chair, if needed.

PAM LITTLE:

Correct. That's correct, Roger.



---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

All really good details to provide some flavor to this. So I think there's a lot of different touch points for us as registrars and not so much to say that we're going to be controlling it. But I think we have a lot of expertise in this area. We have the history. So that makes sense.

Any more questions before I go into the conversation about our participation?

I'm assuming that's an old hand, Pam.

Yeah. Okay. So, as you see, Owen has put in the chat a Google Doc that basically will permit folks, if they're interested, to indicate so. But I think what would be interesting now, to gauge where the interest level is ... Zoe has put together a polling question, basically asking, "Would you like to participate? If so, as a member, as an alternate, as a member/alternate, or no?" If you wouldn't mind responding to this, that'll give us an idea of what we're working with so we're not just guessing as to whether or not we've got high interest. So, as Zoe just clarified, if you're wanting to be an observer, select no. We're just trying now to figure out if we've got the numbers to fill the more or less formal slots. So go ahead. Please mark your answer. Of course, you're not bound to this. This is to just give us an idea. And then hit Submit when you're done.

While, we're waiting, Pam, do you know what the deadline be for getting back to council on our representatives once that goes out?

---

PAM LITTLE: I don't have a timeline at the moment, Ashley, but I suspect very soon. We really want to kick this off fairly shortly if the charter is approved. And I expect the charter to be approved. I don't see anything controversial. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay, good. All right. So, assuming everybody has answered the poll, why don't you go ahead and show us the results, please?

Okay. So we did have at least one clarification from Reg. Just because folks on this call may be indicating that they're not interested, that does not mean that there's not somebody from their company who does. But, yeah, if we've got percentages. Quick, somebody do the math. I think this is good. As I suspect, we'll get some good representation here.

So, Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Thanks, Ashley. I'm not good with math because also the percentages are those that actually voted, not everybody who's participating in the meeting. So we need [inaudible]. Zoe said there's 21, so ten of you said you were willing to participate. I've got seven people who already filled out the form. So please do fill out that form. It will help us try and make sure that we have a well-balanced team. We want to make sure geography as well as type of registrar and expertise are all well-represented in there. So thank you.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Owen. So that's good. So I guess we will watch and see how the council votes today, but as Pam said, it sounds like it's going to be approved. Then, after that, we'll, one, wait for the call for our reps and we will get that sorted.

One thing Pam or Zoe or anybody else could clarify for me is, when it comes to expression of interest for chairs, is that something that is somehow endorsed by the working groups, or is that all independently done?

PAM LITTLE:

Ashley, I will jump in here. In the past, it was done sometimes by the Standing Selection Committee of the GNSO Council. Sometimes the selection was done by the council leadership if we were short on time, like the EPDP, for example. So we haven't decided who will be selecting them, but it won't be the working group. This one will be done externally. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Okay. Good to know. All right. Is there anything else, Roger, Pam, Owen? Anybody else who's been really following the [inaudible] closely? Anything you want to talk about now? Any clarifications that need to be made?

Eric, please go ahead.

---

ERIC ROKOBAUER:

Thanks, Ashley. I want to just make a comment. Again, kudos and thanks to Owen and Roger and ICANN staff for the PDP intro session that happened earlier this week. I think it was very well done. I was appreciative. It was almost like a walk down memory lane. I forgot about that scoping paper that members of CPH Tech Ops had done. Again, just a comment. It's been a long time since I've look at it.

I think one thing we want to do if we haven't started already is [reviewing that] and making sure we feel like it's good place. And do we want to even use that? Are we going to really reinforce it as we move forward to this PDP? Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Eric. Anything else anybody wants to discuss or raise or respond to?

Okay. This is good news. We're getting this puppy moving. Let's hope that we can get a group of folks ... I think Pam's point about keeping this PDP, in terms of participants, small is a good thing—not so much that we want to exclude people but just keeping it manageable so this doesn't turn into a five-year PDP. I think, if we follow the trajectory of past PDPs, that's always a likelihood. But hopefully this is something that can be conducted efficiently and effectively.

Okay. Why don't we keep it moving then? Can you go back to the agenda, Zoe? Oh, okay. This one might sound mysterious to everyone: WHOIS conflicts procedure. So I had a reach-out from Russ. He would like us to identify one, two, three people from the Registrar Stakeholder

---

Group to participate and a consultation group of contracted parties to discuss how to modify or revise the ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy law.

This is something that has been discussed in the past. On October 21, 2020, apparently there was a mention that referenced this correspondence to do this. Pam, feel free to correct me if I'm wrong here. But this is something that the council has been aware of, and we have spoken to ICANN staff in the past at a high-level. But this group I think is going to get the ball rolling in a conversation. Russ would like to get our participants by April 9<sup>th</sup>, and I think the intent is to start conversations of this group in early June.

So I don't have a whole lot of details. I can share with you the letter that Theresa Swinehart sent to Philippe on the GNSO Council, but I just need to identify some folks who, one, have the bandwidth, and, two, the interest and hopefully some perspective on the history of this, which has been loaded, and an open mind and are willing to work constructively.

Anyway, thank you for waiting patiently, Michele. Please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Ashley. Just on this one, it was one of my pet things for years, so I'm happy to volunteer. Also, if anybody needs any background on what the hell it is, I'm more than happy to explain this.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah, it should be [inaudible]—

REG LEVY: I would love that background.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Oops. Go ahead.

REG LEVY: Sorry. I would love that background.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay. Yes, please. And perhaps, if we have time towards the end of this meeting, we can carve out some ... Actually, Russ is on the phone. Russ, if could provide a little context, particularly with respect to how far and wide this conversation could go, because I have heard people in the past talk about basically blowing this up and turning it into something completely different. So a little, I think, context would be helpful. Thank you, Russ. Go ahead.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Sure. No problem. Hi, everyone. Michele, you probably have more context than I do, but from what I understand, this has been something that's been reviewed by the GNSO Council from time to time over the years. I think it was created back in the mid/early 2000s. Frankly, the procedure itself hasn't worked. We haven't actually, I think, taken it through to fruition. We've had a couple fits and starts, but the temp

---

spec came in and alleviated the conflict, at least in theory. EPDP1 is designed to alleviate the conflict for GDPR. But there's been a request to relook at the procedure and for ICANN and CPH to bring a proposal back to the GNSO for consideration that we think improves the process.

In the past, we've focused only on the trigger mechanism. There's been a very limited set of circumstances around when a contracted party could trigger this procedure. I know it hasn't been all that workable because either you have to break the law or break the ICANN rules before you initiate, and that puts everyone in a bad spot. So that's one aspect. But also the procedure itself is quite heavy, so there may be opportunity to lighten that as well.

So, Michele, I'll turn it to you, but I think the ask here is for a small group or registrars and registries. And we've asked the Registry Stakeholder Group to come together and work with the ICANN team to think about what the problem areas are and what are some possible solutions we can together, draft proposals, run them back through the team, bring them back to the stakeholder group if that's helpful, and then something back to the GNSO. This might help alleviate the problem.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks. Just one point of clarification before I go to the queue, Russ. This is just limited—at least the small group—to the GNSO membership? Or is including ACs as well?

---

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** So the proposal development is just ICANN and the contracted parties. That's the way the GNSO asked us to do it. Then what the GNSO does with that proposal I'm not quite certain. Maybe Pam or someone else could talk about what they see the future being with that proposal. We said we would provide an update back to the council by early June or by June 1<sup>st</sup>, I think it was. But that doesn't mean we have to be done with the proposal by then, but we would like to keep it relatively brief. We know your time is valuable and that there's a lot of opportunity that we can make some hopefully productive tweaks to make this a more [usable] procedure.

**ASHLEY HEINEMAN:** So that's actually a relatively aggressive timeline for putting together a proposal.

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** Yeah. I don't think June 1 is really our target to put it together. It was just we owed them some feedback of, "We'll give you an update by this time." So hopefully by that time we have our group identified and maybe a couple meetings under our belt of some issues identified.

**ASHLEY HEINEMAN:** Okay. All right, thank you. Michele, is that an old or new hand?

**MICHELE NEYLON:** It's kind of new. Just on the clarification, because I think Reg and a couple of others weren't certain about this, Russ has gone through



---

what's happening now with this. So, essentially, there's two parts to this. One is the policy as written, the basic idea being that, if a contracted party realized that their contractual obligations put them in conflict with local law, there was a path forward, rather than playing letter and e-mail ping-pong with ICANN Compliance. So there would be a process where you could go, "Right. We've identified an issue. Let's deal with it."

The problem is that the triggers (the way that you can actually access the policy) is completely unworkable. The last time this was revised it went nowhere. The IPC and BC were not in favor of a more reasonable set of triggers. Unfortunately, with the way that that thing was played out, it got to the point where the fact that they said no meant that this went nowhere. So those changes were not made.

It was brought back to council. It was on council's to-do last for a couple of years because, under the policies, it has to be revised anyway on a particular schedule. As Russ said, in light of GDPR and the tech spec, rather than having it on the to-do list, we moved it off the to-do list and paused and said, "Hey, we'll come back and look at this in, like, a year or two." It came back, and now ICANN Org is more collaborative in their approach to this and seems to actually want to fix it, whereas previously they just saw it as a thorn in their sides. See, a lot of this stuff is all going back. It's a policy that's been there since 2008. And nobody has been able to use it, ever, because it's completely unusable.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Yeah. Just to chime in, I actually participated in one of the last efforts to revisit the triggers. It's hard. Regardless of where your interests lie, it has proven to be unworkable and not a whole lot of options available. So it'll be interesting to see how this goes. Knowledge of how this happened in the past, I think, would be helpful because I think you could easily fall into the slippery slope of relitigating a lot of stuff that already have proven to be unworkable. But of course that's not a requirement.

Greg, please go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE:

Hey. So just throwing it out there: can the proposal be that this is unworkable and we don't see a path to getting a consensus on a trigger (which seems doubtful, given the history)? Can we just sunset this? I should know, as a GNSO councilor, how to sunset it, but just asking for ICANN's perspective is an acceptable answer. ["Yeah, this just didn't work out. Let's put this to bed."]

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Yeah. Just to pile on to what Greg has said, I have been hearing things like, "This is completely repurposing this in a different direction." It's almost like the flip. It's not so much to get permission not to publish the information. It's more of that you get permission to get to the info or something like that since it has proven so unworkable.

So, I guess, going back to you, Russ, if you're still there, it'd be helpful to know if there's parameters around this conversation already. Or is

---

pretty much open to things like what Greg said or to completely repurposing it altogether so we understand what we're working with here?

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

I think that's a great question. I think, in the past, we've only focused on triggers, but I think you guys are right. We in GDS feel similar that the problem isn't only the triggers. It's the very bulky process. I think that's a question I don't have an answer for. I can't remember if we've already clarified that with the GNSO Council or not: if our scope is limited to just the triggers or the procedure as a whole. But to me, doing the work ... [Barry], I don't know if you have ... "The scope is mostly the triggers," he says. Okay.

So I think that's a fair thing for us to come back with. We can put lipstick on the pig but that doesn't really solve the problem. I don't know if you need to sunset it or if it just continues to exist the way it exists and it doesn't get used. So I think it's something that probably is worth investigating a little bit, maybe with ICANN and the CPH, talking about it a little bit, and then going back to the GNSO with, "Hey, we can tweak the triggers, but it doesn't really solve the problem here." So, if you're going to touch this thing, you really want to touch the heart of it, which is how the procedure works. And maybe we even have strongman proposal or something in our pockets for that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Russ. Pam?

PAM LITTLE:

Thanks, Ashley. Hi, Russ. Hi, everyone. This is a problem with my failing memory, I guess, because this topic was on and off on council's agenda, and now it's been a few months since I looked at it, so I don't quite remember what the council actually decided. But I think I tend to agree with Greg's suggestion or maybe take. It's really that the council wanted the CPH and Org to sit down and talk about this because the council believed this procedure is very much in place for the purpose of Contractual Compliance, if you like, because, basically, when there's a conflict between local laws and ICANN requirements, a [contra-party] can go through this process so they can get a waver, if you like.

The problem is that this process has apparently never been used. So the council really questioned whether—with GDPR, temp spec, and all these, the landscape has changed so much—there is still a need for this procedure.

So I think the council would be open to all sorts of possibilities, including maybe some sort of position that this procedure is redundant. I think that is a possibility. But I do need to look at the language from the council resolution or correspondence with Org to be certain.

For me personally, I found this procedure quite odd in that it seemed to be based on the premise that you need to get this waver in order to comply with the local law. I feel, if I have to comply with local law that conflicts with ICANN, I will choose to comply with the local law anybody. I would negotiate with Contractual Compliance later. So

---

there's no question about this. Why do I need to go through this process? Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Pam. We're out of time to discuss this, but I'm going to throw out a comment, building out something [Barry] raised, which is a valid point, which is that GDPR is not the only law out there. In fact, if you were to follow this out a little further in the other direction, we could see laws that require the publication of WHOIS data.

But I will drop that bomb neatly there and walk away and say we're going to go to our next polling question, which is, would you be interested in participating in a small team? We do not need a whole lot of people, but I would like to have folks that are really committed to doing this in a potentially quick time, preferably not folks who already are sucked up in a PDP. So please go ahead and fill out whether you are willing to do that. That will give us something to work with in terms of identifying some people. And we will have a list of names with this polling information, so we might use this as a resource to reach out to folks. So please enter your answer and hit Submit.

Thank you very much. If we could just show, Zoe, the numbers of folks who indicated interest, that would be great.

Okay. Well, 20. 20% is good. So yay! That gives us something to work with. So thank you all for throwing your nets out there.

For the sake of time, let's go to the next agenda item or go back to the agenda so I can see what's up. Ah, dang! I meant to write something up

on this. Anyway, let me just get going. So you guys probably recall that we had a session last week, kicked off largely by Eliot Noss from Tucows, on a discussion of approaches to website content. This was a registrar-only conversation. It was not recorded or transcribed to give us a good, safe environment to have a frank and honest conversation. When I'm talking about website content here, we're not really talking necessarily about IP concerns. We're talking, I think ... Well, we talked the whole gambit, if I'm using that term correctly. Is it gamut or gambit? We were talking about the whole spectrum, from DNS abuse to more the IP-related but also fake news, terrorism, hate speech—all the stuff up there – and what is or is not, in our courts, what the current contracts permit us or encourage us to do already, and what, if any, conversations we could be having moving forward.

I will say—thank you, Sarah; “gamut”—one thing that rose to a higher level of conversation was a recognition that the language in our contracts allow us to do quite a bit of stuff and, I think, even to a certain extent, require us to. So perhaps there's things that we can do and identify within that construct.

But also to go back to what was being said by Eliot, there's, I think, some value in articulating what we already do and why we do it and having that made public so it's not mystery land to people out in the wild as to what we're doing and not doing, but, I think, perhaps working with ICANN Compliance as to how they are enforcing our contracts to perhaps find ways that enforcement could better get at real DNS abuse as opposed, I think, the kind of perfunctory making sure, like little nits and nats there, but actually get at abusive behavior.

---

So, with that, I don't want to get into any more real details as to that conversation because, again, it was a safe space. But I do want to open it up to anybody who has any questions or comments. I'm going to scroll down to see. Okay, I've got a hand from Volker. Please go ahead.

VOLKER GRIEMANN:

I think this is a very good initiative and very helpful to basically show that we are on top of this subject, that we care about this subject as well, and that we don't want this kind of usage of our services.

What I want is an industry-wide campaign or initiative on a voluntary basis that allows us to police ourselves to set up guidelines for reporters and to set up also guidelines for registrars who may be new to this or may not have the experience that larger registrars have on how to process this kind of content.

But what I don't want is having to explain to ICANN Compliance in each and every case that somebody might complain to them why I have or have not taken action or the action that they actually wanted us to take.

So I think this has to be looked at from two sides. One is what we can do and what we should do, and one is what we should be forced to do or what ICANN can force us to do. Those are, I think, two very separate issues that have to be looked at from both angles. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you very much, Volker. I think something I didn't mention is that these aren't formal conversations that we're having yet. I think we're

---

just at a stage now where, as registrars, we can maybe start tinkering around here and there on little bits of pieces of these steps. I'm hoping that the DNS Abuse Working Group can maybe pick up some of the items that we identified to see if there's any legs that could be given to them. But to be very clear, we have a very fine line to walk with respect to what is in the ICANN realm and what is within our own independent-as-companies realm, and, for those of us who act as things other than registrars, like web hosting providers, what we could do there, which is really outside of the ICANN realm. So it was a good opportunity to brainstorm and potentially start conversation.

Any other questions or comments from the group?

I would like to look to Luke and Reg. Perhaps we can do a bit of a [group] to see if there's anything we can tease out in the context of the DNS Working Group moving forward.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Low hangs].

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay. I don't see any more hands. I'm assuming Volker's hand is old.

Okay. Thank you, everybody. Next on the agenda: EPDP update. I am not going to speak to this one. So you can get a break from my voice. Sarah, are you there?



---

SARAH WYLD:

Yes. Thank you, Ashley. I'm here. I hope you can hear me. I'm trying the Zoom background thing for the first time. It's pretty exciting. So I'm one of your registrar team EPDP members.

So I'm going to start by giving a little bit of the update about the status of Phase 2A, which is what we're working through right now. So, with 2A, Keith, our Chair, will be telling the GNSO Council later today at their meeting that there is the possibility for consensus on guidance for registrars who choose to differentiate between domains owned by legal persons and natural persons or, perhaps more accurately, between domains where legal person data existed in the registration level or natural person data exists. So there's a possibility for consensus on the guidance, but it is too soon to determine if there's a path to consensus recommendation on the actual policy obligations, as we're waiting on the response from Bird & Bird for answers to some legal questions that will help to inform those decisions. So that's one of the two topics being discussed in this phase: the differentiation.

The second topic is the potential for GDPR-compliant unique identifiers for e-mail addresses. That is seeming maybe less possible, but it has also had less attention. So we'll need to return to that, but I think Keith isn't really addressing that in his comments to his council. That'll focus on legal versus natural.

So that's my update on 2A. If anyone has questions on that, we should do that, and then I'll talk a little bit about this letter.

Are there hands? I'm not ...

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Michele has his hand up. Michele, go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Sarah. As ever, you're concise and wonderful. The only question I have is, what's happening with the timeline on this? Because the 2A thing was only meant to be extended for a couple of months. I assume that some people, not the contracted parties, are trying to push for longer. I'm just trying to understand how much longer.

More importantly, have the financial implications for ICANN's budget for the extension been considered? Thanks.

SARAH WYLD: Thanks, Michele. So I will say, in terms of timing, is what I see from Keith is that ... Okay, I'm going to read you from his e-mail. The team is committed to continuing its work through the current timeline, which requires a further update to the council at the end of May, which is the current target for publication of the report. So we should know by the end of May whether consensus is likely.

In terms of the financial implications for the work happening, I have no information about that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay. I don't see any more hands. Pam, please?

---

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you. 2A. I don't know whether some of you were at the Council-GAC session earlier. I thought I heard from a GAC representative on the EPDP that their goal is to make the distinction mandatory—i.e., the differentiation between natural and legal persons. Did I hear that right? So, Sarah, you just said, in terms of guidance, there is a possibility for consensus. But my concern is that that is probably not enough for the other camp, right? So they are pushing for changes to the existing recommendation in Phase 1, which makes it optional, right? The registrar can choose to differentiate or not. So that's one point.

In terms of the SSAD recommendation, is that the question? I believe it's on the Board's meeting agenda tomorrow; that it's likely the Board will initiate the operational design phase on the SSAD recommendations. So that might be redundant.

Also, the council is having these conversations with the Board on cost and benefit analysis, financial sustainability, etc. The next call with the Board is scheduled for the first of April or the second of April, my time. So that's ongoing.

So that's all I can offer as an update. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Pam. Volker?

VOLKER GRIEMANN:

Thank you—

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Before you go, Volker, just real fast—sorry, I didn’t mean to interrupt you—the IPC letter to the Board regarding SSAD is the next agenda item, but if you have comments or questions about SSAD in the context of Phase 2A, great. But let’s save the SSAD conversation for next. Thanks.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Excellent. How do I phrase this without running afoul of the rules of communication at ICANN? The other side wants a lot. I want a pony. Will I get a pony? Probably not. Will they get everything they want? Probably not. Why? Because it doesn’t make sense. And because it’s not in our charter. At this point, they have still not made a case for why a change to the recommendations of the first phases is even necessary. Without that, I don’t see any room for allowing any mandatory differentiation.

I have no issue with voluntary differentiation. We might even adopt it for certain TLDs where it makes sense, but everything else is just so far beyond the pale. I don’t think we will get anywhere if they make unreasonable demands that are simply hard to implement or impossible to implement and have no practical purpose because, ultimately, the question of whether a registrant is a legal or a natural is irrelevant to the question of data publication because even the legal entity may have personal information in the data sets, which would mean that we cannot publish it.

So the real differentiation that we need to make is the nature of the data that the registrant provides, not the legal status of the registrant themselves. Thank you.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Volker. I think at issue is that, yes, of course, the GAC (and I think some other constituencies) would like this to be a requirement. I think the point is I don't think we know operationally if that's possible. So I think that's the crux.

Anyway, I see Jothan has his hand up. Please.

JOTHAN FRAKES: I'll be brief on this. One of the things being discussed is—obviously, there's hundreds of millions of registrations to deal with legacy data—doing it for new domains and then doing it upon renewal for existing domains. And there's really no way to track which domains have had that happen or not have had that happen. So I suspect there may be some technical aspects of tracking this consistently. I would almost want to see some forms of standards set up for this in handling legal versus natural and handling beyond just what we are individually doing in order to competently process this. I don't know if I'm alone in that thought, but I do want us to consider that the legal versus natural stuff is clearly not as simple as some stakeholders or groups think that it is. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Jothan. Exactly. So we'll continue to discuss this particular issue as Phase 2A continues on.

---

All right. Let's go to the next agenda item, which is to talk about the IPC letter to the Board and maybe have some conversation with that. But to get things started, if, Sarah, you could just give a quick summary of the IPC letter, that would be great. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD:

You bet. Hi. I will also put a link to the letter in the Zoom chat. Just be warned: it's a PDF link. So it will open as a PDF for you. So this is a letter sent from the Intellectual Property Constituency to the ICANN Board. They're asking for the work on the operational design phase and the Phase 2 Priority 1 recommendations, which are all the ones related to the SSAD. They're asking for all that work to be paused. I can't remember if somebody said this just a minute before, but the operational design phase is where we expect to see that cost-benefit analysis for the financial sustainability of the SSAD. So it's actually a really important way to gather information.

So they're requesting this pause of work due to a perceived lack of consensus, a lack of support for the SSAD from several stakeholder groups, not us, and then also an understanding that I do not share of what the NIS2 directive will mean for our work and for our industry. So, because of these things, they're asking for this work to be put on hold and to not proceed or perhaps redo some PDP work.

So that's my high-level summary. The link is in the chat. The date on the letter—I saw Jothan asking—is the 9<sup>th</sup> of March, 2021. Thank you.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Sarah. Before we jump into discussion here, I just wanted to make it clear to folks that we don't have to ... Right now is an opportunity to react to what is said in this letter. I think what's interesting here is that this puts in the mix, I think, some interesting points with respect to how the multi-stakeholder model works and whether we need to object what they say or support what they say or ask for clarification on what they say.

But I wanted to give folks an opportunity to express their views on acceptance of the letter but also what they think on how this is going to play out and whether or not you think we need to consider doing something in response to it. So let me open it up to folks. First in queue here I have Greg. Please go ahead, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

Hey. So I guess I'm a little unclear on what they're actually asking the Board. So it seems like there's three options. They can tell the Board, "You should vote no on these." It doesn't seem like they're doing that. They can tell the Board, "You should go back to the GNSO and say, "Open this PDP back up and continuing thinking about these issues." Or they're saying, "Just sit on these recommendations and don't make any decisions until some point in the future." So I guess I'm asking you, Sarah: which of those three do you think they're asking the Board to do? Or we have no idea?

---

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, Greg. I just pasted into the chat the specific request from the letter. So now I have to admit that, because I was finding that request, I didn't listen to which of your three options it was. I feel like maybe Option 2. So you'll see it says they want to pause further work and send the recommendations back to council for further review or work.

GREG DIBIASE: So "remand" means "reopen"? Right? Am I on the page here?

SARAH WYLD: I thought "remanded to the council" means it get sent back to the council. So the development of modified recommendations ... So they want to send it back to council and make us do the PDP again.

GREG DIBIASE: Right. Okay. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Which I think is a point of that it's not 100% clear what they're asking, which is, I think, part of the concern.

But before I weight it any further, Elliot, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

ELLIOT NOSS: Apologies. I'm trying to eat out of frame. So, look, I think that there's an opportunity here—correct me if I'm wrong; Sarah is representing us



---

ably here ... I think we're thrilled not to go ahead with SSAD. I don't think we as a group are at all happy about that. So doesn't this provide us an opportunity to jump on and say, "Yes, [a] SSAD remand is one thing," but, even further, we can just mothball this. I think it's an opportunity to jump on maybe a soon-to-be corpse. So it feels like we've always been on the other side of this issue. So why not? Freebie.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Elliot. I think, to a certain extent, when it comes the question of if you're not going to utilize this system, then why in the world are we going to build this system? We might fall in the same camp.

I think what comes up in this conversation, though, is a broader picture with respect to how the multi-stakeholder process works and how the PDP process works. If we're going to create precedent now whereby we have a constituency who didn't like what came out of the process a, now [they're] given the opportunity to have it all rejected because of that. This wasn't a quick process. This was a long process which all these participated in. It wasn't until the very end that they said no. So I think there's a process point there.

ELLIOT NOSS:

Yeah, but on the process point, Ashley, look, that's been happening inside of ICANN forever. The original WHOIS was consensus. It went up to the Board, and the Board kicked it back because the Bush government intervened. Right?

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Right.

ELLIOT NOSS: So I have no problem, and I think it's quite wise to call out that process point.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah.

ELLIOT NOSS: But let's not forget that—I say this as a ... Steve Crocker is a dear old friend of mine. This was his fever dream technology solution to see how we could deal with the fact that the usual suspects were complaining that they weren't getting their WHOIS questions answered. I like the opportunity to kick dirt on this grave, Ashley, because I think we all are of the view, as far as I know, that we respond to reasonable requests. We do it in reasonable time. We have a process. A lot of the stuff we're going to be talking about in our framework at Tucows is about that process. You guys have a process. I think that this is a great opportunity to just kick dirt on this thing because ... So what I'm saying is "yes, and" to your process point.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Elliot. Let's get some other folks an opportunity to talk here, but let's be careful here. [If] we let his process fail in this way, then we set up other processes to fail this way.

---

Michele, you're next. Michele, go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks. I totally understand and agree with a lot of what Elliot is saying. The problem with a lot of this is that the IPC/BC were in the room. They were part of the PDP. They were there. They were the ones who wanted the SSAD. We never asked for the SSAD. They didn't like the fact that this inconvenient thing called "the law" got in the way of what they were asking for. I think, if we were to respond, we would need to be very careful in how we do that because, yes, I totally agree: we never wanted this. I don't see why the hell money should be spent on it. I would like to see it burn in fire. But at the same time, we also need to be careful that we don't embolden them and congratulate them on trying to do a runaround on a PDP because, essentially, that's what they're trying to do here. And I know they do this all the time.

The other thing is around this NIS2 stuff. I still do not understand why on earth they are so fixated with NIS2. They seem to think that NIS2 is a regulation. It's not. It's a directive. So you could end up very easily with 27 different implementations of it, and you probably will. So I don't know why they're hanging their hat on that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Michele. To weigh in on the NIS2 thing, I think, if that's going to be a basis of the argument, then that needs to be applied across the board. If that is a true concern, and this work needs to be paused, then

---

so does Phase 2A and perhaps even the discussion of accuracy. I just don't see how you can pick and choose to apply that argument.

Anyway, sorry. Volker, please?

VOLKER GRIEMANN:

Thank you. I think rejecting this or joining the IPC in asking for this to be scrapped is a very dangerous game because the IPC doesn't play fair. They have a Plan B in the pocket right now. What that is is legislation or getting the Board to approve what they really want. What do they really want? Well, they really, really want full automated disclosure without review, which is basically what the SSAD is. The SSAD gives us the ability to automate if we want to, or, if we do want to review, then we can review. They want automated disclosure at a moment's notice, just like the old WHOIS was. They want their old WHOIS back. If they can go outside and tell people that do not know the process that ICANN is doing nothing and, lo and behold, ICANN has rejected the SSAD, which was basically what the NIS2 in the written form quasi-supports, then they might get away with that and might get the Congress or the E.U. legislature what they think the disclosure process would look like into law or some other way into our contracts.

SSAD is a very flawed compromise, but it's a compromise. It is the best that could be achieved. It could be achieved between their maximum position and our maximum position. If we allow them to take this compromise off the table, then their maximum position is back on the table. I'm afraid that they will not rest until they get that. So, even though I don't like SSAD, I think it's the best that we can do.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Volker. Greg, we have you last in queue, and then we've got to wrap this up.

GREG DIBIASE: Real quick, I was going to say something similar to Volker and then also respond to Elliot. If the IPC/BC was telling the Board to vote no, and that's the end of the story, then, yeah, okay, we can continue joining them to put this thing in the grave. But that's not what they're doing. They're asking us to reopen the issue and continue discussing it. That's very different than killing it off and putting it to bed. So I don't think we can support the letter as phrased because no one here wants to reopen it and refight this whole thing.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you so much, Greg. Unfortunately, we are running out of time. We manage to do this every time. We worry that we're not going to have enough to talk about, and then we start going over. So I hesitate to stop this conversation because I think it's a good conversation, but I have some polling questions that are more or less just to see what you guys are thinking. I don't think this binds us to do anything, but let's see what the polling questions are and see what kind of response we get.

“Would you support the IPC call for the Board and Org to pause any further work related to the SSAD recommendations in light of the NIS2 and lack of community consensus?” Please type in your response and the hit Submit.

---

One, two, three, four, five.

I think we have another question. Let's see it. I said that really fast, didn't I? Oh, we do the results first. Oh, we have quite a few folks who said, "Maybe, depending on what pausing means." So it's getting some clarity as to what I mean by "pause." I'm guessing that means to restart the process or pause it or something else.

Okay. If we could get the next question, please. "Should the RrSG take a formal position in some form on the IPC letter, whether it's just a position or a response to the Board or letting them know what we think about their letter?" Please: yes or no. Hit Submit.

Okay. Results, please. Okay, interesting. All right. Well, we'll take that as a potential future work item.

All right. Volker, I'm assuming that's an old hand. If that's the case, Reg, I see your hand went up.

No? Okay. I saw a hand. Okay. Let's keep going. Again, I apologize for having to go very quickly here. If we could go to the next agenda item, please. All right. Another meaty issue. I think we're probably going to have to table this further this for table discussion, and that's okay, because this is the first time you're seeing it. So review of our operating procedures. As awesome as that sounds to everybody, I think there's just a couple of things that have popped up over the last year that might be worthwhile, considering in the context of fluffing up our operating procedures a bit, for the sake of clarity and the evolving environment that we find ourselves in now—those sorts of things.

---

So let's take this opportunity as just keying up some issues. This is not an exhaustive list. I am sure I am missing other things that could be clarified in our operating procedures. Maybe the time is not right to do anything, but I just wanted to present some ideas for us to think about and maybe come back in our next membership meeting and decide whether or not there's enough support to actually address some of these things through an update to our operating procedures.

So, Key Item #1: Appropriate use of the Registrar Stakeholder Group e-mail distribution list; basically, making it very clear what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior—as an example, sharing our meeting minutes with outside parties or taking items that we discussed in a closed session that was off the record and sharing it and attributing it to people. But also, in that context, what are the corrective actions that we would be taking, just so people know, if they do things, what could potentially happen; just basically articulating it so that nobody is shocked or surprised.

So we have a question for consideration. What would you think would be appropriate consequences to RrSG list e-mails being deliberately shared with non-members? Can we see the question? There we go. Would it be a warning? A temporary suspension from the list for the individual? A permanent suspension? Loss of membership for the registrar? We have these listed here, but of course, it could be an acceleration thing, depending on how many times you do it. But just for the sake of keeping this conversation going, let us know what you think and hit Submit. Yeah, I think that's a good escalation word, too, Reg.

---

All right. Let's see the results really fast. We can go to the next one. Ooh. "Temporary suspension right off the bat." Tough crowd here. All right. Thank you for participating.

All right. Let's go the next one. Go, go, go. There we go. Okay. Key Item #2: Procedures for putting forward Registrar Stakeholder Group proposals to the community, whether it's an ICANN70 plenary session, a cross-community session—anything like that. Maybe just articulate how we do that and then how we reach agreement because I think what we saw in this most recent example is that we don't really have a procedure. I think it'd be helpful for folks, if they take the time and the effort to propose something, if we actually have an articulated process [inaudible] questions as to why we make a decision. So that's that.

Next issue or item: Procedures and guidelines for filling Registrar Stakeholder Positions in PDPs and other groups. This has always been something that we do. I think we're just feeling, with acuteness right now, longstanding PDPs, making sure that we've got the correct representation. Should we not punish people for years and years and allow them to term out—things of that nature, just so we have a clear articulation as to how we go about filling these positions, whether they're PDPs or any other kind of group that requires a representation. So that's another area.

Next, Zoe. Industry consolidation considerations. As I'm sure you have all noticed, our industry is getting smaller though acquisitions, mostly. There's some other examples, too. But this, I think, not yet causing serious issues, but there are things to think about. I think a most



---

obvious one is dues for our group. As there are fewer and fewer companies, we might ultimately find ourselves in a situation where we need to reevaluate our dues, and perhaps we should look at things like, perhaps, tier pricing. You pay may more depending on the size of your company and that sort of thing.

But also, how do we address situations like representation on either internal or external groups. if we have fewer companies, it may not be outside the norm of reason to have two people from the same company represented. But maybe we want to say, no, that shouldn't the case, either. So just things to think about and perhaps have reflected in our operating procedures.

So one question, just to get a feeler as to people's appetite: Should there be a tiered membership fee system according to the registrar family size? Of course, you won't be held to this. This is just getting an idea of your kneejerk reaction, but if you could answer it just based on that kneejerk reaction, see what the appetite is. Please answer and hit Submit.

All right, Zoe, what do we got? ["Nay"]. Okay. So it might be worth talking about.

All right. Next up. I think this is the last one. It goes hand-in-hand with industry consolidation. It's something I somewhat touched upon in the last one: membership representation. This isn't so much externally—it is, too—but also internally. It's whether we are a very large company now that represents a whole bunch of different interests ... I think that goes both ways; either a number of different registrars or they're now

---

registry and registrar, but also that we have consultants engaged in here. And it's not always clear what interests are being represented. I'm not sure the best way to do that, but I think there have been a couple of cases where it would have been nice to know, on that position that was being forward, if it would have been helpful to know and what context that position was being put forward in. So again, this isn't necessarily a pressing issue but something we've seen coming up now and then that perhaps could warrant a conversation with respect to if we should handle that in our operating procedures. It could be something as simple as being very clear in our SOIs. I don't know that we're very good in monitoring the SOIs. But, again, just something to think about.

I believe that's it. Right, Zoe?

Okay. Before we go to the question, how much time do we have left, Zoe? Ten minutes?

ZOE BONYTHON: [About ten minutes].

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I just rattled through that very quickly as Reg jogs in the background, trying to get away. If anybody has a question or wants a clarification on what the heck I'm even talking about, do you think that this is an interesting list? Do you think that there's actually more things that could be added to this list? Feel free to ask a question or to make a comment.

---

I guess everybody is just ready to be done with this meeting. All right. Let's put a pause on the question and we'll ... Oh, I didn't answer the poll. Okay. The poll already was conducted. Yes, we should, according to the poll. Okay. Well, at least that's something that we can talk about. I don't see this as something we do very quickly, but we could start the conversation.

I see that Tom Barrett has his hand up. Please go ahead, Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Hey, guys. Can you hear me okay?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah.

TOM BARRETT: So I think it'd be useful, as part of your operating procedures, to have an overarching principle of continuous improvement of that group. Towards that end, there should be a regular review of the operating procedures maybe annually, with an eye towards improving what we do.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Tom. That was our thinking as well. I think nobody really would have the appetite to revisit our charter. So I think regularly reviewing our operating principles is another way to get at some of these issues without having to go that route. And I think it's good to

---

have clarity as to how we do things. I think it's a sign of our continual maturity as well.

I was looking to see if there's any other hands. What I propose that we do is that we'll just start talking about this at our membership meetings. I know this will never happen, but I want to say, if there's ever a lull in our workloads, perhaps we could start a subgroup or a list of very committed volunteers to start fleshing out some of these ideas. Or perhaps we start first with a holistic review of our operating procedures and identify all the different areas going from that. So that can be on our list of future work items.

Okay. Whew! I think that's it on the agenda—oh, no. We're not done yet. Oh my goodness. Outreach and member engagement. Okay. Last agenda item. We need to engage better with our community. With the consolidation I just talked about, we already had a hard time, I think, in terms of engaging with APAC, Africa, and Latin America. I think this is going to put a strain of us in the very near term. What we have here is a GNSO Council representative position, which needs to be non-North-American and non-E.U. Now that we're not meeting face-to-face and we don't really have the recruitment opportunities that we did before, we need to think about how to better engage with these regions.

I know one thing that we've identified as part of the Executive Committee is that I'm going to be sending out e-mails to these different groups to see what we do to help get our existing members more engaged because I know the real obvious one here is that we make it pretty hard for Asia-Pacific to engage because of the obvious time

---

differences. That's one area that we could potentially improve on. But I just wanted to flag this as something that needs attention. Let's see what people have to say.

Michele, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks. I suppose the obvious one for me is to see if ICANN staff are able to assist with that engagement. They have an entire global stakeholder engagement team. They have a Comms Team, and they have support for language services. You look at how much money. Why wouldn't get some of that from time to time? If that's what's needed. I'm not suggesting that it is, but I'm just saying I know these resources are made available to other groups.

But I think the key thing is, at the moment—I don't know how to articulate it—that, when a registrar accredited, I think it's mentioned in passing by ICANN staff that the stakeholder group exists, but it's not an obligation for a registrar to be a member. And there's probably quite a few companies out there that might want to be members but probably don't even really know that we exist.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Good points, Michele. I think something else that might be helpful—I know the GAC utilizes it; I don't know how many folks don't participate because English is not their first language; I don't know if that's something worth exploring—is having interpretation made available.

---

But I think what you're also saying is some really good stuff that I hadn't thought about.

Andee, please, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

ANDEE HILL:

Thank you, Ashley. Andee Hill, ICANN staff. We also would like to support this effort. It's something that we know is difficult for people that are not in European or U.S. regions. We've talked recently about having a round table. So we're looking at doing it at the end of April. We are planning to do two different roundtable sessions so that we can catch both the APAC region and a North American/European-friendly region. So let us know what your ideas are. We're happy to support them.

In addition, we do notify every new registrar about the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the GNSO. It's in our welcome kit that we send to them, which is basically a PDF of things to be aware of. So we do try to notify them of your existence and why they should participate. So, again, I'm happy to help. Let us know if we can do more.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you very much, Andee. That'd be helpful. Maybe we could get that jotted down. Maybe Zoe took great notes.

Kristian, please go ahead.

---

KRISTIAN ORMEN: Thank you. I just wanted to add that the [Live Trend] Group we have today is really helpful as a non-English speaker.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks. That's great feedback. This is all stuff I can start highlighting in my communications as, one, what we have available, but, two, if there are additional things, like real-time interpretation, that would influence your willingness to engage more as existing members. But then, also, how do we recruit more members?

Any other comments or questions on this? I think, again, this is something else that we should continue to talk about. I might touch on some of you to help me with communications. I know Pam is going to be great resource for me in terms of reaching out to APAC. But I think another part of our problem is there are just not a whole lot of registrars in Latin American and Africa. That's just, I think, something that is a reality. But the ones that are there we really should encourage to join us. Thank you, Pam.

Okay. I'm assuming that's an old hand, Kristian.

All right, guys. Is that it for our agenda, Zoe?

It is. Is there Any Other Business? Open questions? You've got one minute. This is your time to shine.

Okay. I'm not seeing a whole lot of hands. I apologize, guys, for rushing this meeting once again. I think it's probably good that we have so much to talk about. It makes it feel like it's worthy of our time, I guess.

---

But I think we identified a lot of things to talk about. And things that we didn't even talk about I think we need to start talking about. How's that for some opaqueness?

But thank you all for joining us today. I look forward to seeing you for at least through tomorrow. Thank you. I hope you join us again for our next meeting. So Happy ICANN70. Thank you, Zoe. You are a rock star. Thank you, Andrea. And thanks for ICANN staff that joined us today. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**