MARRAKECH – GNSO - RySG Members Open House
Thursday, June 27, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi, everyone. We'll get started in just a minute. We do have one or two people remote as well.

Welcome, everybody, to the Registries Stakeholder Group Wrap-Up Session for Marrakech. This was a late entry to the agenda, so for those following along at home, we don't have a lot of people in the room but I do appreciate those who have turned up. A format for this – I don't have a formal agenda but if there's issues that people want to discuss, throw them up and we can have a chat about it.

I think it might be helpful to have a little bit of conversation around – one of the big issues that has been for us since the beginning of the year is DNS abuse and I think there's some momentum certainly around that topic at this meeting and we're conscious that coming into Montreal, which isn't until October, there's probably a bit of planning that we need to do to make sure that we're on top of things going into that meeting. Is there any other topic that folks wanted to talk about? Kristine?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: This is Kristine. I'll just add to the list. I'm happy to update anybody who doesn't already know where RPM is at really quickly if people want to hear it. If not, I'll keep silent.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: This is Jonathan. I'd like to object to that topic.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Excellent.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'd happy to have an update for anyone who would like to have that update. I've just been to the Meetings Planning Group as Sue, and so I'm happy to put a couple of comments on the record for this group and to discuss them as appropriate.

DONNA AUSTIN: We should recognize the Multistakeholder Ethos Award winner Kurt Pritz who's in the room with us today.

Okay. So, DNS abuse. There were a number of sessions conducted this week. One was done with the GAC. One was done with the ALAC. I wasn't present in either of those but I've heard some feedback on what's going on. Obviously, this is something that we've been talking about probably since the end of last year when we received the RFI for the Compliance audit. And also

during the GDD summit, I think we started to get an understanding that because all of the registry operators were part of the audit and it was focused on abuse-related issues, we got the feeling that this was going to be a topic for us in next 12 months. We weren't really sure how it was going to play out but at the GDD Summit, the first notion from ICANN staff, certainly from Jamie, was that perhaps we need a Policy Development Process to define abuse – and I'm not sure what else the intention that PDP would be – but Jamie put that on the table. It was resoundingly rejected by those of us in the room at the GDD Summit. But I do understand that it was certainly discussed with the ALAC yesterday as a possibility. I'm sure the GAC may have had that same discussion.

That's something that we are aware of and we're monitoring. There has been a little bit of back channel conversations going on. Jonathan, Sam, Beth and I met this morning. What we would like to do and use our Stakeholders Group calls for in the next few months before Montreal is understand how we can use those calls to, one, get a download of what's happened here, what the issues are, what we think we need to doing preparation for Montreal. Maybe have a call that's devoted to an interaction with the Public Sector Working Group which is a group that sits underneath the auspices of the GAC. We think that would be

valuable, whether we think having conversation with the ALAC would be helpful as well.

Because we feel that there's a lot of disinformation out there, so we think it's important that people understand what our perspective of the issue is and talk about some of the things that we do beyond what the requirements are in the Registry Agreement. So we think there's value in getting that message out.

Jonathan will give us a bit on an update on the meeting planning. We have understood I think since January, since there was a meeting in D.C. that Bryan Schilling led on Consumer Safeguards and Kristine – and I think Brian Cimbolic went along to that on our behalf and I think we became aware at that time that Montreal was looking as a target date for ICANN Org to have a community-wide discussion around the topic. So, we've known it has been coming. We just weren't really clear about what ICANN hope to get out of it all or how it would set up. So we're starting to get a little bit of a clear picture about that I think.

I think from the ExCom perspective, that's going to be a little bit of a focus for us in the next few months to try to make sure that we're well-prepared going into Montreal and we've got our ducks in a row. Martin?

MARTIN SUTTON: Hi, Donna. Just to add to what efforts are going on, there's invitations going out to various UK stakeholder members to get together in London. I think it's 5th or 7th of July. So all those questions that you talked about are up for discussion there.

DONNA AUSTIN: I'm not sure – where does that invitation come from?

MARTIN SUTTON: From Jean-Jacques, from ICANN. It's this roadshow effect with Brian Schilling going around the community groups and teasing up these questions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Kristine?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks. I think that's really alarming because I think what we're seeing in this roadshow is staff spinning up their own idea. They keep phrasing the slides in the passive voice. An idea for a PDP to define abuse was proposed. They don't say that they spun all these up and they're inviting this turn and they're the ones that proposed it. And so, I think they're making it seem like there's this big community outcry and so you have to get on board.

People are worried. But people aren't worried and I think if you watch sort of what happened in the GAC, what happened in the ALAC, is you're seeing people raise it up. Of course the GDD – you're seeing people hear this and go, "What?" and raising an eyebrow a bit. I'm really concerned and I'm wondering if it's time to approach staff and be really clear that they need to say this was their idea. Don't hold it out there as same big old community demand. That's a proposal and a question because I'm really concerned about that. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, Jonathan has raised something. So earlier in the week, Jonathan, Beth, Sam, and I met with Goran. DNS abuse was one of the topics we discussed and Goran suggested to us that the DNS abuse was on his mind before he came to ICANN. So, it's something he's been pondering in and thinking about for some time.

We had quite a discussion. I don't have good notes or recall of that meeting right now, but I think we did ask the question about – we do have some concerns that Compliance seems to be driving this effort and we're not sure that that's the appropriate place for that to happen, but I don't think Goran was willing to change course on that but maybe he will.

He's waiting for our invitation to have a conversation with him and Jamie and Brian about this topic. In my mind, I think that's something we need to do sooner rather than later, but if there's an invitation for a UK get together on the topic then I suppose that's happening more broadly as well or more widely, I should say so. We probably need to try to get to the bottom of that as well. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we need to make it clear that the idea might be good but if based on non-factually based statistics because we haven't seen any, and as soon as we have results for most registries, we need to make some kind of statement that the attempt was out of scope, the tool used is not the one which fits the purpose because it's not factually based. And to make it clear that everything they build on top of DAAR, it's just like it was built on sand. They even fail to provide us any kind of proof that the records they showed us were legit one. In our case, 75% of their requests were just non-existent. So, it's highly questionable thing.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. DAAR is one aspect of this but there's a number of other elements to this conversation as well. I think with the consumer safeguards effort, it was couched in a way that there

is community concern about abuse. I actually think we requested specifics on what those concerns were during the GDD Summit but we haven't received those.

Yes, Jonathan. I think this goes much wider than DAAR. That's just one element of it, that's something that we're focused on because we think that it could be improved and we think that the data could get better. But this is a much broader topic and its community concern and also the idea that ICANN in doing its work, whether it's with a government or other entities, are getting feedback that this is a concern at a national government level. And one of the potential problems we're going to run into is that with the national legislation that we'll have similar impacts to GDPR, so we need to get ahead of it.

One of the reasons – this is just a conclusion that I've come to – that ICANN might be looking to do a PDP is because it's something that they can point to, that something is being done at ICANN on this topic. Now, it's a visible tangible thing, how long it takes to get through it, all the rest of it, that's not here not there but it's something tangible that ICANN can point to, that we're dealing with this in-house through this mechanism.

Jonathan, Maxim, and then Kristine.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Donna. I think on point, if we focus on that, the high-level objective and at least receptive to that is for a desire to at least articulate what is being done about this – but for many of us, I think we would say, "Let's go back a step and define the problem. Is there a problem? What is that problem? What's the scope of that problem? Where does it exist?" I guess to be fair, if I look at the invitation to the UK meeting, it certainly looks like it has been – this is not just one person who said, "Here's an idea for a UK gathering." This is a part of a structured, I would imagine, multi-region activity going on. But it says things like, what is the potential definition for DNS abuse? What is within ICANN's remit? What's outside of ICANN's remit? So, I would imagine those are the kind of questions we would ask ourselves.

So I think we got to be careful about – we've got to roll with it a little without being rolled over by it. From the point of view of just that, I would say that, I do have a contribution to make on this in relation to the meeting topics that we've just discussed. But I think we're definitely going to have to engage with it and I think that the thinking, certainly the initial informal discussions that have taken place is we need to be ahead of, on top of. Otherwise, we will find ourselves being so steam rolled and perhaps that definition expanding. But one cautionary point in there, it does say what voluntary mechanisms could DNS

operators utilize to address DNS. So, there's clearly going to be a big scope discussion. Thanks.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, I see this situation where we find Compliance to the left. Actually, SSAC behind which we could see shade of the Public Safety Working Group and DAAR somewhere in the middle and I think the current situation is that everybody sees us – I mean the rest of community. As parties who do nothing, because of this evidence that everything is terrible in terms of cyber abuse and we most probably helping those bad parties. I mean the image. And the situation is SSAC is like white knights helping everybody to survive in this horrible situation.

That's why I actually talked to Xavier who is the financial guy in ICANN. If it's possible to identify the amounts spent on security efforts between ICANN and organizations affiliated with the members of SSAC because it would just make picture closer to reality, to say that yes, SSAC is great but please be aware it's contractor's party. They got this amount of millions that year and they're using self-fulfilling prophecies, and it's just methods of monetizing their services, because currently, the situation where we're trying to say, "No, no, no," but denial in situation where everybody blames you doesn't help, actually.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. I think one of the things that we have acknowledged is that we need to get ahead of the story. So, to your point about we look like the bad actors, we need to get on the front foot and just get out there in the community and say, "This is what we're doing." We understand that DAAR is one tool that does X but this is how we understand it, this is what we're doing. We are good actors and we're looking to do more, whatever. So, I think there's an onus on us to get out there and get on the front foot.

I think one of the things too – Jonathan read out those questions. We should actually get the answers to those questions. We should have that conversation internally, so that we can respond to those questions and if anyone is actually attending those meetings that we have a consistent message. Kristine and then Kurt.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks. Yeah, I agree with everything. I'm just going to make kind of a little bit of a fine point. I do agree that we have to get ahead and I do agree that we definitely can't just be standing and pushing, and we've got to roll with it. For sure, that's very true.

My concern specifically that going back to January, that meeting was very precise and it was about gathering the community

basically – a little bit of everybody to try to brainstorm some ideas. The outcome of that was supposed to be a session in Montreal where registries and maybe registrars could showcase their efforts demonstrating that we are good actors and that was going to be the plan and there was going to be a planning session in Marrakech where we would get those people in the room together, figure out who our panel is going to be, and make the showcase, right?

Since January, Consumer Safeguards, despite taking multiple action items to reach out to the small team, has not reached out to us even one time but has instead turned it into a travelling now roadshow. And it's like to now garner support for this PDP. It feels very bait and switch to me, and that's what I'm nervous about. I agree completely on the substance and I agree we had to work with the tools we're given. If we're being screwed, we need to step up and fight back like I get it. But I'm wanting to raise awareness that that was not the intent. That's not what came out of January. So the fact that staff is basically turning this up right now, was not what we were promised and I feel very bait and switched right now. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Kristine. Just a quick follow for you. The original small teams, is that registries and registrars or is it just registries?

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yes. The original small team was the people that came to the meeting in January, which was two people from registries, two people from registrars, and then some random assortment of people that crossed over between the BC, IPC, copyright coalition. There was a collection of people that represented generally content.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. The reason I asked specifically that is because Graeme has talked about the registrars attempting to reach out to Consumer Safeguards and make contact to them. Is that a different or is that the same problem?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: I think it's the same problem. Graeme was in that original and Graeme and Brian were – we were together in that. Anyway, we're in that planning session Kobe as well where that follow-on was, "Yep, yep, these are the action items, we're going to get some stuff around you." Rather than circulating anything to us, it's just let's make a roadshow, carry on. And that feels icky.

KURT PRITZ: Hi, Donna. I agree with you that we should get on our front foot and talk about the things we are doing to the public, but I think also we should write to ICANN and call them on it in the right way. I think we should watch their meeting with ALAC that they had here and watch the meeting with the GAC and point out the areas where they were seemingly purposely vague or even slightly misleading. I think we should call out the small group meeting that happened in the previous ICANN meeting, in the direction that was had there.

More to the point that when they have this roadshow, they'll know we'll be watching. So when you go forward and talk about this, we hope you include this idea that we had an idea for this session, that we are working cooperatively with ICANN on DAAR to make it better, we're doing all these things. So we'll be listening when you have these roadshow meetings to see that you're also talking about those sorts of things.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Kurt. I think we discussed that among a couple of people. I think we really do need – if not our next registry call, we probably should do it in our next registry call – is really do a brain dump on what's happened here. Let's try to go back to the GDD Summit and see if we can pull out some of the action items, because I do recall now that we ask for specificity on a number

of things during that session and we haven't got anything back from anybody.

Kristine, if there was an understanding as a result of the D.C. thing and now that's been changed, at least some of the challenges that we have in the relationships we're trying to develop with Compliance and others. Martin?

MARTIN SUTTON: First of all, I may have been a bit flipping in terms of the term roadshow. I don't know how many there is, but I kind of get the sense that they're doing the rounds and trying to surface this. I think my preference it would have been, if they had approached registries/registrars to say we want to do some effort on this, come and work together in terms of promoting what is proactively done in this space, how we define it somewhat, and where we think there could be improvements relying on those particular stakeholder and the responsibilities under contracts, etc.

So I think that that would have been a better approach and we would have been going through this process then of creating the positive news elements and that stats and details to guide other members of the community, because I think these will be a mixture of people and they won't know the details about who does what, what are the components that are actually in control

of the registry/registrars and what is the vast amount of stuff that is not – I think that might be a point to get across to ICANN as well if we write to them.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Martin. I think it goes back to what Jonathan said earlier that I haven't seen a problem statement on this. So it seems to be growing. Kristine?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: You're exactly right, Martin. That was the outcome. It was a three-prong outcome of, "Tell us only what you have been doing but tell us what you're capable of doing," like registries versus registrars. There was some confusion. There was supposed to be a demonstration of how you submit or take down notice. Very specific. And it was supposed to be the registries and registrars educating the rest of the community and that's what I thought about and I've been calling it a roadshow all week. So, for me, you have a free pass on that. But that's exactly right. I like the idea of the Stakeholder Group call because I know that some registries have been at least socializing with Brian Schilling this week, and so they may have more insight that just hasn't been circulated to the broader group, which would be a little unfortunate but at least it would be something.

I know we're going to have a call next call but maybe an outcome that our subsequent call includes the registrars for a bit because this impacts them I think too. I think we've got virtually identical problems here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Kristine. We had CPH ExCom meeting yesterday and we discussed some of this and understand we need to at least be coordinated on this, if not working directly together. It's certainly on their radar as well. I think I'm going to draw a line under this unless anybody else has anything else.

Okay, Kristine, RPMs update, notwithstanding the objection from Jonathan.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thank you. Objections duly noted.

Really quickly, I know that we've been doing RPMs for a really long time but we finally concluded the two subteams that have been going on. One subteam has been focusing on the questions related to the initial report questions related to Sunrise, and one subteam is working on an initial report related to claims. In this meeting we actually wrapped both of those. So this is the first time in a long time we've had any progress to report at all. Thank you.

David, Susan, Maxim, and I did a lot of drafting to try to get things to the finish line. I joked with Susan – never before have I been part to so many compliments for doing so little because we're just not even close to being done, but it felt good anyway.

Really, where we're at – and that is mostly a shout out to anybody who wants to be interested or do anything with RPMs, now would be a good time to jump in pretty quickly because we're now transitioning back to a plenary review of the initial reports, switching back to some of the stuff we discussed in 2016-2017, so the TMPDDRP and these Trademark Clearinghouse requirements, and specifically those two impact registry operators far more. So the TMPDDRP of course is a dispute resolution mechanism that goes against a registry operator for abusing brands by using a TLD in a way that's abusive to brands. We're going to reopen that and rethink about that.

Then the second thing is the Trademark Clearinghouse requirements which have to interact with the Trademark Clearinghouse at least through our registrars. To the extent that either of those are hot button topics, they're going to be waking back up again in the next couple of months. So if you are interested and want to know more, I'd be happy to show you where to sign up. But yeah, we're moving along and it's a little bit of progress. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Kristine. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just small side note. Actually, some of the text proposed by Susan, we're not in our favor – most of them – but some were mutual work.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Any questions for Kristine? Okay, we hear the call. We need to push the message out more broadly. Jonathan, do you want to go to meeting planning?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah. Just to remind you of the context, there is ICANN meeting staff community planning group that typically has been running for a couple of years, I understand, and they typically meet towards the end of the ICANN meeting and then take planning forward. There are representatives of the various Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies, and Supporting Organizations and so on, on that group. Donna has been doing it for some time and recently asked me to assist a Stakeholder Group by taking over that role. I represent the Registries Stakeholder Group. Sue from Registries Stakeholder Group and Zoe to Secretariats are also

attendees, as is Keith in his capacity as GNSO Council Chair. So, between us, we have some influence and some interest.

I'm trying to think what really were the salient points that came out of that. Certainly to the topic on DNS abuse, the GAC proposed two sessions for that as a first pass. The feedback from this meeting was that we should try and limit the number of high-interest topics rather than make a list of eight and then try to narrow it down. Rather, go for three or four, keep it tight.

So there are already three proposals. The two from the GAC which were on human rights and DNS abuse. That's in the pipeline at this stage, at the very early proposal stage as is a session on EPDP2 which was mooted for this meeting but pushed back on and is now likely to come up in the next meeting. Normally, we have the three topics already, whether or not more come along, that's to be seen.

One critical point I'll just make, Donna, and then by all means, give any feedback. The significant change that has been proposed at this meeting is working through the introduction of the high-interest topics much more rapidly than has been done before and cementing their place in the agenda. There's a very specific reason for that. It's to give the community better notice and understanding so that they can then better plan to travel or not to the meetings is ostensibly the reason. But why that's so

important for us given the topic we're talking about now is that those sessions are going to crystallize and possibly even the initial content might start to form much more rapidly than it would normally have done. That's just the warning especially on the DNS abuse topic that we really do need to get ahead of this. Thanks, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jonathan. We have done two pretty good sessions I think in terms of walking the shoes of registry operators. So we did one on the differences in what success means, so it's not just a matter of domains and the management. The other one was about innovation. Whether we pick this up as a high-interest topic, we could potentially think about doing our own in terms of a standalone session, how we can try to get it as primetime, I'm not sure. But I think we should think about doing something along a similar line of what we did for those two sessions for DNS abuse, because I think the format was pretty good and it was useful context for registry operators in certain instances. So I think that might be a good format for us to think about. If you're saying we're trying to winnow down the number of high interest or cross-community sessions, it might not fit in that bucket. But separately, we should think about doing it. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Donna. I was in the same meeting that Jonathan just attended and I agree with everything he said. I think on this topic of DNS abuse, I think we are likely to see that as a high-interest topic session. Just the terminology, just so everybody understands, we're trying to move away as the staff proposal from high-interest topic or cross-community to plenary, which basically represents the supposed to be non-conflicted. So there's some evolution of how the terminology is being used, so I'll start using that. So a plenary session non-conflicted that will focus on the topic of DNS abuse.

We know that SSAC is in favor of that. We know that the GAC is in favor of that based on the conversation today. I'm sure ALAC will support that. So I think this is something that we will see. We know from conversations with Goran that he feels this is a conversation that needs to take place. We heard that the GDD Summit in Bangkok that he was already throwing around the idea of a PDP on DNS abuse. I think he's recognized that that's not likely to be well-received and has walked that back, but he wants to have the conversation. He thinks the ICANN community needs to have this discussion. I'm willing to bet a lot on the fact that we will see that.

The question – and Jonathan made a good point – is how do we ensure that our story as registry and registrar operators, in this case, registries – as contracted parties, how do we ensure that

the story that's told in the discussion that takes place is even-handed. I did make the distinction today in our conversation with the other SO and AC and NCSG leaders is that we have to be very careful when we start talking about DNS abuse as a term that we're talking about infrastructure, we're not talking about content. And that if we're talking about the abuse of the DNS to propagate malware or things that destabilize the network, that's one thing. But as soon as you start getting into and straying over the line into content-related issues that's outside of ICANN's remit. So I made that point to the group today. I think that gives us the opportunity to keep it a focused discussion. And Jonathan made the point that we need to make sure that we were there to be able to tell the story of what we're already doing, what's being done, and I thought that was very effective. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Keith. One very brief add-on. I also made reference to the DNS over HTTPS (DoH)/DoT session and said we would like to see something analogous to that which was information-heavy content, our content, expert content, and specifically from those of us that are in the DNS infrastructure environment. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, Keith. Keith, one of the interesting things about Goran might be saying that he's walking back from the PDP idea but Jamie and Brian's sessions that they have with the GAC and the ALAC were specifically putting that idea out there. It's a little bit of mixed messages going on, so yeah.

I don't have anything else in particular. Keith, I know you came in late. So is there anything you wanted to update from a council perspective?

KEITH DRAZEK: I'm not sure there's anything that we hadn't discussed in – well, I guess we discussed a number of things with the ExCom. We didn't have any votes or any motions at the council this week. There was quite a bit of discussion on a range of topics. I will just reiterate how important it is for us as the registries to take a lead in the council or among council and with the ccNSO on the topics of IDN variants, the IDN guidelines to the extent that this is something that we care about.

I know that Edmon has volunteered to participate along with Rubens and Maxim and Philippe Fouquart within the council. Dennis from Verisign will also volunteer to be part of that effort. I think we just need to make sure that this remains a focus and a priority because we teed this issue up. The Board has the

resolution in Kobe on the IDN top-level variant issue. We teed up the issue of the guidelines. We can't just let it sit now.

Of course, there was the discussion on the IGO curative rights and engagement with the GAC and the IGOs I think we're pretty much well up to speed on that for those that care about it. Ongoing discussion – drafting team to come up with a scope and a charter for this dedicated subteam welcome input from the IGOs but recognizes there's still a GNSO Council responsibility.

I think that's it, Donna. I can't think of anything else right now.

DONNA AUSTIN: Brian's probably fried.

KEITH DRAZEK: Let me also just say though that at 3:15 today, I will be moderating the cross-community session on the impacts of the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations and consensus policy on other existing policies and procedures and contractual elements. That's a 90-minute session. This is an opportunity to flag the 13 or 14 items that we've identified to discuss and to receive input from the community about those impacts. Are they incompatible? Are there other impacts that can be managed? What do we need to initiate PDPs at the council level? Is it an IRT level issue with ICANN Org in the community? Or is it a GDD

contracted party issue about a contract where the rest of the community doesn't need to be involved? That's sort of the goal is to be able to identify what are the issues? What are the impacts? Do they need to be mitigated urgently? Does it require a PDP IRT or contractual negotiation? If anybody can participate and join and bring the registry view, that will be helpful.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Keith. Just picking up on the IDN issue, I sent a letter back to Goran I think about a week ago and I had a conversation with Russ about that during the week. From Russ's perspective, he wants to start engaging in his dialogue and get away from the letters. So I don't know how that fits in with what the council is doing. But from a GDD perspective, they just want to start having a conversation around it. I really don't understand how the bits fit together and where the issue is we need to try to get to the heart of. So I think breaking that down will be helpful.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Donna. Just to respond, I agree. I don't think any of us really 100% understand where the issues are and that's one of the things that we need to do is to sort of work through that. To the extent that the Stakeholder Group engages with Russ and ICANN Org, I think it will be helpful to ensure that Rubens and Maxim and I, from a council perspective, are aware of or

involved in those discussions so we can then take the benefit of that back to council and to try to move that forward because it's not just the guidelines and the engagement with the GDD staff, it's the overall policy questions related to IDN variants, string similarity. Does it belong in SubPro for future TLDs? How do we deal with policy impacts on existing TLDs? There's a lot of moving parts here. I think it's still a bit of a murky situation at the moment.

DONNA AUSTIN:
Thanks, Keith. Just to be clear, what I said to Russ is that we have Dennis as our lead on this and we have other people that are pretty closely involved in that. So it would be that group, those that have been associated with this for quite a bit of time.

A couple of other things that I spoke to Russ about – we did have a conversation during the week on the proposed changes to the PICDRP which is the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process. Russ had written to us in January suggesting some changes to the PICDRP because of seven complaints by the one person that have been made about their experience with the process. The idea behind the changes was just to provide clarity and do a spell check of the document, really.

We had a group that went through it and looked at it from a contractual perspective. Whether a change was material or immaterial, we finally came back and had a conversation with Russ about that. I think from a conversation I have with Russ afterwards, I think this is a high priority for him, so I don't think he's going to make an issue of it. He will go with, "Let's make changes with the material," but he doesn't want to get into long-winded negotiation to try to overcome the material stuff. So hopefully we can resolve that in the short term and everyone can take that off their plate.

The working group that we had that Kristine and Jim lead, I think there was good discussion on that this week but maybe we'll do a wrap-up of that at a later time. I wasn't in the discussion with SSAC this week on – I'm trying to remember what that topic is – the letter that was received from SSAC. SSAC wrote to the GDD that they had identified some inconsistencies in the way that WHOIS was being reported across registry operators and they felt that that was inconsistent with the requirement in the Registry Agreement. So there was a discussion about that this week. I have heard third-hand that there was some pushback in the meeting about SSAC's ability to tell registry operators what they should be doing. I don't know if anyone from here was actually in that meeting. I know Rick was and a few others. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I actually was at that meeting. There were lots of ideas like, "Let's do that." As I remember, Keith, you were there. Marc I think was there. Richard Wilhelm was there. Effectively, they were trying to say that we have to do part of their job.

I asked if they really want us to venture into their business and if they really mean that. Yeah, they might understand that it might not be in the interest but the station is they see their wishes as something which has power. I mean the SSAC. And you give me a minute, I will find my notes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. If you just want to put a wrap-up also notes to the list, that might be helpful. I'm not sure whether there's an action item coming out of that, whether there's going to be further dialogue or not. But I'm sure we'll find out in the near term.

I know that RDAP Working Group had a session here. I'm not sure what the outcome of that was but I'm sure Rick will let us know at some point in time.

I think that's all I've got. I'm sorry this was a late addition to the schedule, but I think it's kind of helpful to have that little bit of wrap up at the end of the meeting, and maybe it's something we

can do in Montreal as well. Just spending an hour going around the table I think is pretty helpful. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Donna. Just one other thing, not really council-related but focused on the EPDP. And I know our EPDP reps are in that meeting at the moment, but I just want to note that some of the conversations this week and even in this morning's EPDP meeting, focused around Goran and ICANN Org's interaction with the European Commission looking ahead to engagement with the European Data Protection Board to try to get some indication as to whether a UAM with ICANN playing a centralized role is even a viable option. I just want to say – and we can circle back on our next Stakeholder Group call with our EPDP reps and have this further conversation – but in my view, and having had conversations with Goran and listen to the EPDP engagement and all that, we're approaching a fork in the road I think in terms of which direction this EPDP effort goes. It's either going to be with ICANN playing a centralized role as controller, for lack of a better word, taking on the authority and the responsibility and the liability as a controller and having registries and registrars be processors or RDS data. We will all be controllers for other things and other data for different things, but if ICANN – under its Bylaws with the mandate for stability, security, and resiliency, and RDS data being a part of that – becomes the controller then

we know that we're on the path towards a uniform access model with ICANN playing that role. The alternative is we come up with some other standardized system for access and disclosure where the liability and the controllership is distributed to either registry or registrar – probably registrar – and it becomes a much more distributed and less predictable system I think for the users of data.

The engagement of Goran and ICANN Org and his so-called strawberry team that Elena Plexida is involved with with the commission at this point I think will be helpful in figuring out the answer to that question. We may not get a direct answer. We're not getting any guarantees but I think the expectation is in September, ICANN is going to be back in there hopefully with input from the EPDP Team, which has been requested, basically going in and trying to understand what's viable. Then of course, ICANN will have to sign up to becoming a controller from a risk perspective, even if it's legal or compliant with GDPR. That's the next question. But I would like us to encourage or at least recognize that this can be a helpful engagement, and just in terms of giving us some visibility as to what the path needs to be. Then the EPDP Team can follow the appropriate track and not waste time.

I know that there are some frustration among contracted parties and others about the Technical Study Group top-down, Goran

running around with the commission for the last year or two without a lot of transparency and visibility – I totally get that, but I think we're coming to a point now where he and ICANN Org are now ready to engage with the EPDP Team and do it together constructively, and I would like for us to encourage that. We know that the NCSG is opposed to this idea of a uniform access model. They don't want liability shifted for contracted parties to ICANN but I think that there's an opportunity for us here to at least better understand the possible path forward. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Keith. I think that's a helpful summary of where things are. We'll be interested to hear from the EPDP Team. I think the concern that we've had and certainly the problems we had around the letter – do we pull it or not pull it – was the lack of transparency and communication about what was actually happening. So if that is now going to be driven through the EPDP Team and they are going to be informed then I think that's terrific. It's a great path forward.

KEITH DRAZEK: That's what we're hearing. Whether it actually happens or not, that's another question, right? I totally agree with you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Exactly. If we hear otherwise, then it will be a problem.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I found my scribbling from that secret meeting with SSAC.

DONNA AUSTIN: It wasn't a secret.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Oh yeah. It's secret – I don't know. Actually, the thing is it was exchange of opinions on reporting and the registries mostly underline that actually we do what's in contract. My perception is that SSAC thinks that whatever they push for easily goes into our contracts. We told them that it's not so easy, it's not so fast, and if you think that you can add anything each few months or each few years, it's not this case. Because last time, amendments – all important items were thrown out and unimportant took only three I think. The most important thing, which I relate to Graeme because it's for registrars, but since we're contracted parties, there were words about reporting is not yet in the registrar contracts. I told them that it's going to be a furious negotiation most probably and end in nothing.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Maxim. Just before I close this one out, we have a registry call on the 10th of July, and as part of that call, we will have the RSSAC come and talk to us. They have a project that has been ongoing for a little bit of time now and they're looking to establish a working group to develop a governance structure and part of the recommendation is that two members for that come from the Registries Stakeholder Group. So I already distributed the information to the Stakeholder Group a week or so ago. That's a topic we'll discuss on the 10th of July, which might take a little bit of time away from moving forward on the DNS abuse stuff but it's something that I had put in play prior to this meeting. And we do actually need to have something done I think by August. I think there's a public comment period. I don't know. We need to get that sorted.

Okay, thanks to everybody for coming. To anybody who might be listening remotely, thank you. Just for the record, you would've seen via e-mail that Crystal Ondo is leaving Donuts and moving on. Crystal has been a fabulous resource for this group, particularly her leadership on compliance matters, and I will certainly miss her counsel on all compliance-related matters but I wish her all the best. If anybody wants to sign the card, we've got one here for her.

Okay, I think we can end the recording now, Sue. Thanks, everyone.

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN **POLICY FORUM** **65**
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019