

---

ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and RySG  
Wednesday, March 11, 2020 – 10:45 to 12:15 CUN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is being recorded.

BECKY BARR: Thanks, everybody, and welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group/ICANN board meeting here. Lovely to see you all virtually.

And I think we can go right ahead and get started.

Do we have --

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi, Becky. It's Donna Austin, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

BECKY BARR: Thanks, Donna. Welcome.

I gather we're going to start with Registry Stakeholder Group topics here this morning. Just want to, by way of introduction, say thanks to everyone for hanging in with this virtual meeting. We are doing session -- post-session surveys, and there is an email for input on how the meeting is going. Obviously, this is an important opportunity for us to learn about how to most effectively operate remote meetings, not because that's what we want to do as a default, but because,

---

***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.***

---

obviously, when we need to do it, we want to be able to do it effectively. So we really appreciate any inputs or any of those things that we're having, any experiences that you have as part of this.

Just one observation. I think our experience in the past day or two is that -- and it must be because of the sort of thinned-down meeting schedule -- we're getting generally larger crowds in the rooms and very interesting discussions. So it's a new experience for all of us, but so far, so good.

So let's start with the -- the questions that the Registry Stakeholder Group has raised. And perhaps it would be appropriate, Donna, to have you -- I'll turn this over to you, and you can run the introduction of the questions however you want.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Thanks, Becky. And hello to all our board members. I assume that we have a number of our Registry Stakeholder Group members on the call as well.

The way that we want to work this is, we've identified a lead for each of the topics, and they will introduce the topic and then manage the interaction with the board.

So, Becky, how does the -- sorry about logistics, but in terms of people raising hands to make a point, who will manage that process?

---

BECKY BURR: How -- would you like to manage it for your -- the Registry Stakeholder Group topics and then I'll manage it when we come to the other?

DONNA AUSTIN: That sounds good.

BECKY BURR: Either way, whatever makes sense for you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky. I think we'll do it that way.

Jeff Neuman is going to take us through the first topic. So, Jeff, if you're ready to go.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Donna.

Hello, everyone. This is Jeff Neuman. And I do think that this -- the format of these meetings, being virtual, has actually worked pretty smoothly. So I've been fairly impressed with how well this has been running. So thanks for that.

Now, with this first topic, there's been a trend in revenue team reports to make concrete recommendations. But, you know -- sorry, there's a lot of noise here.

Sorry.

So there's been a number of review teams -- (Garbled audio).

---

Can people please mute? It would be much easier.

All right. Let me -- I'll start again. Sorry about that.

So there's been a trend in review team reports to make concrete recommendations that we believe, you know, tread on -- they tread the line between what's policy, what's in the contracts, and what's, you know, ordinary review of ICANN org's processes and procedures and day-to-day activities.

This, coupled with the expectation by many in the community that review team recommendations will be implemented as written, has created tension within a number of ICANN's existing structures, including the policy development processes. So I'm -- as many of you know -- one of the co-chairs of the Subsequent Procedures PDP. And so with respect to that, I've certainly seen that expectation or the blurring of the lines, especially with respect to the CCT Review Team recommendations.

And it seems like there's a flat-out expectation by members of the community that -- especially when they agree with the review team recommendations, that all PDPs just rubber-stamp approval of the review team recommendations, even if the recommendations themselves cover policy, which is supposed to be the primary jurisdiction of the PDP process itself.

This can create the perception that review team recommendations supersede any potential policy recommendations or that it can

---

circumvent the processes that our multistakeholder model depends on.

We're also seeing recommendations that attempt to mandate contract language in an effort to get around the normal contract processes for doing amendments for consensus policies. And this has been seen in both the CCT Review Team recommendations as well as the initial recommendations of the SSR2.

And, finally, you know, we want to note, as you've mentioned before, as the board has mentioned before, there's little, if any, consideration in these review teams for whether their recommendations are actually feasible or how much those recommendations would actually cost to implement. And those costs are not just on -- you know, not just monetary costs, but costs on resources for ICANN Org, the contracted parties, or, for that matter, any other party in the multistakeholder community.

And so in addition to that, you know, it's also a challenge, as it says here, up here on the slide, to take all these recommendations and attempt to prioritize those and determine, okay, which ones do we really need to pay attention to and which ones can be pushed out later down the line.

So with all of that, you know, our question to the board is whether you're seeing these tensions. And we know that -- or I think that the ATRT3 is dealing with some of this. But it would be great to hear your opinions on the review teams and expectations of the community and

---

how to, I guess, clarify to the community what the expectations actuality should be.

Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jeff.

I see Becky has a hand up, Becky, go ahead.

BECKY BURR: Yeah, I'm going to take a first crack at this. And I know other people, including Avri, will have something to say about it.

This is a really important question and an issue that is very much front and center on the board's focus here, particularly, you know, beginning with the CCT recommendations, but continuing right down through where both the number and the type of recommendations is really -- has really changed in a pretty dramatic way.

So we are faced with a situation where we will soon have, you know, hundreds of formal review team recommendations on the table.

In addition, we are getting, you know, both formal advice from the GAC and advice from the At-Large Advisory Committee, as well as input from other stakeholder groups, on a variety of issues, notably, I think, as everyone knows, the abuse issue is the current front-runner on this.

---

There are a couple of observations. And I think -- I hope that it is clear that the board has been very disciplined in its view that the policy development process belongs -- the authority for policy development lies in the community and that whether it is a review recommending it or the GAC recommending it or another SO or AC, the board's -- the board is not responsible or authorized for policy development. And that's very clear.

The other thing that we are clear on is that the contracts with contracted parties, the agreements with contracted parties are commercial agreements between ICANN and the contracted parties. They are voluntary agreements. The board cannot, in response to community calls to, you know, enter into contract negotiations, cannot dictate the outcomes of voluntary policy negotiations, full stop.

And I think that, you know, the other thing that we would agree on is that contract negotiations are not a vehicle for routing around the policy development process. But I think we have to acknowledge that there's some interplay in the sense that, to the extent the community is frustrated by the pace of the policy development process and the outcome of policy development processes, they will put more pressure on the outcome of contract negotiations.

Now, I'm going to speak entirely personally, just for one second, to say some of what we are seeing with respect to the frustration on abuse is actually sort of the by-product of leaning too heavily on a contract negotiation process where the outcome of that is not what

---

some parts of the community would like. And I don't think I need to, you know, belabor the point about the various ways in which people expected spec 11(3)(b) to change the abuse profile.

Having said that, I do think that it is -- it's -- that the contract negotiations and the voluntary work that the contracted parties are doing is a really important piece of the puzzle solution here, which is that, you know, we need to be -- we think there are lots of incentives for the contracted parties to think creatively and proactively about addressing issues in a way that allows both policy development process and the voluntary contracting negotiation process to be working clearly.

So I want to assure you that the board is very much aware of and committed to maintaining the bylaws balance here. But we do want contracted parties to understand the pressures and frustrations in the community. I think you -- I definitely think you do on that one.

So -- And then, you know, things like the code of conduct initiative, the workshops and the various things, I think, are opportunities for the contracted parties to help drive solutions here, to the extent possibly.

And then, finally, I think on this particular issue, because I think this is all wrapped up in abuse, I would call your attention to the formal advice that the board has gotten from ALAC on the abuse issue and the scorecard that the board has sent back. It's the understanding scorecard, the we interpret your advice to mean X, Y, and Z.

---

And I think that is an attempt to serve up in a very conscious and deliberate way the issues on the table that we are talking about.

So all that is a long-winded way to say, very important issue. It is front and center on the board's priority list, and we are committed to working with you guys and with the rest of the community to drive some solutions here.

I know that there are lots of other people in the queue. I just think it might be useful if Avri could say a couple of words about the review team and the work that we are doing on managing the output of review teams so that we have a better sense of, you know, the fact that the recommendations are addressing problems that are identified and supported by fact and that the solutions are implementable and the like.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky.

Avri, are you in a position to follow up?

AVRI DORIA: I think so. Can I be heard?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, you can. Go ahead.

---

AVRI DORIA:

Hi, this is Avri Doria speaking. I don't have all that much to add to what Becky said.

But one of the things as I hope you've noticed is that when the review recommendations are approved, dealt with, accepted by the Board, those that do relate to policy we've been quite careful to send on to the GNSO saying, This is policy related. We're passing it on to you.

Now, that doesn't in any way, as Becky said, determine the outcome. It does not even determine that there will be a PDP on something. It's merely us passing it on.

Now, one of the things that happens is that while we're tracking it -- and we do periodically communicate again trying to figure out where things are at, but there's a certain amount of pressure to say the bylaws give the Board a -- the ability to request issues reports and, therefore, kick off PDPs, why don't you do that.

And pretty much the answers that come back is, first of all, most of the time the groups asking for this are groups that themselves could do an issues report and then go through the process of negotiating that with the GNSO until sometimes the answer back is, "Well, you can do it." But that does not have the forcing function of the Board asking for an issues report.

But definitely to sort of -- what to avoid doing that, one, in terms of dealing with the workload so it really is balanced, how do we, you know, sort of follow through on some of these things that we've passed to the GNSO because we can't just abandon them once they're

---

passed through. How do we follow through on this and not use that bylaws mechanism and, yet, still keep shepherding things along, as it were?

So that's very much the balance that we're playing with these things, with the hundreds of recommendations that there are.

So, again, going back to where Becky started is, you know, reviews don't determine policy. The GNSO determines policy on gTLDs. But the reviews do determine needs, concerns, issues, and community consensus on areas where something needs to be done so we do follow through on that as we're kind of expected to and as kind of the bylaws force us to unless something is not accepted.

Hope that contributes. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Avri. We'll go to Chris and then to Jeff.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Donna. I just wanted to add one tiny other thing, which is that all of these -- not so much with the ALAC advice and stuff, but all of these reviews have representation on them from the contracted parties house and the registries and the registrars. And it would be helpful, I think, to us -- because we are conscious the recommendations should be made to the Board and shouldn't be about policy, if in those reviews we saw that the contracted parties house was pushing that position and actually even if they can't -- even

---

if the rest of everyone else agrees a recommendation should be made, we had some sort of comment from the contracted parties house against it.

So it looks -- sometimes it looks like -- I'm not saying this is the case. But sometimes it looks like there's maybe a little bit of a lack of engagement in the reviews and, therefore, your voices are not being heard perhaps as loudly and clearly as they should be. And that's part of the reason why the reviews are sometimes overstepping the mark in respect to policy. Just a thought.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Jeff, before I go to you, I just want to respond to something that Chris just said.

Chris, I acknowledge that there's an assumption that contracted parties house has representation on these review teams. But something we come to realize a little bit too late with the SSR2 is that we don't have representation on that team. And that's because one of the appointments that was made early was actually employed by a registry operator but no longer is. So that was a little bit of a fail on our part that we didn't pick that up.

But it also represents that the GNSO makes the appointments to those review teams. And the GNSO has a separate process that they go through to make those appointments. So it doesn't always mean that there will be representation from contracted party house because of the way that the GNSO manages that process.

---

It is reasonably fair and equitable, but that assumption that we always have somebody there is not always correct.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I appreciate that, Donna. Thanks for the clarification.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Chris.  
Jeff, over to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. And thank you, Becky, Chris, Avri.

I should have -- and I neglected to say -- that we do appreciate the support we get from the Board in pushing the policy issues to the appropriate place and taking an active role with that and with the contract negotiations.

I think the other question that's in there that hasn't been addressed is that there is an expectation, even within the PDPs, that if a review team said something, then the PDP just has to implement it or follow through with it regardless of whether the PDP working group agrees with the recommendations or the approach or whatever it is that the review team said.

And it's further exacerbated when you have the ALAC or GAC or other groups that endorse those recommendations to the Board because then it puts more pressure on the PDP to act as sort of a rubber stamp.

---

So if you can also just address that. And maybe -- it's great that you're referring policy to the right places. But I think it's also an expectation that needs to be set within the community as to the -- that it's not just an issue for the PDP but it's an issue with the primary jurisdiction within the PDP. And so long as the PDP addresses the concerns in whatever way, then the review team recommendations are satisfied or something like that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jeff.

Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Hi, Avri speaking again.

Yeah. I think that in the last sentence you made -- or said, you basically touched on the point. And I think that point is the expectation that those issues are covered, understood, discussed, and a decision with a rationale comes out so that when the Board is reviewing it after its been through the GNSO's review, that basically we are able to look at each of those issues, see that they were covered, see the rationales for the decision either one way, another way, or some middle way was taken. But that still leaves that recommendation in the hands.

And then if it's not covered or if there's aspects of it that aren't covered, those are those occasions when, you know, the to and fro,

---

back and forth between the Board and the Council happen in terms of asking questions, finding understandings, perhaps asking that something be looked at further if, indeed, an aspect wasn't covered.

But I think the whole practice that we have developed is that, you know -- as long as those things are covered and fully understood and thought out, that's where it belongs and that's how it's dealt with. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Avri.

I just want to pick up on a couple of points that have been made in chat. Let's scroll back. Sam, if you wanted to speak, or Keith.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Donna, this is Sam. Can you hear me okay?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, I can, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Hi, everyone. Thanks for this interesting discussion. This is Sam Demetriou from VeriSign. I'll speak to my point in the chat to keep the conversation going, which is I think there's an interesting question here about -- just generally about how review team recommendations reach their end of life, if you will, how a recommendation eventually gets closed out, especially if it gets referred down to a different part of

---

the ICANN ecosystem, right? So the recommendation that maybe gets referred to policy development, what -- is there a process and, if there is, what does that process look like to track that recommendation and see it through to a conclusion.

DONNA AUSTIN: Avri, I assume that's an old hand. Chris, did you want to --

AVRI DORIA: It is old. I just took it down and put it back up.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sneaky, Avri, sneaky.

AVRI DORIA: May I say a couple of words.

I forgot. What can I say?

I think on that one, one of the things that I said is since we've got the reviews and such and we have to follow through with them, I think that the ultimate process, though, is that the next review basically looks at what we've done, looks at what Org has done, and looks what policy has done, and basically makes a decision did they follow through, is there something further we need to do. Are we going to as a review say, yes, we agree it was done? No, we don't.

---

So I think the interim policy -- interim practice is for the Board that's holding this review set of advice and the bylaws obligation to process it all does follow through, does ask questions.

And then, yes, at a certain point, if we get back a fully clarified policy answer that says yay or nay, we may put it to rest. But it remains there for the next cycle of the review as one of its main responsibility is to check on the work.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Avri.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, thanks. Thanks, Donna. I just wanted to respond.

I think -- I'm going to speak -- Becky spoke personally. I'm going to speak personally, and I'm going to be blunt.

I don't think that it's right for reviews to be making recommendations that supporting organizations should do things. The bylaws clearly state that the reviews are supposed to make recommendations to the Board.

And I think that the only thing that we can do with those recommendations, if we get them, is simply to say to -- in your case the GNSO, This is what the review team said. Over to you. And that is an end to the matter.

---

What a review team should do, I think, is if they want -- if they want something to happen that needs to happen, the GNSO recommend that the Board simply ask the GNSO to consider doing something about it. But at the end of the day, it's the GNSO or the ccNSO or the ASO's decision.

And I just think we need to remember what these reviews are supposed to be about and that they are meant to be recommendations to the Board, not to the SOs.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Chris, on that point, is there an opportunity for the Board to do that with the SSR2, to remind them that that is -- actually understanding this is your personal opinion, perhaps not the Board's.

Well, everyone in the community at the moment is in the position of providing feedback to the SSR2 about their recommendations. And we've obviously -- obviously we will take issue with recommendations that call for contractual changes or are looking to bypass any policy process.

But is there an opportunity to provide a reminder to the review team that's active what the expectation is? It's just -- I don't know.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

There's always an opportunity. I will -- I will see -- I will ask the Board when we come to discuss it if we want to take that opportunity.

---

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Chris.

Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Hi, Donna. Thank you. Hi, everybody. Keith Drazek.

So I typed it in the chat, but I will just reinforce it here, is that I think it's important looking ahead if there are going to be recommendations from review teams or advice from advisory committees referred to an SO for consideration in policy development work that the recommendations be referred to the SO itself or the GNSO or GNSO Council in this particular case and not directly from the Board to the PDP working group.

And I am happy to be corrected if I have this wrong, but I believe that the Board in referring some of the CCT RT recommendations referred some things to the GNSO Council and some things directly to the subsequent procedures group.

And regardless, if that's -- I think moving ahead, it's just really important, I think, for the SO and the policy council of the SO to have the ability to assess them before they end up in the laps of a particular PDP working group.

And I'll give the specific example that we've discussed here around the subsequent procedures PDP working group, which is looking to develop policy and eventually implementation recommendations for the next round of gTLDs.

---

But if there's an expectation that the DNS abuse-related items would apply to all gTLDs or all registries or contracted parties, that the subsequent procedures PDP is not the appropriate venue to do that because those new consensus policies wouldn't be retroactive or binding on the more than a thousand legacy TLDs that we have now.

And so I just want to just make that comment. It's an issue that we've been discussing related to subsequent procedures and the CCT and also now the SSR2 recommendations. Where is the appropriate venue? And what's the appropriate structure for addressing those that wouldn't essentially single out the newcomers for disparate treatment. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Keith.

Jeff, I'll hand it back to you to wrap it up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Oh, great. Okay. Thanks.

Yeah, so -- and I think Keith did a really good job, too, in that last point, because yesterday, when we were -- just to give an example, when Sub Pro was talking about DNS abuse, we did -- with the GAC, we did relay the point that it looks like the working group is going to, for the reasons that Keith mentioned, is likely to say that, you know, while we recognize the issue of DNS abuse, we think this is better dealt with

---

on a community-wide basis where it can apply to all registries and not just the new ones that come, you know, in a few years from now.

The GAC thought that -- or I shouldn't say the GAC. Some members of the GAC took that as that we were ignoring GAC advice on the issue, and when that's obviously not the case.

So at the end of the day, I think this is kind of a -- just to wrap it up, it is about setting the right expectations with the community as a whole, about clarifying the roles of review teams vis-a-vis the policy processes and contracts. And I think after this discussion, hopefully, we can then create some action items to just communicate back to the community.

Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jeff. And thanks to everybody that contributed to that conversation. Obviously, it's a very important one for our stakeholder group, if not public.

David McAuley, I'll hand it over to you with the IRP question.

Are you with us, David?

I don't see David --

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I don't see him, either, Donna.

---

DONNA AUSTIN: So I'll take this question on David's behalf.

So -- Oh, Franco says stand by. We're getting him back online.

So maybe --

DAVID McAULEY: Donna, it's David. Can you hear me now?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, we can.

DAVID McAULEY: I apologize for that glitch.

I am okay to go ahead. Thank you very much.

And I would like to say hello, everyone. This is David McAuley speaking. I am a member of Verisign's policy team and a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group and I'd like to add my welcome to the members of the board, to my colleagues from the Registry Stakeholder Group, and to observers.

And you can see on the screen that I'm going to be asking a question about the establishment of the IRP standing panel. I would like to restate the question just a little bit from the way it appears on the screen so that I might wrap in some context from the bylaw.

But I do promise this will be brief.

---

And then after any members of the board comment, if any of my colleagues have follow-up questions, please just put your hand up in the queue.

But the question that I want to state is roughly along these lines, and that is that the ICANN bylaws call for the establishment of a standing IRP panel of members who will be trained in the workings and management of the Internet's unique identifiers and who will have knowledge, developed over time, regarding the DNS and ICANN's mission, work, policies, practices, and procedures. It seems that such a standing panel is even more important now that IRP decisions are binding, enforceable, and will set precedent.

With those considerations in mind, could you please give a status update on the establishment of the IRP standing panel, including time line, remaining steps, and how you prioritize this work.

And with that, I will say thank you and invite comments.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, David. This is Nigel Roberts. I take it you can hear me okay?

DAVID McAULEY: Yes, I can hear you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Just checking.

---

DAVID McAULEY:                    Please go ahead.

NIGEL ROBERTS:                    Well, the IRP-IOT has been rebooted and the work is proceeding apace.

We have a chair, Susan Payne. And I can tell you that org is going to publish the call for expressions of interest for the standing panel on the 16th of March 2020. They'll also publish proposed paths forward to coordinate the community work on identifying the slate of panelists from highly qualified candidates.

This proposed path forward is supported by a summary of the SO and AC inputs on the elements that are needed in the process. And the call is well aligned with what the SO and ACs have highlighted.

So the community input has indicated support for a few elements. The experts should be engaged to be involved in interviewing and slate competition recommendations, to benefit the whole community. And a group, a representative group, of SO/AC members having the following responsibilities:

Confirming the experts so that not leaving the selection of the experts fully up to ICANN Org.

Coordinating with the expert on the community role in the process.

---

And working with the expert to respond to board questions, if they arise, once a slate is proposed.

So after completion of the selections using this process -- and the time line, again, I'll come back to in a second -- the process we are going to use will be reviewed to see if it worked and if it's appropriate. And reviews should also be conducted to confirm that the appointed standing panelists are effective in upholding the purposes of the IRP, as you stated when you referred to the bylaws just then.

Biggest point of all: Independence. That has been a universally noted requirement for panelists. Pretty obvious, but it bears saying loud and clear.

So what the org has begun coordination with the IRP provider, ICDR, for outreach to them, and the other arbitral networks to interest -- attract interested and qualified candidates. And we all should urge everybody in the community with access to people with these skills to highlight the opportunity.

Sorry for going on a little bit here, but the information is key.

Finally, the time line.

The call for expressions of interest is likely to be open for a four-month window, during which org is going to work with the community to coordinate the processes that are needed for evaluation of the candidates once that window closes.

I hope that's of some help.

---

Thanks.

DAVID McAULEY:

Thank you very much, Nigel. And that is very helpful.

I don't see any hands in the queue, and so, Donna, I'm going to hand it back to you. Again, apologies for the glitch on getting off mute.

But thanks very much, Nigel and members of the board.

And, Donna, back to you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks very much, David. Another issue for contracted parties as well, so it's good to hear that progress is being made in setting up the standing panel.

I don't think I have my colleague Lucky on the call. So it looks like this one's over to me.

Okay.

I -- as chair of the stakeholder group, I recently wrote a letter to Maarten, as chair of the ICANN board, seeking some intervention from the board to allow -- in the first instance, by way of a mechanism that's available in the registry agreement, for the board to develop a -- agree a process for the release of IGO acronyms. We have raised this issue with the board a couple of times. We have instances where registry operators have received requests from IGOs to release the acronym to their use of the second level, or we have third parties that

---

have made representations to the registry operator to release an acronym at the second level with the express approval of the IGO in question. But we haven't been able to release that because of a temporary reservation that's been in place from the board for about seven years now. And also, you know, we've been waiting on the outcome of a policy process that we're still waiting on the outcome of.

And this issue has come up again because we've -- in Lucky's situation, Lucky is -- works for .AFRICA. And the Africa Union is looking to use AU.AFRICA, and they're unable to because of this restriction.

I know we have other examples as well. And folks can talk to that if they want to during this.

But we're a little bit disappointed with the response letter that we received from the board. But I'd like to understand a little bit more from Maarten what he sees as the -- you know, some of the issues from the board's perspective about what is standing between us, you know, being allowed to -- just as a short-term solution, to allow the use of IGO acronyms at the second level for the IGOs themselves, if they request it from the registry operator, and a third party that also has the express agreement from the -- the IGO itself. I mean, from our perspective, we don't see that this -- releasing these IGO acronyms would be inconsistent with the GAC advice. So we're just -- we'd like to understand a little better about where the board is on this and how we work to get a solution to this.

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Donna. As you wrote in your letter, indeed, the suggestion in itself is, of course, very thoughtful. And we are aware that it's a long-standing issue.

But if we listen back to the first part of our discussion here, it's how do new recommendations affect policies and policies effectively. So we need to look into that and be very careful to consider the implications of this request on the policy work that remains with the GNSO.

It's our intent after this week to have the Board Caucus Group meet and discuss all the community work to date, with view to advising the board on all potential paths forward on the outstanding GNSO policy recommendations that go back as far as 2013, as far as the for creative right policy recommendations sent in 2019 by the GNSO.

So I would say that we should consider your suggestions in that context.

As you made very clear and as Jeff expressed so eloquently in the beginning, it's so important to explicitly address possibly implied changes to existing policies when the community comes with new proposals.

So in that way, it may even help now to explain how the Registry Stakeholder Group suggestion to allow IGOs to register the IGO's acronym work as a matter of contract when the GNSO policy recommendations that are still valid from 2013 are against this. And once that (indiscernible) from that is in the Registry Stakeholder Group consideration and in developing this proposal, were there any

---

potentially unforeseen consequences or implications identified as how it might also affect how the board can resolve the outstanding policy questions.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Maarten, I -- I mean, I -- personally, I have a pretty good understanding of where the policy processes are with this because of the time that I had on the GNSO Council. But what would be helpful to me, and I think others in the stakeholder group, is to understand where the board sees that there is still a problem in terms of outstanding policy and the GAC advice.

Now, my understanding is that the board said some time ago that they do not agree that, you know, IGO acronyms should be reserved, you know, forever. They don't see that the IGO themselves has rights to those acronyms. And I think Bruce did a very good job of pulling that out during a session that we had with -- that the council had with members of the GAC. I think it was Copenhagen.

So we -- you know, this has done the rounds of the kitchen. So I think what's really important for the SG to understand at this point is what the board sees as outstanding. Because at the moment, the immediate response that we want is just the ability for IGOs to be able to use the -- or registry operators to at least be allowed to release the IGO acronym at the second level to the IGO itself. And to me, that doesn't seem to be in the way of any policy or necessarily it's not inconsistent with the GAC advice.

---

Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Donna.

Can you believe we're still talking about this after all these years?

DONNA AUSTIN: That's why it's see frustrating, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I'm going to try and do two things, Donna. I'm going to try and deal with some possible issues with your suggestion. That doesn't -- I'm not -- I'm not going to preempt anything, but I'm going to raise at least one point that occurs to me that we'll needs to consider. It doesn't change the fact that I think it's a useful and good suggestion.

Secondly, I'll try and respond to your point about the policy and what needs to be done.

In respect to the first thing, I guess one of the things we would have to consider is, as Maarten has said, what the -- the side effects might be.

So I understand that there are -- shall I call them outliers for a moment? I know that Lucky wants to have a AU.AFRICA, although I wonder if Australia might object to that, but leaving that aside.

And, obviously, AU.AFRICA fits. But how would you decide which gTLD to let an IGO have their acronym in without creating, in effect, a

---

first -- a reservation for them, a first right of refusal, if you like? And what would stop IGO XYZ, A, from registering in every gTLD? Does that not actually defeat the purpose of the board saying in the first place that they didn't think the idea of reserving the acronyms was sensible?

I'm not saying anything more than I'm thinking about that. And I haven't come up with any sorts of mechanisms to deal with it or thoughts about why it might not be a problem. But it is certainly something that would flow from the suggestion that you've made.

In respect to the bigger issue of the policy itself, the current situation, as I understand it, is that we have got conflicting advice in respect to one piece of the puzzle. We've got advice from the GAC which effectively says the name should be reserved. And we've said we won't do that. And we've got advice from the GNSO, which, obviously, is conflicting with that. And we've also got an ongoing issue in respect to the curative rights.

Those two things do need to be dealt with. There is a Board Caucus. The board is trying to get -- to get things to move forwards. And the GNSO has, obviously, got the issue with -- I think it was fifth recommendation that came with the last PDP which was problematic. And the board also needs to look at whether recommendations one to four from that PDP conflict in any way with the GAC advice, or, alternatively, are acceptable to the IGOs. Because if they're not, then that's simply going to lead to GAC advice that will conflict with those four recommendations. So whichever way you look at it, you end up with conflict.

---

And that ends up in situation where the board is forced to make its own decision, eventually. So I think that's the sort of statement of where we are. I know as long as you do how long it's been going on, and I'm as keen as you are to get it sorted out. And I apologize for not having any magic bullets for you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Chris. A magic bullet would have been appreciated.

So I guess at this point, we'll leave it until the board has had an opportunity to caucus on this. And if I could ask that, you know, once that's done, that you come back to the Registry Stakeholder Group and let us know what your position is then, and then we can move forward on that.

But I would -- you know, for some registry operators, this is an immediate concern. And I do understand from Lucky that the Australian government does not have a problem with --

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I wasn't suggesting seriously that they --

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, I know. But we are in -- And I appreciate what you've said. And we need to be careful. We hold the line when it's convenient with something that's policy or breaking our contract. So that has to work both ways.

---

We thought that, you know, this -- what we were suggesting was -- is not inconsistent with GAC advice, and therefore wouldn't necessarily be problematic. But....

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Think about -- it may be a solution. But think about how you would pare it down a little bit so that you were not allowing, in essence, an open slather, but what you were doing was saying, in certain circumstances -- this would be work -- but in certain circumstances where there is an obvious match maybe it would be possible to release a name on a one-off basis.

But, I mean, just have a think about that, and, obviously, we'll look at it the same way.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Terrific. Thanks, Chris.

I don't think we have any -- Edmon has a comment in chat.

So maybe what Edmon is putting in chat, if that side effect is the gap, the registry can put in place a policy to allow the challenge that can make it work. It does not require ICANN to make any further policy. Those considerations should already be in, and he said that (indiscernible) TLD, .e.g., new IDN language/script being released.

So maybe we do have some -- we need to just do a little bit more homework on issues that address the board's concerns.

---

Excuse me.

So thanks for that, Chris.

Kurt, I'm going to hand it over to you for the last question that we have for the board.

KURT PRITZ:

Great. Thanks very much, Donna. And thanks, Maarten and board members, for your time here.

My name is Kurt Pritz. I work with the .ART registry. And you've read the fourth question at the bottom of the slide there about preparations for the new gTLD round.

Just as a brief introduction, so like many other efforts, the time line to launch the next round of TLDs has been dramatically extended and well past the community deadline, set deadline of one year beyond the close of the previous application round.

And these delays seem to serve to denigrate the reputation of the multistakeholder model, especially in one of its most visible efforts. And, you know, we noted in the previous year's budgeting there was public consternation that funding to plan the launch of the next round was eliminated.

We think, you know, it's appropriate that ICANN undertake some of the long-term tasks now to minimize the hit on the timetable and our collective reputations for accomplishment. You know, these might

---

include starting the vendor selection processes for design and construction of what are going to be complex and secure systems.

So we think that there's precedent for starting some implementation activities in parallel with policy development in order to be efficient and operate at speeds needed by the speed of the Internet.

And, finally, I just want to comment that these are -- these RySG comments are coming from a stakeholder group where another round is split. So this isn't for -- necessarily in self-interest, but that all the members of the stakeholder group want to create a plan that keeps the multistakeholder model moving.

So we'd look forward to comments that indicate that ICANN is undertaking some of these implementation activities in parallel with the conclusion of the policy development process.

Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks very much.

I think that Avri and then -- I don't know if it's Goran or Russ have responses to this.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. Avri again.

Yeah. So we've actually taken that conversation very much as input for over a year or two now in terms of basically looking at what it

---

would take to implement, but realizing that there is nothing to implement until the PDP ends, it's been through the GNSO, and it's been through the board approval process.

Now, to try and help the board process along, we've not only been following the work of the -- of the PDP, but we've, now that we believe that we have an actual delivery date coming up -- actually, we've believed it several times, but this time, we really, really believe it -- that -- we've started to basically go through with the board each of the issues that has been discussed, especially those that were controversial. We're basically getting into a routine of having periodic, moving into almost weekly, meetings on the various topics so that we will be ready and up to speed as quickly as possible once we get it so that we can follow through with the approval.

Now, in the meantime, and parallel to that, and something that the org has brought to the board quite frequently, the org has been looking at its planning.

And I think I'll turn you over to Goran -- or he can point to someone else -- to talk about his project (indiscernible) and to talk about the work that's going on in terms of figuring out the financial aspects, figuring out how and when to get them into the budget so that we are ready to go as quickly as possible.

So, Goran, please.

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you, Avri. Thank you for the question.

---

Yes, added to what Avri's been talking about, inside ICANN Org, we set up now a full-on project for this, with no fruit name. It's called Project Milky Way, so we stay on the eating side, which is really the preparation of the startup of implementation.

And we are going through internal process to make sure that when the community comes up with the policy, we can start implementing it. And this is really a little bit based on lessons learned from last time. It's practical things, like finding the best project management tool, making sure that we have the processes in place for decisions, et cetera, et cetera. And this is something I do also based on a goal which was given me to the board.

We're also looking into -- one of your questions is related to if there are things we can start doing before a potential round. And that is actually something we have on the plate to discuss and talk about. But it's also something that we need to go back to the community before we start everything of doing that, because there's also a question about financing those things.

So, to answer your question, we are preparing to sort of slowly start up things when it's necessary. And we are making that happen right now.

KURT PRITZ:

It's up to me to respond. Thanks very much, everybody, for their responses.

---

I just have slight pushback on that. I think, Avri, there's plenty to implement before the final -- before the final policy is approved because, as Goran and everybody on that side understands, there's these lessons learned from last time where, you know, infrastructure needs to be put in place regardless of whether -- what their final policy recommendations are. And, you know, I would -- you know, and this might be odd coming from me. But I sympathize with your desire to get approval from the community but push back a little bit and urge you to forge ahead wherever the operational part of this organization remit exists because I think ICANN does have the remit to go ahead and accomplish things that it anticipates where it's going to anticipate a requirement. And just like in the EPDP, where, ICANN has gone ahead and, in my opinion, purchased some cheap insurance by going ahead and establishing what might become the automated model for data disclosure, I think that was a good move to do some of that work in parallel where it can be tweaked pending the final policy recommendations that are approved. Similarly here ICANN can move ahead and do quite a bit of work to save some of the time line that's been lost already.

Anyway, if there's -- Donna is running the queue. But if there are any -  
- no other comments or questions, thanks very much for your time and your really constructive answers.

---

GORAN MARBY: Can I can you -- Thank you, Kurt. Just reminding you that we -- as you know, we have started this work but we also think it's important that you -- we do this in really close coordination with the community.

And that's why we, for instance, last year went out and actually started to talk to the community about assumptions that we can build upon to prepare. I don't know if you were part of that. But we spoke to many parts of the community, clearly the most important part of that was the sub pro, which was our first planning place to see if there are things and systems that can be built. Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Yep. Thanks for that Goran.

Back to you, Donna and Becky.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Kurt. And thanks for the engagement on that question. I think it's -- it is good to know that prep work is going on.

Becky, we don't have this question on the -- as a topic, but I think there is interest from our stakeholder group and potentially the registrars as well to understand, you know, if the Board has a deadline for when they're going to make a decision about the GDD Summit or whether they've had conversations about that.

BECKY BARR: Thanks, Donna.

---

And we are getting -- we are getting increasing questions about this, and I know it is an issue that is on the Board's list for discussion shortly.

I would like to turn over to somebody from Org to --

GORAN MARBY:

I will take this. Thank you. And thank you, Donna.

So I think there is an invitation going out today, or it's already gone out, to invite the contracted parties to have a discussion about GDD Summit because we really want to have your input before we make any decisions about the GDD Summit.

Apparently, right now the World Health Organization just declared that corona is now a pandemic, if I understand it correctly. Regardless of that, we would like to have the conversation with you.

Later the same day, the Board will have a discussion as well about what to do next in the -- when it comes to the -- not only GDD but also where we're looking into all the other meetings we have planned including Kuala Lumpur -- but there's a lot of different interactions with that -- and also discuss how we can engage with the broader community about any decision that has to be made over the next couple of months.

But to answer your question, before we make any decisions about GDD Summit, we will -- we would like to talk to you. And Russ and

---

Karen are reaching out to you about that. I hope it answers your question.

DONNA AUSTIN: It does, thanks, Goran. And Russ has been in contact with me, and I passed it on to the stakeholder group.

I think just for the record, I wanted to raise it here as well. So we look forward to talking to you next Tuesday.

GORAN MARBY: It is a very fair question, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Goran.

So, Becky, I'll hand it back to you now because I think it's to the Board questions.

BECKY BURR: Thanks, Donna. And thanks for that interesting discussion.

If we can go to the Board topics, I will introduce them. We're really looking for your input here.

In particular, it's important to us to understand sort of what the priorities of the stakeholder groups and the SOs and ACs are. We know that there is a lot on everybody's plate and that resources are stretched pretty thin.

---

So it's critical for us to understand priorities here. And then second -- and I think these are somewhat related so I thought it might be sensible to introduce them both at the same time -- is our strategic plan is intended and designed to be a living document, not a document on a shelf. So we have plans to update it regularly and we are reaching out to constituencies within the ICANN community to make sure we understand your views on whether changes have taken place that suggest that there's need for either major or minor updates to the strategic plan.

So we would just love to hear from the Registry Stakeholder Group on these two topics.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Becky.

On the first question, key priorities for the Registry Stakeholder Group, can we click to the next slide, please? Thank you.

So this is -- this is our current list of activities and in no order of prioritization. But just to give the Board an understanding of some of the discussions that we're having within the Registry Stakeholder Group or where some of our resources are currently active.

Obviously, we -- so the bylaw and charter amendments, that's internal work that we're doing for the Registry Stakeholder Group bylaw and charter. We became incorporated under Florida law -- I don't know -- maybe two years ago now. And we've been undertaking a process to bring our bylaws and charter into line with that Florida

---

incorporation. It's taking a lot longer than we thought it would because we hit some hurdles along the way. But that's something we have been actively doing for some time.

EPDP phase 2, so we have representatives that are assigned to that. So as anyone on this call will know, that's almost a full-time job. So we have people dedicated to that.

And then there's the implementation phase of EPDP phase 1. So we have a really active group in that.

We kicked off the RA and RAA amendment process, I think it was, back in August. That hasn't been going as smoothly as we would have liked. Some of that -- that's on us and we are trying to become more efficient in the way that we're doing our work.

IGO acronyms we just spoke about.

IDNs, there's a number of different things that are going on in that area, and the GNSO is looking at some things. We've had some conversations with Russ and his team about challenges with guidelines.

We have people that have been actively working on the IRP IOT for -- I don't know how long that's been going on but for quite some time.

Obviously DNS is an important topic across the community. We have a number of different discussions that we're having within the stakeholder group.

---

I'd say that this is a priority for us, and we understand at a metalevel we need to do better as registry operators explaining to the community what we actually do in response to DNS abuse and how we manage some of those issues.

So we're exploring a number of different options within that category of discussion. And we've had a discussion group that just hit their one-year anniversary that's been looking at the DAAR information and coming up with some ideas about how that could be better presented so it's more meaningful once it's out there in the community. And that's an effort that a group that's been working closely Amr Elsadr in particular and John Crain from OCTO. So that's a conversation that's been going on there.

The public comment processes, I mean, that's almost a full-time job. Our VP of policy, Sam Demetriou, manages that. And it's not just for us, I'm sure it's across the community. But that's a full-time effort almost.

We have obviously our GNSO Council reps and Keith as the chair. I'd say that is a full-time gig. And the CSC as well, we have two representatives appointed to that.

I think we also have somebody on the RSSAC. We recently made appointments to the RSSAC Governance Working Committee, so that's another effort that's going on.

And then if we start to look ahead on the horizon, then we're going to have the implementation of the EPDP phase 2 and sub pro. Those of

---

us that were around when the 2012 recommendations came out and ICANN started to implement -- Org. Through the evaluation phase within the Registry Stakeholder Group, there was a group called the NTAG, which was the New TLD Applicant Group and that was the interface with the implementation side. So we see that on the horizon. That probably will kick in sometime towards the end of the year, but it's something that's on the horizon for us.

The Registry Stakeholder Group meets every other week. So we have a two-hour call every other week, and we do regular updates and we assign -- particularly with the public comment processes, Sam will take us through the documents and try to start that process for getting substantive comments back.

So I just wanted to give the Board a flavor of some of our activities. And as I say, they're not really in any order of prioritization but just to give you a sense of some of the things that we're dealing on a -- it's pretty much a day-to-day basis.

Thanks, Becky.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Donna. Any comments either from the Board or the Registry Stakeholder Group on this?

I notice that some items like the evolution of the multistakeholder model system is not on the list of -- this is current -- this is activity, so it's hard for us to know how it relates to priorities other than there's a

---

lot of activities on the plate right now, I guess. And maybe that's an indication of where bandwidth is. I don't know if I should infer that.

I see Sam's hand there.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Becky.

Just to address the point about evolving the multistakeholder model specifically, I wanted to just let you know -- let you guys all know that the stakeholder group did submit some comments on the latest work plan that was included as part of the -- I'm going to get this title wrong, but the fiscal year '21 through '25 operating plan and budget and more words in that title. We submitted a comment on evolving the MSM draft plan separately.

It is something that we have been -- we've been focused on and we've discussed a lot as a stakeholder group.

The comments on that sort of boil down to our observation that there are a number of activities that are currently under way that address many of the issues that were identified in the evolving ICANN's multistakeholder model effort. A lot of the topics that Brian had pulled out that we discussed as a community over the past year or so we think can be addressed by things like the PDP 3.0 effort that the GNSO Council has under way and other -- other work streams.

And so in the larger context of needing to give some serious thought to how we prioritize our work and noting that resources are limited,

---

we suggest that some of these efforts be allowed to sort of mature and play out a little bit before initiating additional work per the work plan suggestions, right? So before gathering -- or appointing individual groups within the community to try to develop more solutions, maybe there are solutions that are already in place and we should just see sort of how those play out.

That is something that has been on our mind. We have submitted comments that capture that a little bit better than I think I just did right here. But I hope that answers your question about that specifically.

BECKY BURR:

No, that's extremely helpful. Thank you.

And we, of course, have been aware that, you know, it's important to let PDP 3.0 roll out and iterate on that. So obviously not wanting to step on that effort at all seems like it is a very useful way to proceed.

I see Matthew's hand there and Donna also. I think Donna is first in order and then Matthew.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Becky.

I guess I just wanted to make the point that we don't -- we're dealing more with the things that impact the registry operation. So the public comment responses is where we generally have discussion on the bigger-picture things as Sam just said.

---

So one of the realities -- and I think this came out during the interaction that Graeme and I had with you and the Board in Montreal is the registry operators don't necessarily have a lot of resources to dedicate to ICANN-related activities.

So some of these bigger-picture things, like the multistakeholder model and maybe PDP 3.0 to a lesser extent, and even the strategic plan, it's not something that we have the luxury to spend a lot of time on because we're focused on these other day-to-day things that impact the business operations.

And I think that's probably an important point for the Board to understand, is that, you know, what you see on the screen at the moment is probably those things that impact our business. The multistakeholder model we certainly support it, we understand the importance of it, but perhaps we don't have the resources or the luxury of time that other groups may have to devote ample opportunity to discuss those things in great length, except when they come up as part of a public comment process.

Thanks, Becky.

BECKY BARR:

Thanks.

Matthew.

---

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes. Thanks. Thanks, Donna and Sam, on your comments on the multistakeholder evolution.

We are very cognizant of the issue of resources that can be brought to bear on -- in particular on this initiative. And there is no doubt a common theme that's running through the responses that we've seen so far which is very much we need to see how some of these initiatives, such as PDP 3.0, play out because they're seen as a key ingredient by the community in terms of achieving some of the goals of the multistakeholder model evolution as it goes forward.

So I completely understand where you're coming from. And I think as we further develop this and explore which areas make sense to pursue, keeping the notion of minimizing the burden on the community is going to be forefront in our minds. Thanks.

BECKY BARR: Thanks very much.

Donna, new hand? Old hand? I think it's an old hand.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, Becky, old hand.

BECKY BARR: Kurt.

---

KURT PRITZ:

I just want to re-emphasize something that Donna said. You know, Becky when you were asking about some of the concerns at the Board level such as the evolution of the multistakeholder model, I want to recall that one of your first comments at the start of this meeting went to DNS abuse-related activities and some of the input the Board had received from other quarters during this meeting.

And so I want to indicate and emphasize that a lot of the RySG time, in fact, significant portions of our biweekly meeting are dedicated to extended discussions around DNS abuse. So we have -- you know, we're exploring -- and so I don't want these activities to sort of be lost in the sauce or not recognized. You know, I want them to be recognized at least by the Board.

So, you know, we're exploring dinner methods of sharing information, such as a trusted network, which is really difficult for us with all our business and trade secrets that need to be kept but wanting to work together to understand how to best approach DNS abuse and develop -- we're developing a process to improve voluntary public interest commitments.

We're working with ICANN and amongst ourselves to get a common understanding of the requirements of Spec 11 (3)(b) in a follow-up to the registry audit. We want to settle that so it's really clear for us, especially the community.

And as was indicated later, we have this DAAR discussion group which is making recommendations to ICANN about how the DAAR reports

---

can be improved so that the data and the reports actually provide some sort of actionable data that we can -- we can work on.

So amongst those activities you mentioned, those sort of community-wide activities, I really want to emphasize that the RySG spends lots of time on DNS abuse and how to address it.

Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks very much.

Just in case this did not come across clearly, the Board is very much aware of the work that the Registry Stakeholder Group and the registrars as well are doing within the community and independently on this abuse issue, we're watching closely the various collaboration work. And I think there's a little bit of a love fest going on for the -- mutual admiration going on in the chat over the DAAR cooperation. So that is a very big topic on everybody's plate here.

And we certainly do -- everyone has a variety of different roles here. The multistakeholder model has a role here, but the contracted parties' work is a very important feature of this piece of the puzzle that we appreciate the work that's going on.

Kristine and then Maarten.

---

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Becky. This is Kristine. But I first wanted -- Maarten, if your point was responding to Kurt, I am happy to defer to you because I am going to make a different point.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Okay. This is Kristine Dorrain.

So super excited to see this as one of the topics the Board wanted to talk about because as you can see our very first slide actually mentioned many of the same things, like, how do we deal with this kind of onslaught of recommendations.

One of the things that you will see is that the Registry Stakeholder Group has taken to putting in its public comments specifically for the ATRT3 and the SSR2 a recommendation that not every recommendation coming out of those RTs needs to be high priority, asking them to really think about how to pare that down with an eye toward the community workload.

So we talked about it a little bit earlier today as far as not reiterating recommendations from other review teams or trying to look at what work is already being done and just not even making a recommendation because something is already being handled or is already being done.

---

So those are some of the things that the Registry Stakeholder Group is doing in pushing back a bit on the various community work to try to have a broader understanding in the community and a prioritization within the review team who has that expert knowledge of the amount of work that they're thinking whatever their recommendation will take, to really push back on them and tell them please prioritize your work more effectively. That will allow the Board and the rest of the community to also prioritize. And perhaps if the Board is willing to reach out to sort of the SSR2 or any other review teams to make some recommendations about their recommendations, that could be part of it as well. Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Kristine.

I mean, I just want to sort of remind people that we did put out this discussion document and we will come back with it on those sort of framework for effective recommendations that does talk about sort of evidence-based recommendations that articulate -- that clearly articulate sort of what success or what completion looks like that in their formulation contemplate the implementation challenges.

And I think all of these things are incredibly important. We may see recommendations coming out of ATRT3 that change certain reviews. But nonetheless, to the extent that there are recommendations, we really -- the Board feels that it's incredibly important to be thinking about how to make those recommendations more effective and more

---

implementable. And that raises all of the issues we've just identified, Kristine.

Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, no, thanks for that, both Kristine and you said things that I wanted to highlight as well.

I think what you indicated early on is that we are very cognizant of the fact that we are also very busy. And there's a lot on our plate.

While that is true, if we don't invest in making things better, we will spend so much time on doing things in ways that we can no longer afford. So we really need to find the middle way between doing our current work and investing in the future to make our work together in the future better.

So, therefore, I really, yeah, do urge you to also continue to pay attention to these evaluations going on, these reviews on how to get things better, and to contribute also to the discussion of the multistakeholder model as well as keeping up with the strategic plan as well as the important discussion on how we can do better with all these recommendations, prioritization, and budgeting.

How to find a middle way is something we are all struggling with to find a balance because we know the train is running and we can't stop the train to improve the whole interior or whatever, the way we work.

---

But, really, let's continue to keep a keen eye on this and very much appreciate your remarks on that as well. So thanks.

BECKY BARR: Thanks, Maarten.

And, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky. Just an observation in terms of prioritization, I think the community needs to be congratulated on their ability to quickly identify what should be prioritized in terms of a virtual meeting.

I think the sessions were cut from 217 to 70, so that was a sacrifice for, I know, a lot of community groups just working together in understanding what were the priority items that needed to be covered during this meeting, understanding it would be scaled back.

And, Maarten, to your point, perhaps we did have an opportunity to slow down the train this week and focus a little bit on what the community decided were priorities that we needed to discuss this week.

So maybe we can take a little bit more out of this virtual meeting in the way that the community was able to prioritize issues in the circumstances that we had in front of us.

So maybe some good stuff came out. I think a lot of good things from this week. But the way that the community understood that we

---

needed to do a slash and burn and the way it was done, the community should be congratulated. Thanks.

BECKY BARR:

Yes. And I hope that came across in my opening comments.

We -- it was a very difficult decision for the Board to come to the conclusion that it was necessary to move this to a remote -- a virtual meeting.

But I think I speak on behalf of the entire Board and Org in saying the way that the community came together to make this work has been truly impressive and getting the programming down, the community's decision to take that on and make it work has been an incredibly important piece of this.

And as Maarten says in the chat, it could not have worked without the excellent cooperation of the community, and that is absolutely true.

So with that, we are at the end of the session. And I've sort of summed up, I think, what we have to say. Donna, I'll turn it over to you for short, final words.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thank you for the opportunity for the engagement. I was a little bit concerned without our registrar colleagues that we wouldn't be able to fill the 90 minutes, but I think we've had some really good discussion and I think it's been appreciated by the stakeholder group. So thanks, Becky, Maarten, and the rest of the Board.

---

BECKY BARR: Thanks to everybody. See you around the virtual meeting.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks, bye-bye.

BECKY BARR: Bye.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The recording has stopped.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**