ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – ICANN67 Public Forum 2
Thursday, March 12, 2020 – 09:00 to 10:30 CUN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	This meeting is being recorded.
BRAD WHITE:	Welcome, everyone, to Public Forum 2 for ICANN67. Allow me to introduce ICANN Board chair, Maarten Botterman. Maarten.
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Thank you, Brad. Thank you, everyone, for joining us for the second Public Forum of ICANN67 and the second fully remote Public Forum ever.
	For all of you who joined us for the first Public Forum, which was dedicated to matters relating to .ORG, please note that the responses to the questions asked have now been published on the ICANN website. You can find the link on the schedule with the PIR 1 announcement. Big thanks to the ICANN's legal team for the very quick turnaround here.
	But now we're ready for Public Forum 2. On behalf of the Board, I encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity to make comments, ask questions, and share your thoughts. These public forums are very important to us. We cannot do our job well if we don't hear from you. It is our responsibility to act in the collective interest of

all stakeholders, and for that we need to hear directly from you what's on your mind.

Today's Public Forum will last an hour and 30 minutes. The ICANN Org is working hard to ensure that this virtual session goes as smoothly as possible. I do ask you to be patient if things don't go exactly as planned. As you know, this remote meeting is a learning experience for all of us. And please remember, this is not a placement for public comments that ICANN is seeking on various issues and policies. If you want to weigh in on a specific issue that is up for public comment, please use the online system at icann.org website. It's the only way your comments will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organization, and staff members.

Also, please don't hesitate to take advantage of the skilled interpreters we have here supporting us. If you wish, in addition to English, you may ask your questions in Spanish or French.

Thank you for being here, and I look forward to your participation. I invite the session moderator to now explain in more detail how to participate, including how to use our interpretation options.

Brad, back to you.

BRAD WHITE: Thanks, Maarten. With the exception of the virtual aspect, this second Public Forum of ICANN67 is going to be pretty similar to the others that we've done over the years. There's going to be two Q&A blocks where the Board will entertain any comments or questions of

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

community concern. As is the case in all public forums, everyone is expected to conform to the standards of behavior. You'll note there's a link to those standards on the slide that is currently on your screen.

 Let me talk for just a moment, if I may, about the Zoom platform we have been using. Since this is the last day of ICANN67, we assume that many of you are now more familiar with the Zoom platform since we've been using it all week, but for the uninitiated, I'll run through just a few quick points.

 First, there's two ways to ask a question or make a comment. You can submit a written question or comment by e-mailing it to publicforum@icann.org -- again, that's publicforum@icann.org -- and it will be put into the queue to be read during the session. We will not be reading the questions or comments posted in the chat so if you want to write a question or comment, please email it to us so we can enter it into the queue to be read.

 Now let's go over the process for voicing a question or comment. At the bottom of the screen, click on the "raise hand" icon at the bottom and you'll automatically go into the speaker's queue. In fact, if you have a question in mind right now, you can raise it and you'll be put in the queue. I shall note at this point that everyone's mic will be muted by us to avoid extraneous noise.

 Now, when we see that it's your turn to speak, we will unmute you on our end, which will trigger a note to be sent to your screen requesting that you unmute your mic. This lets you know that it is your turn to speak. When your name is called by the Board facilitator, that's your

queue to go for it, to start speaking. Again, please make sure your mic is unmuted. During the first Public Forum on Monday, we had some issues with that but that was the first session of this meeting so again, most of you are probably now more familiar with the Zoom platform.

I want to note that if there is a second or two of silence after you ask your question or make your comment, it's because the Board is trying to determine who is best suited to address your comments or answer your question, try and give you the best response possible. The board members, like all of you, are scattered around the world, so they will be texting one another to determine who is the most appropriate respondent. So please be patient if there is a second or two of silence. Enjoy the quiet for a second or two.

In terms of the time limit rules, kind of the same as they have always been at the public forums. There will be a two-minute timer on your screen which is how long you have to ask your question or make your comment. The Board response will be two minutes. If you have a follow-up question, the same two-minute limit applies as it does to the Board response.

As Maarten noted, we have interpretation in French and Spanish. For the sake of our interpreters, we're respectfully requesting that if you want to ask a question in French or Spanish that you send it to us at publicforum@icann.org, our email address. We're doing this because of some technical limitations and the convenience of getting the questions to our interpreters.

So with that basic interview, I'll now turn it over to our first Board facilitator, Sarah Deutsch.

Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you so much, Brad, and welcome, everyone.

I want to encourage everyone to please raise your hand to get in the queue. The queue is now open. And again, please give us a little patience if there's a bit of a pause or delay. And we'll kick it off.

So the first person in the queue with their hand up is Mitch Stoltz. Mitch, so if you could unmute yourself, please go ahead.

MITCH STOLTZ: Thank you, Sarah. This is Mitch Stoltz from the Electronic Frontier Foundation. My question concerns the change in control of Public Interest Registry. ICANN's letters to PIR and the Internet society show that ICANN understands that it has an obligation to protect NGOs and other nonprofit registrants. In your response to questions asked on the Monday forum, you said the ICANN Board and Org have been consistently and openly urging PIR to seek input from the .ORG community. PIR's supposed public engagement to date has been nothing more than a series of tightly scripted public relations events. The web forum PIR posted for comments appears to be more of the same. If they were truly interested in being accountable to the community, they would have asked for public comments months ago,

not in a nine-day window ending one week before the deadline that they insisted on for ICANN's decision.

My questions to you are will ICANN itself do anything more to ascertain the needs and concerns of all .ORG stakeholders or will you leave that task to PIR and Ethos?

And second what criteria is ICANN applying to its evaluation of the change in control of .ORG. Note my question was not what information are you considering but what criteria are you applying as you evaluate that information.

Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks, Mitch. So we received last time in the Public Forum -- just to remind everyone, the entire last Public Forum was devoted to .ORG. And because this is an open matter under current consideration by the Board, I'm hoping you will understand that we're taking your feedback seriously, and you'll see the answers to the questions that ICANN has -- has given. And, you know, we're going to do our best to comment when we can, and sometimes we're going to have to get back to you with more answers at a later date.

So thank you.

Okay. Brad has told me, and I would solicit all of you to please raise your hands in the queue, because we would love to get your questions. Brad, we have a written comment in the queue?

BRAD WHITE: We do, Sarah. This is from Martin Cleaver with Blended Perspectives. I'm a business owner but .ORG was established for the good of people, not corporations. Such a change goes against everything .ORG was set up for.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Thank you so much for your comment. I see we have Paul Blaker. Paul, please go ahead and unmute yourself.

PAUL BLAKER: Hello. Thank you. I'm Paul Blaker. I speak for the UK governments, and I'm a member of the GAC. I wanted to ask about the CCT review recommendations. I understand the GAC has advised the Board not to proceed with a new round of gTLDs until the prerequisite and high-priority recommendations of the CCT review have been implemented.

The Board has said that many of those recommendations are for the GNSO, and I understand that the GNSO Council expects the working group on subsequent procedures to address them. But the working group on subsequent procedures currently proposes that it does not have a mandate to address some of these recommendations; for example, on DNS abuse. And it seems that there is no part of the community which is taking responsibility for implementing these recommendations. And this means we'll have a serious problem in a few months' time because the Board will have to choose between halting the new round of gTLDs or rejecting GAC advice.

So my question is what does the Board think needs to be done now in order to avoid such a serious problem in a few months' time?

Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you so much for your question. I see that Becky has raised her hand to answer. So please go ahead, Becky.

BECKY BURR: Thank you so much for that comment. We are obviously -- of course have received the GAC advice and have responded to the GAC advice and engaged in our interactions with the GAC on this.

The Board is quite clear about its obligations and responsibilities with respect to GAC advice and takes that very seriously. We also are very clear and serious about our obligations with respect to the fact that the authority for policy development lies with the community and not with the Board.

So when we get recommendations that are -- that require policy development, we have -- it is -- it is appropriate, proper, and our obligation under the bylaws to move that to the GNSO with respect to new gTLDs.

We have been following the conversations that have been happening in the subsequent procedures policy development process, and we have, of course, said that we expect the subsequent procedures -- excuse me one second.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Have we lost Becky?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think she has temporarily muted herself and will be back in one second.

BECKY BURR: Yes, one second. Sorry.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Let's just hold on for one second.

BECKY BURR: So we have been following the conversations that have taken place in the Subsequent Procedures --

[Timer Sounds]

Working group. We have noted that this has been a discussion within the GNSO Council as well.

I think that at this point what we have said is that we do -- we will look when we receive recommendations from the subsequent procedures group. We hope that they will have considered all of the review recommendations and made a decision about whether or not they want to act on them. We do understand the gap that they are pointing out, but at this point what we have to do is look to the policy

development process to address those issues that are policy development issues. And if and when we come -- when we come to the point where the GAC advice is potentially inconsistent with the situation we find ourselves in, we will have to follow the bylaws procedures to deal with that.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Great. Thank you so much, Becky, for answering that.

We have a written question, so I'm going to turn it back to Brad to read that.

Brad.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Fabricio Vayra. Further to ongoing -- further to the ongoing discussion about DNS abuse, we heard references over the course of the week by ICANN Org to some contracted parties' framework on DNS abuse. However, this neither encompasses known bad actors nor fulfills ICANN's bylaw mandated duties towards security and stability of the DNS.

Can we hear from the Board or from Org in terms of what ICANN plans to do about the high-interest topic of DNS abuse?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Goran, would you like to take this or a member of your team?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sarah, happy to take the first step which is --

SARAH DEUTSCH: Oh, great.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: It's clearly a subject of interest that is in line with the strategic plan, and it's also been coming up in Montreal community-wide. What we saw this ICANN remote meeting is that there was a lot of interest in the topic that came back in several constituencies, and we think that is where it takes place, the thinking about how to deal best with this. The questions that came up were both to do with compliance of current contracts as well as what further policies should be developed going forward.

I think this is a subject that is a main one that we continue to fill -- follow this year, and Org is also looking at what it means in compliance ways.

Goran, can you follow-up on that?

SARAH DEUTSCH: I'm not hearing -- not hearing Goran. Should we move on to our next question?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Merike has an addition here.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Oh, okay. Go for it, it, Merike.

MERIKE KAEO: Yes, thank you for that. Also, I wanted to let everybody know that the SSAC is right now doing some work. They have created a work party on DNS abuse. And while they will not provide a formal definition of abuse, they will look to provide a roadmap for handling abuse across various DNS parties. And the study areas will include an examination of successes and failures in dealing with abuse under the current paradigms and policies, and also a study of effective anti-abuse practices by contracted parties. And the Board is following that work very closely, and we look forward to seeing what SSAC advice may be.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Great. Thank you so much, Merike. And that was Maarten speaking earlier, for the record.

So our next person in queue -- the hand just disappeared, is Esther Dyson. Esther, welcome, and please go ahead.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Esther, you're still shown as muted.

ESTHER DYSON: Okay. Trying to --

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, we can hear you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Are starting to talk more and more about --

ESTHER DYSON: Excuse me, I'm going to --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Close attention to for 2019.

ESTHER DYSON: Sorry.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Maybe we should come back to Esther.

ESTHER DYSON: Yes, please come back.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay.

ESTHER DYSON: Please mute me. Please --

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Sorry about the technical glitch.

Our next -- I'm going to turn it to Brad because we have another written question. So please go ahead, Brad.

BRAD WHITE: This is from Mason Cole. Based on discussions and input during this week and in follow up to the BCs and other communicated concerns about the quickly rising rates of DNS abuse which ICANN is uniquely positioned to mitigate, will the Board reconsider taking further action steps to strengthen the Compliance department's capability to address abuse with strengthened contracts or by enforcing current contracts?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Goran, would you or one of your team want to take this one?

GORAN MARBY: Thank you, Mason.

This Board has done a lot of things to be able to work together with the community to work against abuse. I want to remind you that this Board over the last couple of years has invested a lot of money and time and resources in systems like DAAR and the health indicators and also in a way changed how we work and interact with the community when it comes to abuse.

I think it is important for all us to see that the community has a great responsibility for defining eventually what abuse is and how to work with the community, to make decisions about how to fight abuse.

Also, remembering that there are about 350 million domain names and not all of them is under ICANN policy. So I think to some extent we have to rethink to find the bad actors.

As you know, you asked these questions many times, there are about eight to ten really bad actors when it comes to abuse. And I think we have to work to find ways to mitigate them.

And this is -- we always seem to have the same questions and we sort of always have the same "what is the Board going to do," "what is the Org going to do," "what is Jamie going to do," "what is David Conrad going to do." The answer to this is increased cooperation.

I think that over the last year I have seen an increased interest in the ICANN ecosystem to fight abuse, and I think that's positive.

So I would like to compliment the Board, not only being nice, because this Board has taken on this issue very seriously. And I also know that our friends in sub pro are working on this as well. There are many parts of the community working which work on this as well.

And on the assumption that abuse is going up rapidly, I would like to see a little bit more about those numbers. I know David Conrad in OCTO is very interested to see more about the numbers behind the statements in a neutral and factual way. Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Goran.

The next person I have in the queue is Jaewon Son. So, Jaewon, please unmute yourself.

And, also, I would like to encourage people to raise your hands for further questions. Thank you.

JAEWON SON: Thank you. I am Jaewon Son, ICANN67 fellow for the record. Yesterday's One World, One Internet session made me allowed to get to know more about ICANN's strategic plan addressing geopolitical issues and better alliance with (indiscernible) for the current policy-making process.

While it was the first time in the ICANN session that "geopolitic," the word itself, has been mentioned. I hope more discussion will be continued in the upcoming ICANN meetings regarding the ICANN strategic plan and its efforts in addressing those multistakeholders and geopolitical issues.

 In this regard, since ICANN usually have already two public forums, I was thinking whether it would be possible to have, like, three public forums or so on for each meeting since it is important for the multistakeholders and the end users and other people would be able to have more voice on this forum. Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Jaewon. Leon, would you like to comment?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Sarah. This is Leon Sanchez.

Jaewon, thank you for your comment.

Yes, we are aware that fostering discussion and dialogue in this issue is very important. That's why I stressed yesterday the importance of having true engagement and coordination amongst each other and across community groups and stakeholders so that we can better address this geopolitical challenges that we are facing and that we see coming ahead.

So I note that there is a multitude of people that intervene in planning meetings. So while not sure there will be a chance to have three public forums, maybe we can think of addressing this issue by having, for example, the public meeting on the CCEG on IG, which is the cross-community engagement group on Internet governance. That is a forum in which this kind of issue is also discussed, so maybe you want to keep an eye on the next schedule to see if one of these sessions will be taking place, which I am pretty sure there will be one. So thank you and you're very welcome to contribute to the discussion. Thanks, Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Leon.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

And I see we have another written comment in the queue, so, Brad, I'm turning it back to you.

BRAD WHITE: This is from Jorge Cancio, who is our Swiss GAC rep.

Dear ICANN Board and ICANN Org, let me commend you for a very successful and interesting virtual ICANN67. Something ICANN has been able to organize in less than two weeks.

This experience is tremendously important and interesting for many organizations and processes worldwide, both in the Internet governance ecosystem and beyond. Your lessons learned are of utmost importance and value and many help many others in keeping up global exchanges, fighting against climate change and COVID-19. Let me kindly ask ICANN to make efforts to share your lessons learned as widely as possible, including information on technical, human, and organizational aspects, practices and solutions conducive to conductive successful massive virtual meetings like will ICANN67. A dedicated website would be very welcome.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Brad.

Yes, it's a fantastic suggestion and a great idea. And I think we're going to be talking about those lessons learned after this meeting. Just want to congratulate myself, ICANN's technical and full team for making this happen. It has actually been incredible.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

Next in the queue I see Margie Milam has her hand up.

Margie, please go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. Last week Facebook filed suit against Namecheap and its proxy service, WhoisGuard, for registering domain names that deceive people by pretending to be affiliated with our company. These are names like facebook-login.com with a zero, or whatsappdownload.site. These and 43 other deceptive domains are dangerous and re-used for phishing, fraud, and other scams.

This is the second in a series of lawsuit Facebook will file to protect people from the harm caused by DNS abuse.

We do not want people to be deceived so we take action and track suspicious and misleading domains globally. Proxy services are meant to protect legitimate owners of domain names and not to engage criminals -- enable criminals to engage in fraud. And proxy services cover approximately $90 million domain names.

Unfortunately, in many instances, many contracted parties do not investigate or respond to abusive reports or even provide WHOIS information which delays our efforts to fight fraud and abuse.

Ironically, Namecheap is a party to the DNS abuse framework. Yet, it did not cooperate with our request when we notified them of these names.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

While we applaud those companies that have signed up for this voluntary framework, we note that without action, it's just a piece of paper. It is not a substitute for their or ICANN's action on DNS abuse.

While Facebook will continue to file lawsuits to protect people from harm, lawsuits are not the answer. Our preference is instead to have ICANN enforce and fully implement new policies such as a proxy policy and establish better rules for WHOIS access.

This is ICANN's role and its delay in implementing these key initiatives hurt real people who fall prey to these attacks and scams. Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay, thank you, Margie, for letting everyone know about the case and the actions you're taking. We really appreciate your comment.

So I will turn next to Esther. You're back in the queue. Please go ahead.

Looks like we've lost Esther. So I'm going to turn to the next -- actually, back to Brad where we have another written comment.

BRAD WHITE: This is from Russ Pangborn -- I hope I have that correct -- with CIP Law Group, an IPC member.

Privacy and proxy services are meant to protect legitimate domain registrants. However, it is clear that bad actors continue to take advantage of the anonymity these services provide. Of course, the

PPSAI went through the PDP process, got unanimous GNSO Council approval and was approved by the Board. And implementation began in 2016.

In 2018, due to GDPR concerns and alleged reliance on EPDP work under way -- work that was under way, implementation was put on hold. ICANN Org pointed to the ongoing EPDP work as justification for work stoppage, which the Board recently confirmed was an appropriate response. Meanwhile, abuse of privacy and proxy services is increasing.

On Tuesday, we heard the EPDP -- we heard from the EPDP that they will not address the privacy/proxy issue.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thanks for that question and comment.

We will take that under consideration.

And I'm going to move to the next person in the queue, which is Ajay Data. Ajay, you should be free to speak.

AJAY DATA: Thank you very much for the opportunity. And I would like to first congratulate and appreciate everybody else for holding this virtual ICANN in a very good way, and a lot of participation is happening.

In the UASG, we had large numbers of participation, immense participation, which I have never seen before.

So I had two points to say.

One, I saw in the financial planning this time that almost $500,000 had been planned by ICANN Org to spend on UA. So this is welcome news.

And I just wanted to know whether we can also tap in, collaborate, and work together to utilize that fund and what is the plan. I was not aware of.

And, secondly, I wanted to request the chairman and every Board member to spread the word whenever you go and speak in your SOs and ACs and public speaking, to spread the word for UA because we are looking for investors everywhere.

And we have lack of investors. And the region is too big to cover ourselves active from the leadership.

So we request you to please suggest the names of the ambassadors in your region who can help us spread the word. And if you think yourself can be part of spreading the word, please let us know so that we can work more together. Thank you very much.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Ajay.

Akinori?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes, thank you very much. This is Akinori Maemura for the record. Thank you very much, Ajay, for this point.

First, I'd like to respond to the second point. That's my understanding, that the Board members are so cognizant of the importance of the universal acceptance. And, yes, it is a good idea for the Board members to be involved in the regional activities. That's actually a great idea which is worth considering that.

And then the first point, for the UASG activities, we actually had constructed a good budget for the UA program. And then we are now -- they are trying to have -- run the program manager for the UA but still not there.

So if we had a good program manager under Sarmad for the universal acceptance advancement, then that would be greatly contributing for the progress of the UA program itself.

And I think you would be working with him or her for (indiscernible) your own activity to the universal acceptance.

I'm looking forward to it and take advantage for your contribution. Thanks.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Akinori.

I'm going to turn the mic over to Lito who wants to add something.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Sarah.

Thank you, Ajay, for the question and comment. Yes, I may mention that some of us are really involved in the IDN and UA promotion and creating awareness in our regions and also other parts of the world.

I can mention, for instance, that within LACRALO, during a session at the At-Large for Latin America and Caribbean, there's a special working group that is working very actively in doing the promotion and outreach for IDN and UA.

I think you are completely right that -- (indiscernible) -- more members of the community get involved in this matter. Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Lito.

We're going to turn back to with the folks in the queue. The next person I have is Imran Hossen.

Imran, you just need to unmute yourself. You are all set to go.

IMRAN HOSSEN: Hi, Sarah. Thank you for giving this opportunity. This is Imran from Bangladesh. I have an abuse issue with a registrar, (saying name).

We have client who have a domain. That domain is erbilgroup.net. So the erbilgroup.net (indiscernible). And suddenly the (indiscernible) abuse team emailed us that the domain name (indiscernible) association with Erbil Bank. And they suspend that domain name.

So I need to know how the abuse is handling in this matter from ICANN. The Erbil Bank is present from India and (indiscernible), Limited is using as a short form of Erbil in Bangladesh. So how can this handle this abuse? Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Thank you for your question.

I think we're going to have to take your question under advisement and get back to you. I'm not sure we're in a position right now to have anyone respond on the fly, but we do want to think about it. So thank you.

I'm going to turn now to Sebastien Bachollet. You just need to unmute yourself. You are all set.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Sarah. Thank you for giving me the floor. I am Sebastien Bachollet, chair of EURALO, ICANN At-Large, and member of ATRT3 and of the Work Stream 2 implementation team. But speaking in my personal capacity, if I have any capacity, and from Burgundy in France.

You will not hear me speaking in French or Spanish, even if we are in Cancun. But as you know, we are virtually there.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the interpreter for helping this virtual meeting to be more than only in English.

Now my question: With the current situation, a face-to-face meeting will not be possible for few weeks or even maybe for a few months, how the Board can help any of the working group PDPs or review team to fulfill their missions?

Some have delivered (indiscernible) including face-to-face meetings, but those face-to-face meetings will not be done.

Can the Board take an alternative decision allowing all the groups to have some additional time, like additional months or percentage of time that we are supposed to deliver to be able to fulfill better their mission? Thank you for your feedback.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm going to turn the floor to Maarten to respond. Maarten, please go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks, Sebastien. Maarten Botterman for the record.

Thanks, Sebastien, for the remark. It is very difficult to see how the future will unfold. What is clear is that we will consider what the best way forward is. New facts will develop in the world, to come up every day.

Our intent is to discuss this on Tuesday and then come back to the community as shortly as possible on what we think is possible and what we can do otherwise. So it's a shared concern and we look for the best possible solutions in the current circumstances. We will

interact with the community to also ask their view on that. So thanks for that.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Maarten.

I'm going to turn the queue back over to Brad because I understand we have another written question. Brad? Okay. Well, let's take the next person in the queue then, Russ Pangborn.

Russ, can you hear me?

RUSS PANGBORN: Can you hear me now?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yes.

RUSS PANGBORN: Sorry about that. I had submitted actually a written statement and question. When it was read, they did not actually read the question. They only did the same portion. It was regarding the privacy/proxy accreditation implementation and a little bit of the history.

The last line that was read mentioned that on Tuesday we heard from the EPDP that they will not address the privacy/proxy issue. This begs the question then: Will the Board now instruct ICANN Org to

immediately reinstitute the implementation of the PPSAI? That was left off of the question. So thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Thank you.

Becky, do you want to respond?

Becky?

Okay. I think we're having some small technical issues, so please be patient.

Brad, do you have a written question that you can read to the -- into the queue?

BRAD WHITE: Yeah, can you hear me okay, Sarah?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yes, please go ahead.

BRAD WHITE: I have a comment or a question here from Kurt Pritz. Does the Board find the 40% decrease over the last eight months in the number of total raw count of security threat domains in new TLDs reported in the most recent DAAR report to be statistically significant?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Brad. Before we respond to that, and I think Becky is unmuted, so I'd like her to be able to weigh in first.

BECKY BURR: Yes, sorry about that. Thank you very much for the question.

We have heard that the EPDP is contemplating that they have not finished their -- it's our understanding that they have not finished their work on that, but it will be discussing it again.

The Board is aware that they may not be addressing the PPSAI, and we plan to discuss next steps following a final decision from the EPDP.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Great. Thank you, Becky.

Brad, can you just reread the question from before, just to make sure that we can hear that one again?

I guess we're having more technical issues.

BRAD WHITE: Can you hear me okay, Sarah?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yes, we can hear you.

BRAD WHITE: I assume it's the question from Russ Pangborn that you want me to repeat; is that correct?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, did we --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, it's the country from Kurt.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Kurt Pritz.

BRAD WHITE: Sure. Again from Kurt Pritz: Does the Board find the 40% decrease over the last eight months in the number of total raw count of security threat domains in new TLDs reported in the most recent DAAR report to be statistically significant?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Great. Thanks for repeating that.

Okay. Merike.

MERIKE KAEO: Sure. Thank you, Sarah. This is Merike Kaeo, SSAC liaison to the Board. Any statistics on security threats will need further analysis, and the Board understands that OCTO is actually looking into some of this

analysis. And so I -- you know, we're going to be looking to see what analysis OCTO will have from its latest data.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Thank you, Merike.

David Conrad.

DAVID CONRAD: This is David Conrad, for the record.

Yeah, as Merike said, we are looking at the data. It's probably a little too early to determine statistical significance. And we're looking to try to understand sort of the underlying causes for the changes that we're seeing across the different security threats that we're monitoring.

There does appear to be a downward trend in some of the threats. There's upward trends in others. So at this point, it's unclear, and I wouldn't want to make any, you know, statements as to why those changes are occurring. Rather, I'd encourage the community to look at the data that we are collecting and providing via DAAR and ITHI to inform their discussions about policies and, you know, processes that may help address DNS abuse.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you. And just to clarify for the record, the little glitches we're having are not technical. I think it's just extra time as people are

working through all of these questions on the fly. So thanks, everyone, again, for your patience.

Okay. The next person in the queue I see is Owen Smigelski. So, Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hello. This is Owen Smigelski, and I work with Namecheap. So I'd like to read a statement in response to Margie's statement regarding the lawsuit that they filed against Namecheap.

As one of the world's largest domain registrars, Namecheap takes customer privacy and internet rights and due process seriously. Over the years we have taken a stand against many attempts to undermine our customers' rights.

Today we find ourselves in another battle as Facebook is attempting to bypass legal protections and our own stringent customer protections. Facebook claims that certain websites have violated Facebook's trademarks and may be perpetuating fraud due to misleading domains. Because Namecheap does not voluntarily divulge domain registrants private data such as protected by WHOIS proxy, WhoisGuard, without a court-ordered subpoena, Facebook has filed a lawsuit against us.

As our CEO, Richard Kirkendall, said, Namecheap takes every fraud and abuse allegation seriously and diligently investigates each reported case of abuse. We actively remove any evidence-based abuse on our service on a daily basis. Where there's no clear basis of

abuse or when it's purely trademark claim, Namecheap will direct complaints such as Facebook to follow industry standard protocol. Outside of said protocol, a legal court order is always required to provide private user information.

Facebook may be willing to tread all over its customer privacy on their own platform, and in this case it appears they want other companies to do it for them with their own customers. This is just another attack on privacy and due process in order to strong-arm companies that have services like WhoisGuard, intended to protect millions of Internet users' personal private data. Namecheap believes our customers have rights, just like large corporations, and we stand against any company or entity that insists on invading privacy without due process.

Thank you.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Thank you, Owen. Your comment is noted.

At this point I'm going to toss the facilitator role onto my colleague Lito Ibarra.

So Lito.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Sarah.

Just continuing with the comments and questions, this I give the floor to Sergio Moraes. Please.

SERGIO MORAES:　　　　　Hi. This is Sergio Moraes. I'm a data governance professional. I'm not representing anyone here today.

I would like to thank everyone for this opportunity to comment. It's my first time participating in the Public Forum for ICANN.

I would like to say that as a web user, it's really interesting to me that we have the opportunity to talk about this specific matter. It's -- I can -- as a traditional user, especially with the domain .ORG, it's -- it's been historically one of the main ways that a user identifies the kind of website and the kind of domain they can trust or they can understand the use for. So it's a -- I just wanted to put my opinion out there that this does affect users and their trust in specific domains and their safety as well in my -- in my opinion. And I would like to see -- I think that this private -- this Public Forum is a good example of how -- something we could possibly lose were the .ORG domain to fall into the hands of private equities -- private equity. So thank you very much.

LITO IBARRA:　　　　　Thank you for your comment. We appreciate that, as we have been saying from Public Forum 1. We are taking all your comments very seriously, and we are doing our due diligence work and the process that we are meant to do regarding this (indiscernible).

So we go to next in line, which is Wisdom Donkor. Please, Wisdom.

You need to unmute yourself? Okay.

WISDOM DONKOR: Hello.

LITO IBARRA: Yes, please go ahead.

WISDOM DONKOR: My name is Wisdom Donkor and I'm speaking from Ghana. I have one question on org and data. Yesterday I missed the open data session, but -- and I think I should ask this question here. Thanks to ICANN for introducing open data into ICANN, and I think it's going to help to a large extent.

The first question I would like to ask is what measures is ICANN putting in place to make sure the open data policies has been adopted, all the communities within ICANN adopted and use it.

And my second question is what capacity-building programs is ICANN putting in place to help all the communities, all members in the various communities learn about ICANN -- learn about open data and also adopt to the usage -- to the usage of the platform that ICANN has been putting in place.

And then I also like to suggest that if ICANN can at least add the open data, especially in the capacity-building side as part of the Fellowship Program. So when the fellows comes to the program, they can begin

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

to also learn about the open data that ICANN has adopted within -- within the various -- yes, within ICANN.

So I thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Wisdom.

First let me tell everyone that if you want to ask a question, please raise your hand. (Indiscernible) not in the queue, so just a reminder.

Regarding the open data, I agree with you. It's a great initiative from ICANN. And we mentioned yesterday we have several lessons and we have a description of the system which was the open (indiscernible) yesterday to be accessed by the ICANN community.

So I don't know if someone else wants to add anything to that. (Indiscernible) or Goran?

GORAN MARBY: Hi, this is Goran, for the record.

Thank you very much for the praise of the Open Data Initiative. Yes, thank you. It's been a -- I think it's actually two years ago, or close to three years ago that we started talking about the Open Data Initiative, which was a request from the community. And it's been taking a lot of time to have this first version out. And the reason why it took some time, because we also had to take into account not only to find the data but also to make the data sort of readable and then to build a

platform for it, and then also put it under the sort of GDPR perspective as well.

So I'm very proud that we now launched it, and we see the great interest from the community about it.

When it comes to additional information coming into that, we will continue to evolve it over time. We are going to continue the communication with the community about what the community thinks is the most important in priority sense. We will be respectful of privacy laws when we disclose data for this information, but we're not putting any sort of restrictions onto it when it comes to what you can be using it for, in that sense that we don't know. We just think for transparency reasons to be out there.

I took your question about how -- to train the community quite interesting. And I was thinking to myself that maybe that's something we can think about, if we can have a -- during the next ICANN meeting, for instance, to have a seminar about the platforms and the information to see if we can do that. We haven't planned to do any training, particularly, about it, but dialogue and communication is always good.

Thank you very much.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Goran.

We have another question online; right? Please.

Brad? Are we ready with another question or shall I go to the queue?

Let's go, then, with Natalie rose who is in the queue.

Thank you.

I think we miss her. Okay. Let's go to Alex Deacon.

ALEX DEACON: Hello, everyone. This is Alex Deacon. I hope you can hear me. Thank you for taking my -- my comment here.

Up until the end of last year, I was an active participant in both the phase one and phase two EDP -- EPDP deliberations. I somehow managed to escape that, but I do follow them closely the topic is important.

Regarding of issue of the paused privacy/proxy IRT, I think it's important that we realize we've managed to create a deadlock for ourselves.   Privacy/proxy IRT is paused pending EPDP phase two discussions. And recently, very recently, the EPDP phase two team drafted language that rely on and reference obligations specified in the privacy/proxy IRT -- privacy/proxy policy and will be implemented ultimately, hopefully soon, in the privacy/proxy IRT.

So it seems to me that the simplest way to break this deadlock is to restart the privacy/proxy IRT as soon as possible and get that wrapped up. Until that happens, we are in a deadlock situation which I think will be hard to resolve.

Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. Anyone from the Board wants to comment? I didn't see --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Lito, it's Chris. I'll just comment and say that thank you, Alex, for the input. It's pretty much along the lines that Russ was saying earlier, and I think Becky has covered our response to that for now. So we'll just take it as a comment, and thanks very much.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Chris.

                         Next in line is Jonathan Zuck. Please, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Can you hear me okay?

LITO IBARRA: Yes. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks.

                         Jonathan Zuck, vice-chair of the ALAC for policy. Thanks for taking my statement, I guess.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

I just wanted to chime in a little bit on the question of DNS abuse and follow on from Goran's statement that it's really going to take the whole community. It's going to take a village to combat DNS abuse. And I think that's certainly the case. And that's why one of the initiatives, in addition to regularly harassing all of the possible policy environments inside ICANN about DNS abuse, is to also launch an end-user education campaign, because so much of DNS abuse is delivered through social engineering.

And so I just wanted to let folks know that this is a multi-front battle against these abusers, and the ALAC and the At-Large generally have signed up to participate in all those different avenues.

We agree there needs to be a cooperative effort to solve the problem, but we had a great session with Jamie and -- from contract compliance, and James Bladel from GoDaddy where we discussed a number of different scenarios and what the best way would be for Compliance to approach those. And I think it really revealed what some of the weaknesses were in the current contracts.

And so I think the challenge is going to be to find a way to go after the bad actors, which are clearly the minority, and without unduly --

[Timer Sounds]

-- tying the hands of the good actors.

So we're dedicated to finding that solution and working with the ICANN community to see it implemented.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

Thanks.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Jonathan. We agree the DNS abuse is a major issue. And (indiscernible) -- we need the work of everybody. Thank you for the comment.

So let's go to Brad and see if we can have the online question.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you, Lito. Sorry about the audio problems on my end. Can you hear me okay now?

LITO IBARRA: Yes.

BRAD WHITE: Excellent. So let's return to the question from Dmitri Shchurov of the International Council of Virtual Reality. When will the second new gTLD program start?

LITO IBARRA: I will go ahead and say we don't have a date. We are waiting for the input from sub pro.

But I will let anyone else to join -- (indiscernible), make some comments. Avri maybe?

Okay. Appreciate it. We are awaiting input. In the meantime, we are, of course, working on -- (indiscernible) -- we can work on.

Next go to the next one in the queue.

Paul Diaz.

PAUL DIAZ: Thank you, Lito. Can you hear me okay?

LITO IBARRA: Yes, go ahead.

PAUL DIAZ: Thank you again. And thanks to everyone for the points that have been raised here today.

Look, on behalf of PIR, we want to say we really value these forums. We've listened to the discussions took place on Monday, discussions here today. We've wanted to hear the thoughts of the community about the transaction; and we've tried very hard to be transparent, conveying the details about it. We want to note for the record, we've held multiple Webinars. We've responded to questions and concerns. We've also published transcripts of those sessions on the site that we've maintained, the key points about .ORG.

And then we plan to publish more responses to questions that we couldn't get to from the most recent community engagement that took place at the end of February.

As noted earlier today, we're holding public engagement right now. The comment period, the engagement period, closes Friday, tomorrow, at 12 midnight or 20 -- whatever that is, 12 midnight eastern time. And we're encouraging everybody to participate in that. Again, you can learn more about that from the key points about .ORG's site.

We do plan to publish the response we receive from the public engagement as well. And there's been a lot written about what is going on. We tried to be open throughout the process, and we are really working hard on it. In fact, we believe we have been more transparent than any other registry during the change of control request, and we're proud of the work we've done.

More has been asked of us. More is expected of us. That's okay. We all want what's best for .ORG because we are an exemplary registry. We said publicly that we believe PIR will benefit from the investment.

We appreciate the steps Ethos has taken to follow the voluntary PIC. Ethos didn't have to do that but it did. And we think it shows it takes its responsibilities quite seriously to the point where Ethos -- [timer sounds] -- is willing to make commitments to limit prices, maintain PIR's freedom of expression policies, and make them legally enforceable.

We are hopeful that we are near the end of the process and the community will see this, too. Thank you for continuing to share your thoughts with us. We look forward to ICANN's decision next week.

LITO IBARRA: (indiscernible) the next round. Go ahead, Goran.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. As we said, it's hard to predict an actual date for sub pro to happen. We have great trust, of course, in the -- sub pro working group is working on it right now. And we have good engagement with them.

Just a to remind you that we have -- despite that we don't have a policy, we started sort of preparatory work within ICANN Org in sync with the Board.   Last year, we went out -- we had a sort of questionnaire to different parts of the community and started engaging in prerequisites -- not prerequisites, preparations for it, assumptions, how to proceed. And we did that to start to figure out if there's anything we can start to prepare before the actual recommendations are done. And we do that because we want to see if we can prepare systems or applications or processes before the recommendation is done by the community.

Internally, in ICANN Org, we also started out the internal project work to make -- a little bit of a lessons learned from last time. So when the community -- the idea is when the community is ready, GNSO is ready, and the Board has made decisions, we will be ready as well.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Thank you, Goran.

Avri, do you want to add anything?

AVRI DORIA: Sure. Hi, this is Avri Doria speaking.

Yeah, I just want to add one thing, that in terms of this work and in following with the work that's being done by Org, the Board has also been preparing itself in terms of going through all the issues that are being worked on and the policy making sure that we understand what the work is, where it's going with the recommendation so that when we get the decision and the recommendations from the GNSO Council, we'll be ready to deal with them and same thing for the upcoming reviews. So just wanted to add that we're working with Org to be sure that we're prepared as things get done. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Let's go to another question online.

Brad.

BRAD WHITE: This is from Dave Kissoondoyal, the ALAC member from AfRALO.

Dear Board members, I am following the public form in English. I have a question as follows: Can I know from the Board members the reason why the public forum, which used to be multilingual during face-to-face meetings, is only in English? And a request as follows: Can the

Board consider that future virtual meetings and the public forum be multilingual? Thanks and kind regards.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you for the question. I will ask Ashwin to answer this. Thank you.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you, Lito. Thank you, Dave.

We are offering services to have this session be fielded in English, French, and Spanish, all three. So if speakers who are wishing to express their opinion or ask a question in English, French, or Spanish, use one of those three languages, we have live interpretation services that are standing by to translate in realtime whatever is being expressed in language other than English and make it available as an English question or an English comment to the floor. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Ashwin.

I will go to the queue now with Bill Woodcock. Bill, please go ahead.

BILL WOODCOCK: Thank you, Lito.

ICANN has an established open, transparent, competitive, multistakeholder process for the delegation of the .ORG domain. That

process was run in 2002 and produced 11 options which were a wealth of possibilities.

The established process allows the multistakeholder community to select the best from a multiplicity of options. The established process ensures that competition will produce diverse and innovative proposals, which seek to distinguish themselves by creating the best and most appealing services for the domain's constituents.

But instead of following the established process, ICANN staff and Board have taken it upon themselves to treat with unnamed private interests behind a curtain of secrecy.

This abandonment of the established open, transparent, competitive multistakeholder process needlessly subjects .ORG's registrants to an existential threat.

This refusal to enact the established multistakeholder process belies ICANN'S public interest purpose. It belies the principle of transparency and discards the trust, which an open process engenders.

Most importantly, it denies .ORG's constituency the benefits which competitive discipline confer.

Instead of getting the best of many possibilities, it would ensure that we get one of two extraordinarily bad possibilities: Allowing unidentified parties to pay, to bypass the multistakeholder process and the discipline of competition, belies ICANN's very reason for existence and ensures the worst of outcomes.

It appears that the ICANN staff and Board have backed themselves into a set of positions that ICANN is no longer subject to any oversight, having escaped the oversight of the NTIA and subsequently rejected categorically the oversight of the empowered community; that ICANN is no longer bound by the principles of multistakeholderism, namely, the affected communities should be central to the decision-making process; that ICANN no longer has a regulatory responsibility to the public interest but is merely responsive to the industry by which it has been captured.

[Timer sounds.]

The competition is no longer a goal. And the transparency and openness are no longer necessary. If these principles and purposes are gone, what remaining purpose does ICANN serve? Merely to collect money for itself and avoid lawsuits? That's not sufficient reason for us all to be here today.

If ICANN no longer recognizes that it has a purpose, we might as well all go back to our jobs and families. But I don't believe that's the case. I don't believe that ICANN has irretrievably lost itself. I believe that the Board can introspect and examine its reasons for being here and follow its conscience and serve the community.

So I ask you to think about the situation that .ORG is in, think about the constituents of .ORG, and recognize that the 2002 process is the existing established process and needs to be run again. Thank you.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

LITO IBARRA:	Thank you, Bill.
	As we have said previously in this -- in the comments regarding .ORG, PIR, we are taking all comments into account. And you have made -- we have to work that out.
	Maybe a possible response, I have Maarten or Chris?
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	This is -- this is Chris.
	Maarten, you go ahead, if you want to.
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Yeah, no, just pointing out that this is a process that was started shortly after Montreal and we have been taking this as transparent as possible and we will continue to do so. And like for the comments that were made on Monday, we will take comments made today into account as well. We are fully aware of our responsibilities and follow those very thoroughly in interactions with the community.
	Chris, anything you wanted to add to that?
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Well, yes. A little bit.
	That was -- thank you, Maarten, for that.
	I would just like to add one thing, which is that whilst I appreciate Bill's opinion, I think that a lot of what he's just said is assumption and

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

rhetoric and purely opinion and that with great respect, his opinion about what we might or might not do or believe is merely that. It's opinion. And we have to make a decision based on our obligations as a Board, based on our fiduciary responsibility, and based on what our bylaws say we need to do and our mission says we should do. And it's that that we'll make our decision on. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Perfect. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. Thank you, Maarten and Chris.

We'll go now online with Brad.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Natalie Rose who is an ICANN fellow.

I know there is a compliance program for registrars, but can we have more frequent review so that registrars are complying with the ICANN policies?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Hi, this is Jamie Hedlund, senior vice president for contractual compliance.

Thank you, Natalie, for the question. The contractual compliance function is charged with enforcing ICANN's agreements with registries

and registrars. It is a continuous effort that comprises of many components, including addressing individual complaints that we receive against registries and registrars. It includes proactive efforts which take into account media reports, industry intelligence, and prompt us to investigate will what may being reported.

And then, finally, a major part of our activities are auditing compliance with the agreements. We recently concluded an audit with 1200 or so registries for their compliance with DNS security threat obligations. And we are about to launch one also with registrars, also looking at their compliance with the DNS security threat obligations.

So compliance is not a one-time effort or review. It is a constant, continuous activity. And we'd encourage you to go to our Web page and reach out to us and we'd be happy to answer any additional questions you might have about our compliance programs. Thanks.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Jamie.

Let's go to Ajay Data.

AJAY DATA: Hello. Thank you, again, for the opportunity. And actually I wanted to make a request on behalf of UASG.

When we talk about community consensus and information being seeked, universal acceptance will not receive any request or any feedback request from the Board or from ICANN Org, even for this

(indiscernible) 7 to 19, we had no communication, what's going on, or the thought process, feedback. We do not receive any kind of communication from that point of view.

So maybe we are still outside the ambit of this communication or the community. I don't know where we fit in. But at least please include us whenever you talk to SOs and ACs, include us in the mailing list and the leadership discussions.

We are 500 plus people actively involved in volunteering. We represent a large community. So please include us in all the discussions we have so we are not left out. Thank you very much.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Ajay.

                        Thank you for the comment.

                        Anyone else?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Lito, can I take this?

LITO IBARRA: Yes.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Ajay. Universal Acceptance Steering Group which you are chairing is actually now regarded as a working group

but not as a supporting organization or advisory committee. So it is -- it is a little bit -- it has a little bit different working method.

But I do think currently the UASG is handled by the GDD, and then we have sufficient applications with the steering group members. I'm actually really looking forward to the next session which is UASG.

I think that we -- we have some room for improvement for the communications for me. And for now, I would like to ask for your understanding the setup of the UASG's -- kind of the working group. And then we are applying our practice for that working group. Thank you very much for that.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Akinori.

I don't see anyone else in the queue. So last opportunity to raise your hand because we don't have any more questions online either.

So we will take a couple of minutes.

Okay. I see Werner Staub. Go ahead, please.

WERNER STAUB: Can you hear me?

LITO IBARRA: Yes, go ahead.

WERNER STAUB: Thank you. Werner Staub from CORE Association, but I speak in a personal capacity.

I want to say that we should not just react to domain abuse. We must learn to be proactive. We should not just go after the bad actors. We must provide better support for the good actors.

Now, about being proactive, currently we're dealing with DNS abuse purely in a reactive way.

Even with the best of our anti-abuse measures, our reaction time is just too long. It allows the abusers to commit all the crimes that they wish to commit. Unless we act reactively, we just play a game of Whac-a-Mole where we have no hope.

Now about helping the good actors, the DNS is intrinsically good at providing certainty. It has been built for that. It has been built to handle machine-verifiable pointers that are understandable to machines and to humans.

We must use this for voluntary disclosures, corroborating information and certifications and checks on good domains rather than just chasing down the bad ones.

In this way, we show the qualifications of the good domains. If the DNS has a mechanism to publish both to machines and to users the voluntary basic disclosures, the corroborating factual information of the good domains, then the good is being separated from the bad. And then the users themselves with the helpful actions of intermediaries will be able to see where domains are subject to

concern for lacking disclosures and for lacking corroborating information.

This is a technical subject, but I think the DNS should be built in that way because it is on the right track. And we should focus on that portion and not just focus on reaction, not just focus on chasing down the bad.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Werner.

Anyone wants to react to that.

Okay.

GORAN MARBY: This is Goran, for the record.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Thank you, Goran.

GORAN MARBY: I think this meeting and the Montreal meeting when it comes to the abuse discussion is really a -- I want to compliment everybody who comes on talking about it, including ALAC and the GAC and everybody else, and also the contracted parties because I think there is a change in -- there is a title change when it comes to talking about abuse. It's much more factual based. We're starting to understand where,

together collectively, where the problems are and who are the bad actors. And this is a very important discussion.

I -- I really like the engagement from the community because I'm learning a lot. ICANN Org is learning a lot. The ICANN Org slash the Board is learning a lot. And it goes everything from contractual provisions to how do we -- the report, how we mitigate. And also engaging with other -- other partners who is outside the sort of ICANN policy-making process.

So I would say anything you say, there's no simple answer to it. And I'm looking forward to further engagement on this.

We will continue to provide more tools, more information, more abilities for the community to make decisions about this going forward.

Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Goran.

I have Jonathan Zuck. Please, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Jonathan Zuck from the ALAC, for the record.

A lot of discussion about DNS abuse has been about the juxtaposition of compliance and the voluntary best practices in the registry/registrar

community. And I think that's an important, you know, balance to be struck.

One of the issues that I think we face sometimes is that there is a lot of difference in size and capabilities of many of the contracted parties. And so the ability for some to take on these best practices might be daunting in some instances.

What the At-Large mentioned in our Valentine's Day advice to icann.org is that it perhaps spend some of the money that's coming from the Verisign to expand on the research that's been begun by .EU, .UK, there's some research out of Asia as well on both the predictive analytics for DNS abuse as well as real-time detection of DNS abuse, because if ICANN can take a role in focusing in on this research, expanding it and making it actionable to more people, even potentially being a part of some sort technological innovations along those lines, then there might be some best practices that are more easily made available across the entire contracted community, contracted party community. And so that might be a reasonable role for --

[Timer Sounds]

-- ICANN to play in addition to just contract compliance.

Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Jonathan.

David Conrad, can you jump in, please.

DAVID CONRAD: Thank you, Lito. This is David Conrad, for the record.

Thank you, Jonathan, for that suggestion, comment. As you may be aware, the Office of the CTO does perform research, trying to provide information to the community that helps inform policy discussions. We are engaging on a number of research topics specifically related to DNS abuse. Some of them involve work related to machine learning and trying to drive indicators of potential security threats based on heuristics associated with how the names look, how they're registered, the propagation time, those sorts of things.

We're aware of a number of research efforts that are occurring in a number of places. I know, for example, I believe it's SIDN has done some really interesting work with regard to registrations and DNS abuse related to those registrations. We're somewhat limited in that we don't have access to the same sort of data that registries have directly, or registrars have for that matter. But it is something that we are continuing to look at very closely, continuing to explore the various possibilities, particularly within both the SSR group and the research group within the Office of the CTO.

Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, David.

We will go to the last question of the forum to Graeme Bunton.

Please go ahead.

GRAEME BUNTON: Hi, all. Thanks.

I just have been listening -- Sorry, I should probably start with this is Graeme. I am the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and so I have been listening to a lot of this discussion on DNS abuse and thought it would be worthwhile to maybe tell the community here that following a lot of the conversations we had in Montreal at the previous ICANN meeting, stakeholder group has spun up a subteam to focus on DNS abuse, and we're beginning to really get that under way.

And the first work-product coming out of that subteam inside the stakeholder group has been a document on reporting DNS abuse to registrars. I posted a link to that in the chat, but you can also find it linked off the Registrar Stakeholder Group website at RRSG.org. And it's not rocket science, but what it is is a set of requirements for general DNS abuse as well as the specific requirements for different types of abuse that you might submit to a registrar.

So I would encourage everyone to take a look at that, and we're perfectly happy to take some feedback on that from the community so that we can continue to make that better. But we think that's hopefully a helpful resource so that we can begin on working on all this together.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Graeme.

And with that, I would like to toss it to Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, Lito. And thank you very much everyone who participated today. It was a wide range of questions and comments, and we really appreciate the input.

To my colleagues of the Board, thank you for your facilitation, and a great thank you to our language service professionals for providing the opportunity for community members to speak and follow along in Spanish and French.

All participants, you're also invited to participate in a survey where you can share your thoughts about the session. The link is being posted in the chat, and you see it on screen. And it will also be posted on the sessions' schedule page where you can find all the information about the sessions in the schedule before and after.

So again, thank you for participating. Looking forward to seeing many of you again for the board meeting that will mark the end of ICANN67 remote in a couple of hours from now.

Thank you, everybody. Forum is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020