ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum - GNSO - RrSG Membership Meeting
Monday, June14, 2021 - 10:30 to 12:00 CEST

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Ashley, this is Nathalie from staff again. I see we're two minutes past.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sure, let's get it going.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

Dustin, Derek, please start the recording.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hello, and welcome to the GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group membership session.

Please note this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be only read aloud if put in the proper form, as will be noted in the chat shortly. I'll read questions and comments out loud during the time set by the chair

or moderator of the session. Interpretation for this session will include Chinese and English. Click on the Interpretation icon in Zoom and click on the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English.

When speaking, please be sure to mute all devices and notifications. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

And with that I'll hand the floor over to Ashley Heineman. Please begin.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hello, everybody. Welcome to ICANN71. I am still waking up, so bear with me, but the good news is this is a bit of a different meeting today. Today is our General Assembly!

Now that we are an official association perjure man law, we have a number of requirements, and that includes this General Assembly. But we'll get to that.

First of all, let's take a look at our agenda, which is up on the screen. We have a very groggy welcome and update from myself and some others. Then we have our General Assembly. We'll see how much time that takes, but that will be, I think, a good chunk of our meeting today and will have its own separate agenda, which we'll look at shortly.

Then we have a presentation today from a guest speaker from the Internet and Jurisdiction Project. They are going to give us a much belated, and my apologies for that, but a briefing on their DNS abuse toolkit. For those of you who may not be aware, Liz is going to walk us through that. And then we're going to have any other business and open questions.

So hopefully everybody is okay with this agenda. If not, let me know, and we'll do our best, if there's anything else you would like to talk about, if we have additional time, we will do our best to get to it.

So any questions?

Okay. Could we go to the next slide, Zoe.

Okay. So our welcome and updates.

So I am going to turn over -- well, first of all, these are our updates as you can see here. Elections, Phase 2a initial report, enabling DAAR for registrar data, and a reminder to pay your membership fees.

But I'm going to turn it over to Eric now to give us the update on the elections. So, Eric, if you're awake, please go ahead.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Thank you, Ashley.

Good morning, good evening, and good afternoon. I'm jumping that, so, yeah, I'm obviously off to a great start.

Hi everyone from Massachusetts in the United States. It's 4:30 in the morning for me, so if I don't make any sense, I apologize. I will do my best.

So again, thanks. Hi, everyone. Your secretary here. Just a reminder, I had sent a Notice of Nominations and Election Period. We're ready to kick that off, so hooray. As you know, we've got

members representing our stakeholder group, and we serve certain terms, either one- or two-year terms depending on the position.

So up for nomination, we have three positions. We have our Nominating Committee, the NomCom position, that was currently being held by Tobias. And then we have our two GNSO Council representatives that we need to fill. Currently those positions are held by Greg DiBiase and Pam Little.

If you look at the email, I sent to the membership list, they kind of break down a little bit, just explain the situation. You know, again, Greg had replaced Darcy Southwell back in late 2019, and so he actually hasn't served his two terms yet. So he is eligible to run for two terms. He has stated he plans to run again, so thank you, Greg. And I see there's already been some chatter on the email thread, so I appreciate that.

And finally, Pam has proudly served us for the two terms, so I just want to commend Pam Little for representing the Registrar Stakeholder Group on the GNSO Council. So thank you, Pam, for your service. And now we need some help, and we're looking for someone to step up. So anyone who is interested, absolutely, I'm sure you can talk to Pam or Greg or Kristian or other GNSO Council representative if you have any questions. Of course you can refer

to our charter. We've got some -- in there, if you recall, there are some description of the positions. But again, if you have questions about them, directly you can reach out to any of our GNSO Council members: Tobias for NomCom, or, of course, any other member of the Ex Com. We're sure to explain as best they can.

So again, we have the nomination period starting this week. It's going until Friday, June 18th at 1200 UTC. Hopefully we'll have nominations for the three positions. If that's the case, then we'll have a discussion period, which will last for seven days. Following that, we'll then go into a 72-hour ballot inspection with the Ex Com and of course the ballot period will begin. I will email the group, the membership of course, to keep everyone updated.

So I think that was it. Of course if there's any questions feel free to reach out to myself or Zoe. Happy to answer any questions. Or if someone didn't get the email, again, directly reach out to myself or Zoe. Happy to help.

So I will stop there. Hopefully I didn't sound too mumbly or rambling this morning. But, yeah, I'll take any questions.

Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: So while everybody who is interested is queuing up to put their name in the hat and express interest, I just wanted to say, please, please, please take this seriously. Diversity is very important to us as well. Don't be afraid. If you have the slightest bit of interest, I'm sure folks here would be happy to help in terms of explaining the roles and responsibilities. But this is very important, and we would love to have people please indicate their interest, ask questions, please. My plea to you all.

Okay. I don't see any questions, but thank you, Eric.

Be in touch, everybody, with Eric. And we'll see how this goes.

All right. Next up, EPDP Phase 2a initial report and public comment.

Zoe, remind me, who is speaking to this one?

ZOEY BOYNTHON: Hi, Ashley. Actually, no one needs to speak to it. This is just an update to say that it has gone out for public comment. And actually we will -- we'll have more time dedicated to talking about it once the RrSG draft response has been finalized by the RrSG

EPDP team. And then, yeah, at the next membership meeting on the 28th of October, we will go into much more detail.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Zoe.

All right. Well, just chugging along here with the updates, then. All right. Next up is enabling DAAR for registrar data. You may have seen some chatter, either via an ICANN blog or via our email distribution list, but, yes, it is true, we have -- ICANN has proposed a means in which registrar information can be included in the DAAR. And in a way, that is very lightweight for us. In fact, I don't believe there's really anything that we have to do. It basically would be done via an amendment to the Registry Agreement, and basically information from registries would be pulled into DAAR.

I encourage you all to look at the blog announcement. This is something that has not yet been decided, but it is something that we should discuss. Not here today, unfortunately, because we don't have the time to do so, but please do take a look at it. We can have an exchange via email, but at first blush I think this is a good thing at least for consideration, as I think us engaging in DAAR is something we have supported in terms of providing some technical fact-based discussion on the issue of DNS abuse, and having our information represented there I think is a good thing.

But I will not belabor it now, but just want to bring your attention to it.

Any questions?

Okay. With that then, I will turn it back to Zoe to remind us about membership fees.

ZOE BONYTHON: Thanks, Ashley.

So, yeah, as it says here, this is for any member obviously who hasn't managed to send through the membership fee yet. We do have 30-day payment terms, and then we have a grace period of 45 days. So unless we are speaking separately about other issues, that is the date that we -- so by 6 of July, that's next month, of course, we do need to receive them. Otherwise, after that point, we will need to revoke your membership privileges which essentially means we take you off all the lists, et cetera, until payments are received.

So, yeah. If there are any issues, reach out to me if we're not already in conversation. Otherwise, I'm sure I'll be reaching out to you. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: And a big thanks to those of you who have paid already. I assume that there have been.

So, cool.

With that, we are done with our welcome and updates. Here's your chance for any final questions or thoughts. You will have the opportunity again at the end during any other business, so don't stress if you're not quite ready yet.

I don't see any hands, but I have to say I have a lot more interpreters on my screen this time so it's a hard to see.

So I don't see any hands, so why don't we go on to the next slide, Zoe.

And here's the fun part. I'll admit, I don't know what I'm doing, but we're going to do this for the first time together. It's going to be all right.

And thankfully, thankfully, thankfully, we have Thomas Rickert here to help us through this process. So he will be doing most of the speaking.

In fact, I will go ahead and ask him to, please, I believe, kick us off, right, Zoe? And then when it is time for me to speak, which I believe is this much of this portion of the agenda, I will just ask Thomas to let me know when it's my time.

So, Thomas, you still there?

THOMAS RICKERT: I'm still there.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Awesome.

THOMAS RICKERT: Good evening, everyone.

Thanks, Ashley.

Not only is the first AGM that you have with your brand-new association but then it's 4:40 in the morning for you, so I'm more than happy to help out.

Now, for everyone, just to refresh your memories, last year in March, we have formally created the Association of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and this association which is basically you

share, let's say, to collect membership fees and support you in your policy-making, has its home at the address of my law firm. So we've incorporated the association in Germany.

At the moment, as you know, your former chairs are Volker and Theo, and then there's the Executive Committee which does all the heavy lifting. So basically Volker and Theo are installed, so to speak, to fulfill the legal requirements. They are named in the Register of Associations. But the executive committee, we have more flexibility with that. That doesn't need to be entered into the Register of Associations, and that makes it far easier with an international association working at the global level to deal with the formalities.

Also, let me preface this by saying we have set this up as a professional association which goes along with some privileges with financial reporting and all that. So that's far easier than if you were commercially active.

Now, for today, I would suggest to you that I take over the role of the chair of this meeting, not to replace Ashley but it's just the formality that we need somebody to guide you through this process. And I'm happy to do that.

We're going to take a couple of votes today, and eligible for voting are the representatives of the founding members. I've spotted, like, ten representatives of founding members in the list of attendees for this meeting.

But just to refresh everyone's memory, we have EnCirca. We have Tucows, PLISK, Realtime Register, Key Systems, 1&1 IONOS, MarkMonitor, Blacknight, Nordreg, United Domains, Brandsight, EuroDNS, Namecheap, domain.com and web.com as formal members of the association so far. So I'm sure that we will make another announcement towards the end of this AGM to encourage those who have not formally joined the association to do so, that invoicing and all that can be done properly.

As you will hear in a moment from Ashley, this last year was characterized by the pandemic, so that took all the -- all the formalities took longer as they otherwise would.

So I think when we meet next time, things are going to be more sophisticated in terms of there's more information to be reported and all that.

So the way that we're going to vote is using Zoom. And I'd like to ask the representatives of the founding members to raise their hand when I ask for a yes. Then we're going to lower the hands so

that the queue is clear. Volker is testing this right now, so that's excellent. The same goes for no votes and for abstentions, right? And I would like to ask Zoe to help capturing that.

For the first vote that we're going to take, I'm just going to ask for objections, and that is whether anyone is against me chairing this meeting.

So I will wait for a second. I don't see any hands raised. I am the duly elected chair for this meeting.

Also, let me mention we have invited -- or the Executive Committee has invited to this meeting two weeks back -- in terms of quorum, the Articles of Association -- of this association state every general assembly that has been duly convened is quorate. So we don't need all of the members present for this type of activity that we're planning today.

And, also, for the votes that we're going to take today, a simple majority will be sufficient.

And votes that -- or abstention will be counted as if the vote was not cast, right? So that's my little welcome and introduction.

Are there any questions with respect to this agenda that you see in front of you?

We have the welcome. And then Ashley is going to give you a brief report on what happened last year.

After that, we're going to hopefully approve the annual report and discharge the Board. Then the fourth item is resolution on the funds that have been transferred from the account that' been managed by John Berryhill to the bank account of the association. After that, we're going to vote on the election of Volker and Theo, or reappointment.

Then there's going to be the election of the EX COM, the election of the cash auditor who is actually going to have a little bit of work to do next year, and then miscellaneous.

So let me pause for a second.

Eric.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Thank you, Thomas. This is Eric.

So question, sounds like with the founding members, there may be -- maybe it's outdated as far as for domain.com and web.com. Recently, there was an acquisition to merge those two companies. I don't know how that will factor into the voting process. So I don't think I should be voting twice. So I just wanted to confirm how we want to handle that.

THOMAS RICKERT: I think every company just has one vote. So you would have one vote, Eric. And I think it would be for the EX COM to check the eligibility of members in the light of the articles. I mean, you have voting members, you have nonvoting members. We basically copied all that over from your existing charter. But thanks for asking the question. So the answer would be that you only have one vote.

So I don't see any further hands. So I would turn it to Ashley as the chair of the executive committee to give the brief annual report.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Thomas.

Zoe, I believe we have a slide.

Okay. To preface everything, as Thomas mentioned before, this was a -- I don't want to sound too derogatory -- a slow-going process to begin with, but it slowed down even more thanks to COVID in terms of meeting a handful of deadlines we needed to do in order to make this all come together and this beautiful association you see before you now.

So with that, we were able to during the phase of 2020 and early 2021 obtain the signatures of the founding members. We registered the association with a local court in Bonn, Germany. We obtained a new tax I.D. We set up a new euro bank account in Germany, also very important, which is why you have seen some of the changes you have seen for billing for our membership dues. And then we had to transfer funds, 107,622 euros and 40 -- I think they're cents in euros, too -- from the U.S. -- do we spell out this acronym or pronounce it? I don't know -- the IOLTA account.

But nothing happened in the first reporting period between March and June 2020. We have no financial report yet for the fiscal year of July 1st through June 30th, at least it's not complete.

And there were no association members in the first year, but all of the Registrar Stakeholder Group members should become members of the association.

There's our annual report.

THOMAS RICKERT: Great. Thanks so much, Ashley. Just one small addition, if I may. On the financial reporting for the fiscal year from July 1st, 2020, to 30th of June, it's not that the accounts are not yet complete, but this fiscal year has not yet been completed. And, therefore, we don't really have anything to report on. So we find ourselves in the unusual situation that the first few months since the incorporation basically didn't have anything financially that could be reported on. And then for the currently-running fiscal year, that year is not completed.

So next time when we reconvene for the AGM, you will actually hear a proper financial report, profit and loss, and all that so that you can understand where the finances of the organization are. And then the financial report will be voted on, but this year we don't have anything to report on.

But I think I can say that towards the end of 2020, there was no money in the bank because this transfer only took place this very year.

I think for you, the important news is that the organization is in good shape financially; that you don't have anything to worry

about. And in the light of that, I would suggest that we open it up for questions for -- for Ashley on the -- on the report. And I see that James's hand is raised. James, please.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, Thomas. Thank you. James's speaking. Just a couple of questions and I think it's more housekeeping type questions regarding membership. I think building on Eric's comments and what Matt put in the chat, it sounds like we're a little out of date on our membership. And then knowing that there's frequently been a lot of turnover in the RrSG membership and, of course, of a given year through consolidation and people changing jobs and changing companies and so forth. So how difficult or how responsive can this organization and this association be to those types of membership changes? And how much work is it going to be for somebody, maybe Zoe or Ashley, to keep that synchronized with our RrSG membership?

Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, James. And sorry for not having followed the chat while I was talking.

So this was not to ignore Matt. I apologize for that.

Now, the Executive Committee is going to take a look at the membership, and I'm just flipping through the Articles of Association as I speak. So if you could just bear with me for a second.

Okay. So it will be for the Executive Committee to make those decisions. If you -- if there's a merger, then there should be a written declaration by this company to the Executive Committee.

So according to -- what is it paragraph 3, subsection 8a, the leaving has to be declared in writing via member of the Executive Committee, and the resignation can only be declared to the end of the fiscal year with two months' notice.

So I would suggest that for the meeting today, as I mentioned earlier, in order to be quorate, we don't need a certain specific number of members present. So it could be only two or three.

So should we -- Should we spot that the votes depend on the presence or absence of one of the members that have been affected by, you know, mergers or other changes, then we will pick that up again. If the votes are all clear-cut, then it wouldn't affect this. And as I mentioned, those who have been merged or represent two members just vote once. And I will put together a little memo that can be shared by the Ex Com with all members

with a suggestion on how you can operationally deal with that; you know, what the sharing of responsibilities between the Ex Com and the General Assembly is in dealing with accepting, expulsing or otherwise sorting out membership issues.

I hope that this is an acceptable way forward.

Let me just check, are there any other hands raised?

I don't think that's the case. Then let's proceed to the vote on the annual report that you've just heard from Ashley and the discharge of the Board.

So all those of the founding members who are in favor of approving the annual report and discharging the board, please do raise your hand in the chat, in the -- So that's one, two, three, four, five, six. Do I count this correctly? Can anyone double-check? So we have one, two, three...

Is it eight?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thomas, I see nine.

THOMAS RICKERT: You see nine. That's great.

MICHELE NEYLON: Jothan is saying ten.

SPEAKER: 11.

THOMAS RICKERT: Ah, okay. A few folks have joined. So that's great.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: This is Owen. I see, what? 13?

ERIC ROKOBAUER: This is Eric. Yeah, I'm counting 13 as well.

THOMAS RICKERT: Great. So we have 13 in favor. Please lower your hands.

                       Anyone against approving the annual report and discharging the
                       Board?

                       Volker, Michele, are these old hands or...

Okay. So the queue is clear. It looks like nobody is against that.

Any abstentions?

I don't see any. So this vote passes with 13 votes in favor. That's great. Congratulations on that.

So let's now move to agenda item number 4, and that's the resolution with which we declare that the funds that have been transferred from the John Berryhill account, trustee account to the association shall benefit the association's assets. So this is a technicality that I have been asked to put on the agenda after consulting with the text consultant because we need to make sure that the funds that have been accumulated over time by the members of the RrSG did not have profit-gaining purpose, you know, and that they shall be further used for the association's funds in a nonprofit manner.

So on that, is -- I would suggest that in the light of expediting this process, is there anyone against resolution number 4? The members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group have saved funds over the year that shall benefit the association's assets.

I don't see any hands.

EN

Any abstentions?

I don't see any abstentions.

And with that, this resolution passes as well. Thank you for that.

We're now coming to agenda item number 5, and that's the election of the Board of Directors in the sense of paragraph 26 of the German Civil Code. As you will remember, as I mentioned at the outset, we have Volker and Theo acting in that capacity, but they are just there to fulfill the legal requirements being entered into the registrar associations.

So Volker and Theo, am I correct in assuming that you are okay with being reelected, potentially?

VOLKER GREIMANN: No objections. Yes, thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Volker.

Theo?

ICANN|71
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM

THEO GEURTS: One quick question. If the reelection would pass, would that also mean going through the entire process again, which happened last year, going to -- getting everything official, notarized, et cetera, et cetera, or is that no longer required?

THOMAS RICKERT: This is going to be easier.

THEO GEURTS: Okay. Sure, no objections.

THOMAS RICKERT: Perfect.

So with that, let me pause for a second and ask whether there's any objection against conducting the next votes as we did the last one; i.e., not asking for affirmative votes but only asking for "against" votes and abstentions?

Okay. Then the second question is whether you are okay with one vote on Volker and Theo. And if you object against that, we can do individual votes. Please make yourself heard if you want the votes to be taken separately.

I don't see any objection. So let me ask, is there anyone against electing Volker and Theo to the Board in the sense of Article 26 of the German Civil Code?

I don't see any hands raised nor do I hear any objections. Are there any abstentions?

So there are no abstentions. So the vote passes unanimously.

Volker and Theo, can I ask you whether you accept the vote?

THEO GEURTS: Yes, I accept.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I accept. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Congratulations.

We now move to the election of the Executive Committee.

So let me first ask whether Ashley, Jothan, Owen, Eric, and Benny are okay with being elected today? So can we put you on the ballot, so to speak? Any objections against that?

I mean, it's a pure technicality. You've been on the Ex Com already.

Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: It's not an objection; it's just a question, Thomas. Sorry; just for my clarity. The association has to go through this process, I assume, every year, but the Registrar Stakeholder Group also has elections which are held at a different time of the year. So what happens when we have -- say if we have an election later this year and half the Ex Com changes? How do you handle that?

THOMAS RICKERT: So I think as we move on, it would probably make sense to do everything in one go, but that's something that the -- that you guys need to determine. I think it would make sense to synchronize that, but at the moment, it's like the RrSG is -- because it does have members which are not members of the association, so it's two distinct legal -- legal questions. But synchronizing that would make an awful lot of sense.

And we can always have members meetings outside the AGM, you know. So if there are changes that should be reflected, I would

suggest that we convene an extraordinary members meeting and do the elections of the Ex Com at that point in time.

MICHELE NEYLON: Okay. Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT: Great. So you had times to raise your hands and object, Ex Com colleagues, so I don't see any objections to that.

So let me then ask whether there are any objections against doing the election for the entire Ex Com in one go.

There don't seem to be any objections against that.

So I would then like to ask you to raise your hands if you're in favor of electing, Ashley, Jothan, Owen, Eric, and Benny to the Ex Com.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Just a second. I want to second Jothan's question from the chat. Do we vote for ourselves or do we have to abstain?

THOMAS RICKERT: Sorry, I didn't get that acoustically.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Sorry, this is Owen. Jothan asked in chat are we supposed to vote for ourselves or do we have to abstain?

THOMAS RICKERT: You may. You may. You can abstain but nothing prevents you from voting in favor.

Okay. Can you guys let me count? Because I can't see all the tiles on my screen.

Is it 13 again?

Zoe, help me out.

Looks like we have 15 now. Is that correct?

BENNY SAMUELSEN: 16.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: I'm seeing 16.

THOMAS RICKERT: So we have 15 founding members, and given the merger, it seems we have more votes than we should.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah, my bad. I just took my vote off. I'm a first timer. Sorry, I didn't understand the rules.

THOMAS RICKERT: All right, and then we have Neli from LEMARIT. LEMARIT is also not a founding member. That makes it 13, and then we have a unanimous vote. Great. So let me capture that.

Anyone against? Just a technicality. So please lower your hands just to double-check whether we got the figures right.

Anyone against, please raise your hand.

I don't see any hands.

Any abstentions?

No abstentions.

Rieke, you asked whether you are a founding member. One.com has not been amongst the members that have signed the incorporation documents. So I'm sorry for that. It's just I have to work off that list of those who have signed subsequent to the incorporation.

Great. Now, so since we have so many Ex Com members, let me ask whether there's anyone unhappy with the vote or whether you all accept -- you know, those who don't accept the election, please do speak up.

Not hearing anything, so you've all accepted. That's great. Congratulations to you.

Then we can move to the next point on the agenda, and that is the election -- oh, I see that there is another question.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hi, yes. This is Owen. I can read the question here. It's from Stuart Pelling or I guess Chris Pelling. How were the founding members chosen?

THOMAS RICKERT: The founding members were not chosen, but we've asked during the May meeting -- March meeting 2020 who would be willing to become a member of that group of founding members.

And if memory doesn't fail me, we had several candidates or several companies or representatives of companies that were in a position to do so, otherwise present during that meeting, were not in a position to formally represent their company because they needed internal approval for that. But everyone is invited, you know. The eligibility criteria are as for the RSG as in the RSG charter.

And as I mentioned earlier, I would work with Zoe so that we can onboard you easily and that we also reflect any changes in future in the most efficient way.

Great.

So agenda item number 7 is the election of cash auditor. So next year we're going to have the report on the first fiscal year. And what the cash auditor is supposed to do is take a look at the work that's been done by the -- by the treasurer, take a look at how much money is in the bank, whether the receipts are sort of

mentioning what's been captured in the financial reporting. It's not a big deal, but it needs to be done.

So let me ask whether there are any volunteers for this position.

If not, and I'm not saying that to deter any one of you from volunteering, but I would be willing to volunteer for that -- for that position unless somebody else wants to take it.

So anyone interested in being the cash auditor for the association, please raise your hand or speak up. That does not seem to be the case. Then I would suggest myself as the cash auditor.

And my question -- Reg is very swiftly seconding that. Thank you so much.

So let me just ask for "against" votes. Is anyone against me acting as the cash auditor for the next year?
 I don't see any hands raised.

Any abstentions?

There are no abstentions.

With that, I would like to thank you for your confidence.

And that leaves us with the last agenda item.

I'm not sure how you want to go about with it, Ashley. Zoe mentioned to me that you might want to have a discussion on membership fees. I mean, you could certainly have that outside this meeting, but this would be a perfect place to have that discussion if you wanted to.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Thomas. I'm actually going to use this opportunity to ask a few questions and maybe put a few things on the record.

Just so it's clear to everybody, because it sounds like since we've had all these conversations, they were quite some time ago and I think people are reintroducing themselves to this whole concept and why we're doing this today.

And please, Thomas, correct me wherever I am wrong.

But I just wanted to let folks know that this General Assembly is largely a formality in terms of having ourselves as an association. And there's benefits associated with having us as an association.

This gives us more opportunity to be in charge with what we do and that sort of thing.

This does not replace what we do as the Registrar Stakeholder Group. This doesn't replace our elections and how we decide on things and how we vote on things, if we have to vote on things. So if any of you are feeling nervous about this, please don't.

And this is something that we need to do once a year in order to maintain our status as an association.

So I will leave that there. I will leave it up to Zoe to tell me if we should or need to talk about our membership dues at this point.

But I did just want to make sure since there were a lot of questions in the chat that we kind of just set the stage maybe a little bit better than we did in the beginning to explain why we're doing this.

So did I get anything wrong, Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: You got it all perfectly right. And just remember that the primary drivers for setting up the association in the first place were, number one, you wanted to have your own bank account and

your own credit card because so far you needed to go to John and ask him to help you with transactions, so you wanted to have more flexibility and control with that.

And the second main point was to have a legal vehicle with which Zoe can be hired. And due to the pandemic, we didn't make progress on that part; but that is hopefully soon to come.

That has nothing to do with the RSG's policy work and your role in the ICANN community. That's basically a legal vehicle that allows for you to basically do -- assist you with your administrative matters.

Great.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Sorry, Thomas. I didn't mean to cut you off.

THOMAS RICKERT: I just asked if you were still with us. I wasn't sure if your line was micked up.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm still here. Did you ask me a question?

THOMAS RICKERT: Shall we have -- Benny, do you want to speak to the membership fees, or shall I close the AGM at this point?

BENNY SAMUELSEN: I can certainly speak about it.

We have sent out the budget for '21-'22. And after we are looking at how much money we have in the bank, I have proposed that we lower the fee to 800 euro per year. It would be a slight down. We would use a little of our funds, but we have a good war chest. It's well-filled and we have enough money for a good while. And since we are a nonprofit organization, we cannot put too much money in the bank. That's basically what it's about.

THOMAS RICKERT: Are there any comments from members? Does anyone wish to speak to that? Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yes. Hello. There was a question raised by Desiree from name.com as to whether we have any employees.

THOMAS RICKERT: At the moment, there are none.

EN

JOTHAN FRAKES: Okay, thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: So, thanks, Benny, for introduction of the topic.

Changes of the membership fee will also require a vote. So I suggest that either we -- you continue conversations on this, and then the formal vote will be done so that the new membership fees will become effective next year.

Benny, or do you want the new membership fee structure to be in place for the upcoming fiscal year starting next month?

BENNY SAMUELSEN: That would be for the upcoming fiscal year starting next month.

THOMAS RICKERT: Because then we would need -- because this revised membership fee has not been on the agenda and, therefore, the invitation period has not been observed for that topic. So we can still do that as an ad hoc meeting, but that would require all members to waive the formalities.

ICANN|71
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM

I'm looking at Ashley now virtually. Ashley, is that something that we should do now? Or shall we do the vote on that at some future point?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I don't know. Do we need to do anything?

ZOE BONYTHON: I can take that, if you want, Ashley.

Sorry, it has to be later because we still need to go through the formal procedure -- like, the budget has only just gone to the member list. So there needs to be a period of review and then voting in the stakeholder group to approve that budget. Once it's been approved, then it can be voted for approval in the association, I believe.
Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT: That's very helpful. So I would just minute that we had an introduction of the topic by Benny.

Benny, can you just help me. So it was the reduction to 800 euros?

BENNY SAMUELSEN: Correct.

THOMAS RICKERT: Great. So I will finalize the minutes shortly, send these out to Zoe and the Board, and then these will be shared with the members as well.

So with that, I think unless there are more comments from members, I would like to close this meeting at 9:23.

Thanks so much for your patience. I mean, it's not easy to do these formalities online, but we've done a pretty good job of getting this done in slightly over half an hour.

So thank you so much, and I give the mic to Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you so much, Thomas, for getting us through our first General Assembly meeting. I think that was educational for all of us, particularly me. And I encourage you all if you have any questions please do so. But, yes, again, this is something we have to do annually. So this won't be the last time. But thank you. Thank you very much, Thomas.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Ashley, this is Owen. Just real quick, I saw a question from Tom Barnett in the chat. He's asking, what is the ceiling for reserves for the association? Can somebody speak to that?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Are you there, Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: I'm here. I would need to check with a tax person, to be quite honest. I'm not a tax expert. But I think you don't have an issue as far as -- as long as the funds are not used for profit. If you engage in commercial activity to collect funds, to gain -- to get new money streams in, that would be problematic. But as long as it's non-for-profit, you're in the clear. But that's just -- that's conditional to confirmation by the tax advisor.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Okay.   Hopefully that answered Tom's -- he's got another question. I thought this is why fees were being lowered.

Zoe, can you answer that one?

ZOE BONYTHON: I think probably Benny should since he did the budget.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:	All right, Benny.

BENNY SAMUELSEN:	Yes. Well, it's not lowered that much. It's only 28 euro per year, so it's not dramatic. So we'll just get a nice round number to pay instead of 828 euro per year. Instead we put it at 800. So we take a little from the funds, but it will be easier to handle.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:	Any other questions? Question just noted it used to be 1,000 U.S. dollars. Now it's 800 euros. SO that was part of the issue, is the conversion to euros.

		Okay. Any other questions? If not, big congratulations to ourselves. Thank you, Thomas. We are official, folks. We're official-official. We've been official, but now we're official-official.

		Okay. Let's go to the next agenda item which is a briefing from the Internet and Jurisdiction Project on their toolkit.

		You guys probably all heard about this. It was launched a couple of months ago now, but I thought it would be a good opportunity for folks just to be aware of what's happening outside of ICANNland. I think this is -- work like this is very good because it's

reflective of the attention that DNS abuse is actually getting. And a number of our members were involved in this.

I don't want to get too into the weeds of explaining it because that's why we invited Liz to be here.

So, Liz, are you still there with us?

ELISABETH BEHSUDI: I am. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: All right. I will turn it over to you. But thank you very much for joining us. Liz is joining us from Paris, France. So she is not waking up early, even though she sounds like she might be. So, anyway, I'll turn it over to you. But thank you for joining us.

ELISABETH BEHSUDI: Thanks. Thanks, Ashley. Thanks, everyone, for being here today. No, it is very, very early for some of you.

So my name is Liz Behsudi. I'm the director for the Domains and Jurisdiction Program at the Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network. And as Ashley said, I want to talk to you a little bit today

a little bit about our toolkit and give you a little bit of an overview of the work we're doing.

Next slide, please.

Really, really brief introduction for those of you who aren't familiar with our organization. It was founded in 2012 by Bertrand de La Chapelle who many of you may remember as a former ICANN Board member and his business partner, Paul Fehlinger. It's a multistakeholder organization really dedicated to really fostering legal interoperability in cyberspace. And here you see the vision statement. I won't read it.

But in terms of just sort of telling you what is meant by "legal interoperability," it is definitely an attempt to harmonize all of the laws and all of the jurisdictions all over the world but rather to sort of look across the landscape at different laws, different jurisdictions, different business models, and try to come up with sound policies, policy recommendations, and operational solutions that can work across the various platforms and among different actors.

Next slide, please.

So The Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network has three policy programs embedded within it. Of course, the Domains and Jurisdiction Program, which I'm going to talk to you about today. But we also have a program on data and jurisdiction which is focused on cross-border access to electronic evidence; content and jurisdiction, as you might imagine focused on cross-border content moderation and restrictions. Mainly platform-focused, I would say.

Each one of the groups are supported and facilitated internally at the secretariat by staff. I'm a member of the staff. But then they're coordinated by volunteers, one for each program. Brian Cimbolic is the coordinator for the domains program. And I should say that each program has a contact group. That's what's being coordinated. And that contact group is basically 30 to 40 folks from governments, civil society, Internet companies, technical operators, subject matter experts in the various realms. And the contact groups meet regularly, about every six to eight weeks, to address different challenges that they see in the industry and across sort of the data sphere, the Internet.

Next slide, please.

For the domains program, the focus really is on, first, recognition that the domain name system is part of the technical layer of the

Internet, part of the Internet's, if you will, technical infrastructure. And so the program really focuses on how best to preserve the neutrality of the Internet's technical layer, especially when, as we know, there are lots of national laws that are applied to the domain name system, not all of which agree, and, also, in view of the fact that when a domain name operator, as you know, takes action, there's a global impact. So the question is really about thresholds, when is it appropriate to act at the DNS level to address abuses.

Next slide, please.

I included this slide here, this effects of action at the DNS level. This was one of the early outputs from last year, from 2020, that the group produced. And I'm not going to explain the various technical commands that are contained here because I know you all know them. But I just thought it would be good to share this infographic. I think it's really helpful perhaps when you're talking to folks who aren't as familiar with how the DNS works, you know, what does it mean when someone asks you to, for example, delete a domain because they think there's something bad going on there, is that really effective? Is it really what the person wants, is asking for? And is it going to solve the problem that that person is seeking to address?

So, again, I included here it is part of the toolkit. I think it's a very nice infographic that can really, again, I think help notifiers primarily in understanding what they're asking for and what they're seeking to implement when they're trying to address abuse.

Next slide.

The toolkit itself, again, we've already talked about the concept of interoperability. It's all about defining thresholds. It starts at least with defining thresholds, when is action at the DNS level appropriate.

In terms of thresholds, I will say that I&J put out what's called an operational approaches document a couple years ago. Many of you were involved in that process as well.

And in particular, when we talk about thresholds, when is it appropriate? Well, if you're talking about technical abuse, when the domain itself is engaged in a significant level of abuse to justify taking action at the DNS level.

For content, as we all know, there really isn't, I would say, consensus about when, if ever, is that threshold met, when if ever is it appropriate for a DNS operator to take abuse to disable

content. Perhaps CSAM is the one thing that most folks can agree upon.

But we simply say with respect to content, it's a much higher threshold. And it's probably going to tip somewhere along the line of when there's a significant and eminent threat to public safety, to health. So, again, toolkit is all about interoperability. We hope it will help DNS operators in designing and implementing their abuse-related activities. Also targeted toward notifiers, helping notifiers in the detection and reporting of problematic activity, and, finally, legislatures -- legislators and law enforcement to help determine the procedures for dealing with the different types of DNS abuse.

Next slide.

In terms of the structure of the toolkit, it is focused mainly on technical abuse. The 2020 contact group -- 2020-2021 contact group really focused its effort on technical abuse and the number of resources that are contained in the toolkit.

Here you see the two columns in the middle and right of the slide. So in the middle column, we are just talking about sort of the pillars of what we call the framework, like, how did the group think about the various issues and then attempt to sort of flesh

out policies, procedures, taxonomies, best practices, if you will. And those pillars are identification, evaluation, action, and recourse and then sort of applying those different building blocks producing what you see listed here on the right, on the right-hand column.

In terms of identification, you know, this is really entailed a consideration of what are the various types of technical abuses.

I will say that last year in advance of the Kuala Lumpur meeting, the contracted parties house actually adopted the definition of "technical abuse" that the Domains and Jurisdiction Contact Group had produced which is basically malware, phishing, botnets, fast-flux hosting, spam only to the extent it's used as a delivery mechanism for other forms of abuse.

And it may not really sound like such a big deal, but I think just getting people on the same page to agree about what they mean when they say "technical abuse" I think is not insignificant.

Again, identification, what are the different types of technical abuse. What is due diligence required of notifiers before making a notification? How and when, once the notification is made, do you inform, if at all, the registrant? Also help to produce

something we call a typology of notifiers, which identifies various types of notifiers and provides examples.

Why is that important? Well, I think it's important because I think most operators use or receive notices from many, many different kinds of notifiers, including, for example, artificial intelligence. And how -- and how they interact with the various types of notifiers really sometimes depends on the type of notifier.

We also produced, the group also produced, I should say, a due diligence guide for notifiers. Again, we'll talk about the different outputs in a minute, but just to give you an action of -- give you a sense of, you know, what we sort of put in the identification category.

Under action of choice -- or choice of action, this was really geared toward producing outcomes that we think will be very valuable to DNS operators and sort of taking into account what are the types of actions that are available, what are the effects of each type of action, which we talked about on the earlier slide, and then what types of action are really most suitable toward different abuse cases.

And then finally, recourse, which, you know, takes into account due process for registrants and it helped inform the production of

a workflow for phishing and malware which I think also would be very helpful perhaps in your education and outreach efforts. It maps the process for reporting technical abuse and sort of the responsibilities of the different actors in the communication flow and in the remediation process.

So if we move to the next slide, these are just thumbnails of the different outcomes that I just briefly talked with you about. But to just do a little deeper dive starting on the left, the DNS Operators' Guide to Detecting Technical Abuse, again, it contains a framework to help operators sort of structure how to identify, evaluate, and address abuse, taking into consideration such things as, you know, is the domain actively engaged in abuse? In other words, how old is the notice? Has the domain been compromised? Where specifically is the abuse taking place? If, for example, the domain resolves to a very content-rich website, is it the entire website or is the abuse limited to a subpage or URL? If so, is it really appropriate to take action at the DNS level or, you know, should the notifier be at least attempting to work with labor the site operator or the hosting provider. Things like that.

So these are considerations that, you know, can really help the operator decide whether to take action. And if so, to ensure that whatever action taken is really appropriate and proportionate.

No one wants to, for example, you know, disable Facebook.org because, you know, someone's put up a phishing page, right?

Minimum notice components. It's a table-format document. Again, I think it would be very helpful, again, in education and outreach efforts, and just sort of lists components of, first, those that are necessary to make the abuse notification actionable. Doesn't mean that every operator will act on it, but what are those things that sort of get you off the starting block? Things like, you know, what's the type of abuse being alleged? Is there a legal basis for the notification? If it's a court order, you know, has the court order been provided? If the court order is provided, is it specific? Does it tell you what sort of action you're supposed to take? Are there confidentiality provisions written into the court order? Or let's say it's a notice by law enforcement and they'd like you to maybe hold off taking action because, you know, it's part of an upcoming coordinated action. Things like this I think are in the "must have" columns, and then we have things that are sort of nice to have; things that, you know, you certainly could take action without having different data points but the "nice to haves" I think certainly make it easier and perhaps more efficient for the operator to act.

And, you know, again, the goal here is really not to say everyone must do everything the same way, but again, what sort of

minimum, regardless of the business model, regardless of the type of notifier, what do we really need to have in order to address abuse notifications effectively and efficiently?

Typology of notifiers I think I talked about a little bit earlier. It's just an overview of the different types of notifiers from whom operators receive notices. It just provides context and gives examples of each. The due diligence guide for technical abuse notifiers, I think very, very helpful document, again, in education, outreach, maybe you even want to put it on your website to help notifiers sort of understand how you, as an operator, are looking at that notice. So what considerations should -- should be undertaken before the notice is made, both procedurally and substantively, before making -- before sending the notice to the operator? So things like is it content? If so, is it something that folks generally agree on? Something like CSAM or, you know, conversely, is it something where there's not really broad agreement, in which case notifiers are encouraged to look at the operators Terms of Service and to determine what types of content the particular operator would be willing to address. Where is the abuse taking notice -- taking place? Is it the entire website? Is it a sub URL? Again, should it be addressed at the DNS level? You know, really taking into account the principle of proportionality and the collateral effects of disabling a domain.

The choice of action document, the DNS-level action that -- sorry, DNS Technical Abuse Choice of Action document really takes the earlier document we looked at, effects of action at the DNS level, and tries to map it to various types of technical abuse. Again, I think very helpful for education/outreach to notifiers. You know, if it's phishing and malware, the operator would most likely lock and hold/suspend the domain whereas that might not be done for a different type of abuse case.

And finally, as I talked about earlier, the procedural workflow mapping document, which is another sort of visual infographic, and it follows the path of notification from beginning to end. And I should say starting with notification first to the registrars, since as the registrar, you have the direct relationship with the registrant, and allowing the registrar to complete its evaluation process before, if at all, a notice might get escalated to a registry. But again, the registrar is really the first -- the first line of action, if you will.

So these are the various outcomes that are contained in the toolkit. There are others. I tried to really just highlight the ones that I thought would be relevant and useful to all of you today.

If we go to the next slide. In terms of what we're thinking and working on this year in the content group, we just reconvened

about a month ago, and we're hoping to do maybe a similar sort of procedural workflow document for botnets. We want to do some work on notices' traceability and statistics, so transparency in accounting reporting, if you will. We're going to do some work on trusted notifiers, knowing that not everyone uses them, but nonetheless, some do, and sort of what are the considerations on both sides of the equation for the would-be trusted notifier and the operator when they're thinking about entering into a trusted notifier arrange. And then we have "and more," dot, dot, dot. And just to fill that in a little, we are very much looking at things that maybe aren't squarely front and center at ICANN right now but things that we think will definitely and are affecting the industry. For example, the DSA and the NIS2. So this is something that we will talk about internally as a group, and then as the secretariat, we are reaching out and trying to get more clarity, for example, you know, under the DSA. We think it's fairly clear that registries and registrars are considered intermediaries and will have to sort of fit into one of the intermediary liability exemption categories. So mere conduit, caching, or hosting, to take advantage of the liability exemptions.

And likewise, even though it's not really part of the domains program yet, we have our eye on the Electronic Evidence Initiative within the EU now. I don't know if many of you are following it, but I think it's likely, I'm not sure, but arguable that what's called

basic subscriber information under the electronic evidence proposal would perhaps encompass WHOIS data.

So all things that we're keeping an eye on and that we'll be discussing. And hopefully maybe even we'll produce a framing paper or two on the topics that you see here, and more.

So with that, I'll pause and see if anybody has any questions. Happy to -- happy to answer any questions you might have.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you so much, Liz. And thank you all for listening to Liz.

I think these -- these documents are really helpful in terms of education. I think these documents say a lot of what we've been saying but actually put into writing in a very glossy, pretty format.

As you may or may not know, members and Liz alike, our DNS abuse subgroup is embarking on a number of, you know, new action items moving forward, including making sure that we get information out there and visible, whether it's our work or others. And I think, if possible, it would be great if we could have this information linked on our website, because I think a lot of the audience that we're trying to target could benefit from this information, including, you know, what the process flow is, so

people understand it; you know, what are the different considers that we are taking into place.

So if that's okay with you, we would love to -- at least I would like to post a link to this information on our website.

ELISABETH BEHSUDI: Yeah, absolutely. And I will say, you know, just to echo what Ashley has said, I just think it's really important. There's so much actually good work that is being done on DNS abuse, and I think in the past, maybe the industry hasn't done as much as it could to get the information out there. So yeah, please do post. And, you know, if you haven't already downloaded the toolkits, feel free to do so. And we hope as many -- as many people who are interested will do that and will share it with others.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you very much.

All right! Last call for questions. I don't see any hands.

I'm bad at checking for hands because my computer screen is too small.

Great!   I guess everybody loves the presentation and your content. So thank you for taking the time to present it to us here today.

I understand now we've got about ten minutes that, for any other business, I have a request from a dear old colleague who would like to also talk about efforts that are happening outside of the ICANN sphere, and that is Graeme Bunton would like to talk a little bit about what the DNS Abuse Institute is doing, or at least planning to do.

Graeme, are you there?

GRAEME BUNTON: I am here. Good morning, everybody. I just rolled out of bed because I didn't have to attend the whole thing. Nice to see all these friendly faces. Hi, friends. Remember me? I used to hang out with you guys. Then I got different.

I won't take up too much of your time. And I do recognize that ten minutes is precious. So I will be brief.

I moved to this DNS Abuse Institute thing in February. We've been having fun.   Lots of research, discussions, outreach, planning, figuring out what we're going to try and do, and we've really come

to a place where we've got, I think a pretty good idea of what it is that the institute is going to try and accomplish. And we're going to publish that in a document hopefully today, if I can get some more little bits and pieces of it done. Sort of calling it a roadmap. Something else entirely. But let me try to summarize this 15-page thing in six minutes or less, which is, you know, looking at the -- So broadly speaking, you can reduce DNS abuse in two ways. You can use preventative measures, so things that either attempt to predict if a domain is going to be harmful and either introduce some friction or stop it from registering in general, or you can do reactive measures, and that is you can take reports of abuse or you can subscribe to something like a RBL or an abuse fee. So that's like, broadly speaking, the actions that you have available to you on your plate.

But then there is also the economic realities of the industry. You know, registrars, there's lots of consolidation in the market. There are lots of old domain platforms. Many of them I think were written in sort of the early to mid 2000s. It's a low margin, high volume industry, so registrars are -- you know, it's very competitive. And so as I'm looking at the things that the institute can do, I'm trying to marry those two ideas. So, like, these are the preventative measures, these are the reactive measures, these are the economic realities of the industry.

EN

And where I get to all of that is a place where, boy, if I'm producing lots of really cool things and then I need to get them on all of your backlogs to introduce them into your registration processes and platforms, and getting them on your backlogs, I'm going to have a really tough time being successful in reducing DNS abuse just because I think registrars are busy and it's a complicated space and trying to get you guys to give me some dev resources to integrate some cool machine-learning model would be a bit of a mistake.

So I'm really focused on improving reactive measures, at least for the short to medium term. So that's things that the institute can produce, registrars and registries can consume or use but don't have to spend a lot of time, or as little as possible time, integrating into your, you know, code bases and platforms.

And so in our roadmap document we have three cornerstone, what I'm calling cornerstone initiatives. I'm not in marketing and no one has helped me rename these things into flashier stuff.

So the initiatives that we've got are going to be one around education called the DNSAI of Learn. Again, the names are terrible. And this is just, you know, really best practices, tool reviews, case studies, research, educational stuff for registries and registrars, what is abuse, what does it look like, how to

mitigate it, for people reporting abuse, for law enforcement, intellectual property, business owners. Just a really, you know, if somebody needs to understand it -- oh, end users I should say, lots of great quality, regularly produced educational content. We'll begin putting that out in the relatively near future. I've got a couple of tasks in the pipeline for that. So that's one.

The next one that I think is most interesting to people is what we're going to call the CART, the Centralized Abuse Reporting Tool, and it is going to be a -- essentially at its simplest form, a domain lookup. So who the registrar is. Abuse reporter authentication, so who is reporting the abuse. You select the type of abuse that they think it is, malware, phishing, botnets, pharming, spam if it's serving those other guys, classic DNS abuse definition from the CPH, and then it collects the required information basically based on the RrSG Minimum Requirements for Reporting Abuse form. And it does that in one place so that registrars will then get into your API, if you are using ZenDesk or some other ticketing system or into the email address that you would prefer, you know, a clean, well formatted, de-duplicated, well-evidenced abuse complaint that also has been checked for, you know, malware and other harmful things in it. And, you know, you're not getting a thousand of them because we're doing that work on the front end to prevent people abusing the system. Reporters get one place to go because there's so much diversity

of implementation of abuse reporting out there in the world, and that makes their whole life better and easier. And so the goal is really for you guys to have to spend less time triaging garbage complaints, and hopefully that will be helpful and good. I think people are generally pretty excited about that one. I recognize we've got four minutes left so I'll try to wrap this up in 90 more seconds.

The last one I'll talk about is another one that I'm calling intelligence, and this is really the institute needs to understand what's happening in DNS abuse. I can't keep trotting out, God bless him, John Crain to explain what he thinks is happening in DNS abuse. And so we're going to build something like DAAR, and it's going to be better and it's going to be newer. And it's going to measure only evidenced-based abuse, like if -- I'm going to say you have abuse on your platform, you need to at least be able to have done something with it. And so that is the bit that I think is going to be different and fair.

We're also going to look at measuring persistence rather than existence, because this is all retroactive, right? And so it's not just that there is abuse on the platform. It's abuse on a platform that stayed for, you know, a day, two days, a week, two weeks. And so that's not even -- that's not just binary either. So we can have a more sophisticated understanding of what type of abuse exists

and how it's being mediated. And then we'll publish those reports by TLD, by registrar, by registry, et cetera. So that's going to be fun.

And then also I think that's pretty important for credibility for the institute that people can look at what we're doing and that we're being pretty honest and straightforward and totally transparent about how that works and get that out there.

So those are the three big things we're going to tackle first off, the top. Again, mostly focused on reactive measures because I think that's what you guys could use, and you'd be able to use it right away and it would be the most helpful in reducing DNS abuse.

And to Liz's stuff earlier, we're really looking at what I&J is putting out and how to incorporate a lot of that in the work of the institute.

I'll stop there. Thank you for your time. Look for more of this coming out in the next few weeks. We'll do webinars and stuff and socialize this like crazy. Hopefully build some sort of user group so we can talk about especially how CART will work and how you would like that to work with your own system.

Thank you all. I hope you're all well. It's nice to see you guys.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Graeme.   We miss you, too.   And again, great information here. You kind of see, this is almost iterative how this work is progressing and rolling out. And hopefully at some point we can link to your work as well, Graeme.

So with that, we have about two minutes left. Open to questions if people have them.

I realize this was a different membership meeting than most. You can expect something along these lines, maybe not at the AGM or even at a membership meeting, but having these General Assemblies once a year, but also incorporated some briefings in here as well. So something a little different.

I don't see any hands. So with that, then, I guess I can bring things to a close.

Thank you all for joining us here today. I hope this was helpful. Definitely a learning process in the beginning there. And I hope you enjoy the rest of your ICANN experience.

Thank you, as always, Zoe and the ICANN crew. And we've got interpreters now. We are so grown up.

So anyway, thank you all. Enjoy the rest of your days, whether it's ending or just beginning.

Talk to you all later. Bye.

[The recording has stopped.]

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, everybody. This session is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]