MARRAKECH – GNSO - NPOC Policy Committee
Monday, June 24, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, everyone. Thank you for joining the meeting. We should be starting shortly. Thank you.

DAVID CAKE: Let's get properly started with introductions. My name is David Cake. I am currently the chair of the NPOC Policy Committee and I have been around ICANN for about ten years now and I've done various other things along the way, including being the vice chair of the GNSO Council. I come from an organization – I represent an organization called Electronic Frontiers Australia. I think let's introduce everybody else, just so we know who's in the room, please.

OREOLUWA LESI: Hi, everyone. I am Oreoluwa Lesi, NPOC secretariat. I think that's it. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, there. This is [inaudible]. I'm also a member of NPOC and I'm from Romania and I'm glad to be here this morning.

PAR BRUMARK:	I am Pär Brumark, GAC vice chair. Been in ICANN since 2013. Representing Niue, a small country in the Pacific.
DAVID CAKE:	Welcome to our meeting. And of course, on staff we have Maryam who is just about to get up and do something. It is the first meeting, first proper session of the entire meeting and quite early in the morning, so I will forgive the quite low attendance.

First thing I'm going to say is that the NPOC elections concluded overnight. I did not run for reappointment as NPOC Policy Committee chair, so Carlos was the successful candidate and I congratulate him in absent here, and when he turns up, I will be happy to let him talk about his ideas for the Policy Committee meeting. I will also ask anyone who does turn up during the meeting to introduce themselves.

So, quickly, the agenda for Marrakech. This is the agenda for council. So, let's go through that. What's on the consent agenda? Sorry, I'm finding it actually quite difficult to read this. Just give me a second and I will …

So, one of the things that is useful to do at these is to just discuss what basically our plans will be for the coming few days. So, I'm actually having some difficulty actually reading some of this.

There is no consent agenda. At most, the items on the agenda there are for active discussion. One of the first items, repopulating the independent review process implementation oversight team and GNSO input into the independent review process standing panel. So, the

purpose of this team is … The purpose of this is reform to the process of how the independent review teams are run.

The independent review teams are a vital part of the ICANN process. They basically continually review ICANN in various ways and they're one of the most important forms of external oversight to ICANN. Of course, ICANN does decide who's on the teams but once the teams are created, they're supported by ICANN but of course they can produce outcomes that ICANN is not very happy about and they are vital check-and-balance which also lets the rest of the ICANN community have their opportunity to see if they think the board and the organization in general is doing a good job.

So, I think this is likely an interesting discussion, and if you are interested in this topic, although this is a longstanding discussion, we should – this is a good opportunity to talk to, if you know someone who is involved in the GNSO Council … Martin is our NPOC member who is most actively involved in the council – this is a good discussion, if you don't understand how the independent review teams work or you have been involved in one or believe that the process needs discussion, this is a really good point in which to get involved. Can we move to the next item? Unless anyone has any comments on that. Has anyone here, apart from me, been in review team or been involved or have any thoughts on them? They're quite a good opportunity … In particular, I would recommend if you have very strong skills in a particular area that is relevant to a review team, the review teams are a good way to get involved in a long-running ICANN project to learn about ICANN, become somewhat involved in ICANN processes without necessarily having to

go through direct election or have a huge amount of experience in ICANN beforehand. Most of the review teams have a good mix of people who are ICANN veterans and relatively new to ICANN. Usually, the people who are external have very strong skills in relevant areas. If you do have particularly strong skills in one of the review teams, I would strongly advise you to consider getting involved.

Next item, IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms, next steps. First, actually, before we discuss this, the gentleman who just entered, can I ask you to introduce yourself?

[ASHWIN]: My name is [Ashwin] from Indonesia from the GAC.

DAVID CAKE: From the GAC as well? We have as many GAC members as we have NPOC members here almost. Welcome! I'd love to talk to you, actually, afterwards.

So, IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms next steps. So, the role of the GNSO Council is to oversee the policy process. Now, normally this is a matter of ensuring that the standard procedure is followed. The GNSO produces an initial report about a policy issue, then it puts together a working group on a policy issue. The working group goes through a range of standard steps. So, we talk about you produce a – it works towards an initial report. It eventually, when that report is completed, they send it forward to the council who generally approves it, if the procedure has been followed. So, the role of the

council, while the council often discusses policy issues, most of the time the actual work is done in working groups and the council ensures that the process is followed and also talks about how the GNSO and the council interacts with the rest of ICANN.

The IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanism working group is a complicated issue, though. That one has been around for a long time. It has a long and checkered history. It itself was created when a previous working group was considered to have not have fully addressed the issues. This one has also been one where there's been a lot of argument about whether or not the process has completed.

So, the issue – and I particularly invite our GAC visitors to comment if they feel I'm representing the history of this issue incorrectly. The IGO-INGO, the decision is effectively when a previous working group completed its work, it had a little bit leftover. A curative rights protection mechanism is one to say, well, a curative right is one to correct a mistake. So, the idea of this is when a domain name has been delegated and an IGO or an INGO feels it's been delegated incorrectly, then the [inaudible] was made they should have some right to correct that mistake. It's generally similar to the UDRP and the URS which are used in the general case.

The UDRP, which is along dates from 1998 and is only just undergoing review now is the most well-known curative rights protection mechanism within ICANN. And in new gTLDs, we also have the URS which is a sort of simpler, faster version of the UDRP but that doesn't give as many rights to the winner.

So, the IGO-INGO, there's a working group that's formed to address this. They quickly realized that the legal issues were quite complicated. This had a long history of getting various bits of legal advice. It was approved by the council. There seems to have been a lot of issues with it. People arguing the process was not followed. IGOs communicated first through GAC advice and then directly to the board that they were not happy with the process and wanted a different outcome from the start but did not participate in the GNSO PDP working group.

So, arguably, there were issues with that process within ICANN. Did the working group address GAC advice on the topic? It's a complicated issue. The motion was put but was withdrawn for a bunch of reasons involved with both process and substance.

Now, what we're trying to work out here is the process has not worked. How it has not worked? Who was unhappy about it? Certainly, there are people who believe the GNSO did its best with a complicated issue and there are those who believe that the GNSO … Well, certainly, there seem to be those in the GAC who believe that this was not really an issue for GNSO PDP at all and did not participate in that process, and instead have attempted to drive the policy outcome through GAC advice and direct communication to the board.

This is a summary. I'm sure I've missed out important things. But suffice to say the GNSO Council is trying to work out what is its part in the role of how we move forward with this really complicated issue, and those of us that are new to ICANN, this is a really good opportunity to attend

the … If you're attending the council meeting, to work out what is going on with this difficult issue.

So, I've probably gone on long enough about the GNSO, about that issue. If the GAC would like to add any perspective to that? I don't think NPOC has a policy position on this, per se, other than generally I'm in favor of the GNSO PDP Working Group as the proper policy process. But a number of things have clearly gone wrong in this case and we could have a long discussion about whose fault it was and I shan't do that. Do you have any comments? No? Okay. Thank you.

Moving on to the next issue on the council agenda, if we can. Or does anyone have any comments on that issue?

Item six, council discussion. There's no outcome about this. This is about next steps for internationalized domain names. Internationalized domain names, there's no single policy within ICANN that talks about IDNs. Rather, there's many different processes taken on simultaneously. There's GNSO processes, though I don't think there are any active ones. There's advice from SSAC and so on. There are [inaudible] to have a lot to do with IDNs because there are a lot of issues to do with, for example, Cyrillic character sets that closely resemble the Latin character set being used for domain names, possibility of them being used for deceptive purposes. There are a lot of issues to do with … But we're well past those issues mostly and to talking about quite a lot of different and less … It's quite a lot of more complex character sets, particularly to do with some Indian and Chinese language family discussions.

EN

So, this is the council's part of an ongoing effort. It's only discussion, but if you are interested in this issue, council discussion is often a very good way in which to work out what's going on within the ICANN process. Next item. Thanks, Maryam. Unless we have any comments.

Oh, excuse me. Newcomer to the room. Can I get you to introduce yourself?

ABDIRAHMAN MOALIM ADDOW: Hi, my name is Abdirahman. I'm from Somalia.

DAVID CAKE: Are you a member of NPOC?

ABDIRAHMAN MOALIM ADDOW: No. I'm a member of … I'm the government contact for GAC.

DAVID CAKE: Oh, right. So, we definitely have reached the point where the GAC representatives have outnumbered NPOC in the room. Thank you. Board consultation on the expedited PDP on the temporary specification phase one, next steps.

So, I will talk about the expedited PDP and the temporary specification a bit later. There's a lot of work on the expedited PDP and what it is. But this is about phase one. So, phase one of the expedited PDP on the temporary specification

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

Now, I actually have a presentation at last meeting's discussion about what even is all this. Who here does not know what the expedited PDP on the temporary specification is? Would anyone like an explanation of that? Do you know? If you don't know and you would like to know, I'm happy to a brief.

Anyway, the temporary specification is about … So, running through that quickly, the expedited PDP is a form of policy development process hat has not been used before and we're using an expedited version to try and get things done very fast because there seems to be a bit of a crisis on the issue.

The temporary specification was … The core issue here is actually about the European privacy legislation. I'm blanking on the name. The GDPR. I'm just trying to remember what all the four letters stand for. General Data Protection Regulation. That was [inaudible] basically the WHOIS and the registration data was handled was found to be in contravention of the GDPR, so we had an emergency specification put in place to replace the original rules. Because that [inaudible], temporary specification was put in place by the board. It needed to be verified by the GNSO. The GNSO did this new process, the expedited PDP, which goes much faster than the old PDP and we managed to get something useful within one year which is what was needed, otherwise the temporary specification would lapse.

This is about the work that's already been done on the PDP, the work that was done in the first year and it's about particularly it's discussion about the parts of the first year's work, the new work of the EPDP that

the board rejected. So, this will be quite an interesting discussion and I certainly will be following it because I'm part of the EPDP project as an alternate. Next item.

Council discussion. Consideration of updates from PDP – that's [inaudible]. Probably that will be very short. Normally, in a longer meeting, the council would spend at least half a day or so looking through all the updates from PDPs and so on. This is a very short meeting where you won't have really time to do that. I recommend that it's worth attending and other meetings.

Council discussion. Consideration of the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team. That team is reported and passed recommendations to the GNSO that we're discussing about implementation of those.

Item ten. And progress made for the implementation of PDP 3. Now, PDP 3.0 is updating the policy development processes. These updates are actually worth I think the NPOC Policy Committee meeting having a meeting to discuss or something but it won't be at this meeting because these are still things for the future.

The GNSO policy process is in relative crisis. We don't have enough new people. The people that are heavily involved are all pretty burnt out and have a huge slab of work involved and a lot of issues like the IGO-INGO process have run into problems and some of the problems seem to be relatively intractable in that they keep happening again and again. In particular, the IGO-INGO one, the difficulty of coordinating with the GAC appropriately has been one of the big issues in that one. We have done

a bit of work when I was council vice chair. I was part of a group that worked with GAC and council leadership to try and make the two groups work better together and there were some issues with that. If we can move on. Do you want to introduce yourself, new people in the room?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. Good morning everyone. My name is [inaudible]. I work for [German] Ministry of the Interior Building and Community and I have to admit, it's not my first time at ICANN. It's my third time. But I thought it's always good to meet new people and you can learn something new every new day. Thank you.

DAVID CAKE: Okay. And?

MANAL ISMAIL: And my name is Manal Ismail. I'm the GAC chair.

DAVID CAKE: Yes. I don't know why we have so many GAC people here. I assume you're waiting for another meeting soon or something or you just wanted to visit?

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry. This is the session for the GAC first-timers, right?

DAVID CAKE: Right. No, it is not. It is not the session for GAC first-timers, though I hope your GAC first-timers will have learned something about the GNSO I guess. According to our schedule, this is the NPOC Policy Committee Meeting.

MANAL ISMAIL: Then, we're sorry.

DAVID CAKE: Well, it's been a pleasure to meet you all. And I said, you've learned a little bit about the GNSO Council. I've tried to be …

MANAL ISMAIL: Maybe you should be there.

DAVID CAKE: I just hope you enjoyed your insight into the GNSO GAC interaction from the other side. Can we get back to the main agenda?

The only thing I'm going to add on current policy issues during the meeting is that the EPDP phase two will be meeting and that will be a fair bit of my time. The other two … We have two other big PDPs during this meeting that are meeting during this meeting. The rights protection measures PDP which has been ongoing for some time, and the new gTLD issues. Both of those are very large policy working groups. I wish we had people here to give some updates on them, but we don't, so I'm

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

going to skip over them because I don't have a lot of insight into what's going on into those in this meeting. I know EPDP two will be very busy.

Now, I was going to talk a little bit about capacity building planning and where we go from here and what we do with the NPOC but it seems that, without Carlos here, we're going to be limited in what we could usefully do with that. So, while I'm always interested to hear input for what people would like done in policy committee, this probably isn't the meeting to discuss it.

The two of you that are here, what would you like to talk about? Let's just use this space as productively as we can for you while you're here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, what are we going to discuss about EPDP and the RPM Working Group?

DAVID CAKE: Well, I was hoping that we would have someone who is closely involved in the RPM Working Group to do that. So, the EPDP, what we are going to … The biggest issue that's before the EPDP in general in phase two is we are talking about … So, the phase one said, essentially … We haven't 100% solved every issue, but essentially the job of phase one was to work out what information should be collected and who should have access to that. No, which parts of it should be public.

So, we worked out which information is collected and it was roughly divided into is this information going to be public or not? The

mechanism by that which is done is that previously ICANN … Well, ICANN really had a list of which information it wants to be collected and it made all of it public, essentially. The process that mostly was done in phase one was working out which purpose it was collected for. Under the GDPR, you need to say why you collected information, what was the purpose of that collection, and then you're only supposed to give it out for things related to that purpose. You can't say, "Well, we collected people's home address purely for purposes of sending them material but now someone wants to use it for research." You can't just simply automatically use information you've collected for any purpose, only for the purpose it was collected. We did most of that work. There's still a few issues that are lingering, so there will be still addressing some of those.

The other issue that's a big part of EPDP phase two is essentially how is that going to work? We had a proposal presented in the last meeting in Kobe about how it might technically work. Generally speaking, I think a lot of people have found that while there's some useful things in that, it highlighted some issues with … A lot of issues with that approach have been highlighted and it also, the policy proposal presented had some sort of implicit … Sorry, the technical proposal that was presented had some implicit policy decisions that it probably needed to be looked at first before it was fully done.

So, the EPDP will be looking at how to build an access model, or how people are able to get access to that data. And that will be the big issue for EPDP phase two and that will be discussed – we're moving towards that, though we're still at fairly early stages this meeting.

Particular, we're talking about will it be a unified model, [inaudible] every if bit of access working the same way? Who decides who gets to do access? It probably needs some certification or someone to authorize particular people to get access. Will different people be granted access or will it be a case-by-case decision and things like that?

There's two main groups – well, probably three main groups of people – that are interested in getting access to that data. Law enforcement I one. And I think everyone is in agreement that there definitely needs to be full access to law enforcement. But all the access law enforcement are legally entitled to must absolutely be done, quite exactly the mechanism and how that will be managed is still up for discussion.

There's also discussion for people who want to use that access for security purposes. That's kind of a complicated discussion. It may not be clear that they need access to the raw information but what often they're looking at is correlation. For example, if the security researchers … In many cases, [inaudible] commercial security providing firms, they would like to be able to when they find a domain that's being used for some illicit purpose or maligned purpose, they would like to be able to quickly identify every other domain that is registered to the same person and things like that. How exactly they'll be granted access to that is an interesting question which is still under discussion.

There are also people who want to do similar purposes for intellectual property violation, and they also are very keen to have a very broad, wide access to data and there's a lot of discussion about whether or not

they should do that and be able to have that access and under what purpose. The purpose is still [in some dispute].

Oh, yeah, it is an open meeting. I just wondered why you were here and whether you'd like to introduce yourself. No?

So, that's pretty much the EPDP discussion. I'd be very happy to either discuss that or put anyone who's interested in specific issues in touch with people from the NCSG team who are handling that discussion. We're not quite got a full complement this meeting. We had a few people who were not able to make this meeting. In particular, Farzaneh Badii. So, we're going to have to rely on some of the … Well, some of the alternates, like me, will be taken off the bench and participating [fully] in the EPDP process this meeting.

Do I have any other questions from anybody, including our visitors?

OREOLUWA LESI: So, for the EPDP, since the members of the group are appointed, for other people who are interested in following up with the different issues, what's the best way to do that?

DAVID CAKE: So, the meetings are … I believe observers will be in the meetings but observers will not be permitted to … This group is unusually very tightly controlled. Normally, in most working groups, we work on the basis of the bigger the better and we like to have large working group membership and to be as inclusive as we can. Then when we have

EN

meetings at ICANN, normally even visitors and observers will be permitted to speak. The EPDP, however, particular because it was supposed to be … It's basically designed to move as fast as possible, especially because we had so much work to do in the first year – the second year we don't have a tight firm deadline the same way that we did for the first year, but because we now have data that is being redacted and groups that want access to that data, particularly law enforcement … Well, [inaudible] law enforcement who can talk to registrars and registries directly if they need to, but particularly for groups like security researchers and so on, they want this – and the GAC wants this – to be completed as quickly as possible. So, we're still on a very tight timeframe. I think GAC advice says within a year, even though that's sort of optimistic.

So, we're still working on this very streamlined model, which means that only EPDP full members or their appointed alternates – so, even as an alternate to the group, I generally don't get to speak or participate on the mailing list and can only take a passive role in meetings, unless one of the full members have dropped out and appoints one of the alternates to take over.

So, I've got to say, you can certainly go and see the process and I think you'll mostly find that the actual process is quite involved and painful on the EPDP. If you want to know what's going on in more detail, particularly if there's a specific issue that you're involved in, I would strongly advise your best method is, while you can observe the public meetings, you might want to get detail from one of the people who is actively participating in that meeting or actively following that process.

I'm an alternate. There is an NCSG team here. Other members, I'm sure, would be happy to discuss what's going on, including Amr Elsadr. Tatiana Tropina is very active. Ayden Ferdeline, Stephanie Perrin, Milton Mueller. Rafik Dammak is also involved in the leadership of that and I'm sure will be happy to help as well. I think I've got everyone. Oh, and new member. Stephane is a new alternate, replaced Collin Kurre who dropped out and I think will also be an active member this session.

So, it is a difficult one to get a handle on. It's extremely involved and it is difficult to actually be … No one is allowed to really take much active part in discussions. It's a good question and I'm afraid I don't have a really satisfying answer, other than that is a particularly difficult one.

Also, looking at the … Follow that council discussion about what they're doing about the phase one might also be interested. Ask a councilor about that.

Do we have any other questions about that? If we don't have any questions about policy issues, do we have any other questions about what's going on in the meeting and do we … Or are there other questions about what would you like to see in these meetings? I think I will be running the next meeting in Montreal but I will certainly be working closely with Carlos to move towards his direction he wants to set and what intersessional activity you are keen on. We did create a couple of comments.

OREOLUWA LESI: I think maybe for the next meeting, it would be nice to maybe talk about some more hot topics. There was the public comments on the multi-stakeholder model and the evolution of it, so maybe we could also talk a little bit about that here as well.

DAVID CAKE: Well, it's a good point. First, I'll go through the … Do we have another 15 minutes, Maryam? Yeah. So, let's go through the open public comments currently open. I think we just closed the non-contracted party house election procedures for board seat 14. I don't think we [inaudible] commented on that one, but NPOC along with all the other parts of the non-contracted party house participated in deciding those election procedures for board seat 14. So, that was really more … We did not contribute. That's fine. That comment was really more of an opportunity for those outside the non-contracted party house to comment on that election procedures.

A study on the technical use of root zone label generation rules is open until more or less the end of the week. That's a relatively technical one about IDNs. I don't think we have any interest in putting in a comment on that from NPOC.

There's a proposal for streamlining organizational reviews. That will be open until mid-July. Organizational reviews are pretty vital, and I think any of the … I mean, NPOC has a strong interest in making sure those organizational reviews, at least of the GNSO, is done in a good and timely manner and process. The proposals I think about timing and

methodology, though, so [inaudible] yet to be seen, I think if we have any comments on that.

There's a fundamental bylaw amendment proposal. That's about the IANA naming function review. I don't think it's an NPOC-specific issue.

And similarly, revisions to the ICANN bylaws, regards SSAC and RSSAC leadership. That's an issue we should look at but it's not I think one that's a strong concern of the GNSO particularly.

There are [inaudible] [SLAs] for publishing label generation rules and IDN tables. Again, that's quite a technical one about IDNs.

Draft final report of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review. Another ccNSO.

There's the operating plan is open until August.

Financial assumptions and projections in operating initiatives for the development of fiscal years 2021 to 2025.

And [evolving] the governance of the root server system.

So, there's quite a few that are open. We just closed the evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model report. That process is going to be an interesting discussion. I think that's a high-interest topic that will be discussed. I think that is going to be one of the hot topics. Partly that's about … Is the way we run the model working as well as we would like?

Are there particular … There's a lot of … Which also disclose a lot of registry agreements, of which dot-org was seen as a very big hot topic

agreement. So, NPOC did put in a policy submission – put in a policy comment to the proposed renewal of dot-org. A lot of other organizations within both internal and external to ICANN did that as well. NPOC, in particular, was critical of the removal of price caps on the dot-org domain name and put in a comment very strongly against improvement of price caps. The dot-org did respond and said that they did not intend to actively raise prices. It was more that they wish to harmonize the dot-org agreement with other more recent agreements in other ways. But that issue remains something that I think will be up for discussion, but I think the heat around the issue is probably reduced.

Are there any other specific issues in public comments that we'd like to talk about, particularly about a public comment we might want to put in? Any of those public comments people think we should consider responding to that are open or going to be open soon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] mention about dot-org, so what happened to dot-org registry or [inaudible]?

DAVID CAKE: Well, what has happened is the new registry agreement was put out for public comment. The public comment period has closed. As far as I'm aware, staff is still responding to that, I think are still collating all the responses and that dot-org agreement will be up before the board fairly soon.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] changes [inaudible] registry?

DAVID CAKE: No, I don't think there's any likelihood … I mean, I think that public interest registry going to remain the registry for dot-org but the specific details of their agreement were up for renewal. Now, dot-org is one of the original domain names. It's been around since considerably before ICANN existed and it was one of the first registry agreements with ICANN. But those historic agreements, like dot-org and dot-com, every few years they have to be renewed, and as part of that process, they look at what can change.

Now, the big controversial issue is the new registry agreement … Registry agreements previously used to have price caps on them that the registry couldn't increase the amount they're charging without direct approval from ICANN. More modern registry agreements don't have that and more or less said, "Well, we'll let the market take care of it." Now, many people were very upset at the idea that dot-org might remove those price caps and people who had a dot-org domain name for a long time might be able to have the price raised on them. That was the big issue that people put a lot of discussion into.

Now, dot-org responded publicly by saying that they did not intend to raise the price caps. They were just trying to bring their agreement in line with other agreements. Whether or not the board decides to change that process in response to public comment I don't think has

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

yet been determined. So, watch the board, basically, to decide when that will come up. But you can certainly look at the public comments. There's a lot of them. Maryam, you don't happen to know anything about whether or not when that dot-org comes up for the board or not? No, I didn't think so.

So, I think it's still basically staff are preparing the response to all the public comments. They probably will be talking to PIR in doing that. PIR itself has its own advisory committee and members of the community – a lot of members of the ICANN community are part of that advisory committee. If you're a member of NPOC, I would strongly recommend a good place to talk about – a good person to talk to about dot-org issues is the chair, Joan Kerr, because she's on one of those advisory boards – advisory council, I think. Also, as a member of NCSG, you could talk to Stephanie Perrin, who is the chair of NCSG, and is also on the PIR advisory board. There are a few other people around who can talk to you about the dot-org side – the PIR side of that negotiation. I think the ICANN side is still at a board level, so staff are still making decisions on – helping the board decide what their response will be.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] many revenue or money from [inaudible] registry money will go to [inaudible] will support IETF. So, IETF is a lot of [inaudible] dot-org revenue, so I think it is very important for IETF also. I think that's why I [inaudible].

DAVID CAKE: The benefit of everybody else … Sorry, I don't know your name.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm [inaudible] from [CNIC].

DAVID CAKE: Yeah. The issue that we're talking about there is, for those of you who are not aware, PIR (the Public Interest Registry) runs dot-org. PIR is owned by ISOC, the Internet Society. So, revenue from dot-org registrations goes to PIR. PIR passes most of its surplus. It is a non-profit, but it generates significantly more revenue than its running cost, and that surplus is generally passed along to the Internet Society and, in turn, that's one of the major sources of revenue for the Internet Society which then uses a lot of that to fund, among other projects, the IETF which creates the Internet standards.

So, besides its role as a provider of dot-org registrations to various non-profits, it has a very important part in the ICANN ecosystem of ensuring … Well, not so much the ICANN ecosystem is what sometimes called the ISTAR ecosystem, the organization of all the – the ecosystem of all the organizations that help run the independent Internet, including … We're ultimately going back to the IETF.

The IETF for a very long time, surprisingly, is one of the world's most … Probably incredibly significant standards organizations actually had no legal existence. It was not a legal person. That means it had no money. But then it got to the point where it was running meetings with thousands of attendees. It needed money. What do you do with them?

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

The IETF became not a legal entity but a project of ISOC and that was how it was able to run large events with huge budgets and things like that. And PIR is part of that.

So, one of the things that happens with this people being very worried about the dot-org price increases is there's a counterargument that what's actually happening is that money would only flow back into the Internet ecosystem and would be used in a lot of valuable ways, so there's an interesting argument there, which I'm sure will be addressed by the board who are all very aware of that role in the ecosystem.

Do we have any other comments? We're about two minutes away from wrapping up, so I think we are going to wrap up. I'd just like to get any final comments from anybody.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Final comment. When I first [inaudible], registry fee is around 500 US dollars. Now [inaudible] 1000 US dollars [inaudible]. IETF is very poor, so need more money from dot-org registration [inaudible] fees. So, I think it is a very important issue for IETF.

DAVID CAKE: Thank you. I will also note that PIR also runs other registries. Sorry. The PIR registry also runs other gTLDs. Well, they include dot-ngo and I think there are a couple of others in there. I can't remember the exact variant, but it's a similar thing – same letters in a different order for French.

So, they're no longer quite solely reliant on the dot-org income, but the new gTLD income does not seem to have been very large in comparison. They tried to diversify and it's not great reduced reliance on dot-org income.

Okay, well, it's 15 minutes past the hour, so I think I'm going to stop it there and thank you for all those who attended.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]