ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: CPH and CSG Membership Meeting
Thursday, September 22, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 KUL

SUE SCHULER: Hello and welcome to the combined membership meeting of the Contracted Party House and the Commercial Stakeholder Group. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name and your affiliation for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much. My name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm the outgoing Chair of the ISPCP. We were very happy when we got the invitation by the Contracted Party House to have a common meeting again since we had, for a longer time, no common meeting. We used to have them sometimes before.

So then we tried also to coordinate an agenda. And with that agenda, I think, under this agenda we have four points. Is it possible to show the agenda? Yes, okay. So these are the points we are going to discuss. I fully understand that we could not get Göran to the room as we tried to do because at the very end of this meeting [inaudible] also did not get here in the room.

With that, may I just hand over to you, Sam, first? And then you start the discussion. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And thanks, Lori and Mason, for getting together with Ashley and myself and all of the CPH membership. I think, Wolf-Ulrich, you're totally right. It's been a long time since our respective groups have had a chance to sit down face to face, so I think this is very timely.

We have a couple of topics, as you see here. I think it makes sense to just dive right in on this first one. This had been a question that had

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

come in from the CSG. So if one of you guys want to maybe tee it up and then we can just kick it around from there.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I think it's Mason. Is he here? Yeah, it is.

MASON COLE: Is it me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah.

MASON COLE: Okay. Mason Cole, chair the Business Constituency. I want to say thank you to our Contracted Party colleagues as well for this session. This is an excellent idea for us to get together. We should probably try to do this every ICANN meeting.

So on DNS abuse, I'll just give a bit of context and then we can talk about next steps as, by the way, I sign into the Zoom room, if you don't see me there. So I think most of us around this table have had discussions about where we stand on DNS abuse. And we've had some encouraging developments in terms of our discussion about the Non-Contracted Parties House wanting to see some action on DNS abuse at the contractual level.

And we've heard encouraging news from the Contracted Parties as well. I'll reiterate, at least on behalf of the BC if not the CSG, that we're

interested, obviously, in doing something about DNS abuse and establishing an affirmative obligation for mitigation of abuse in the contracts. We think that would be a very helpful step. We don't expect to crack open the contract and pour a bunch of community desires in there like what happened in 2013. I remember that very well because I was on the other side of the aisle at the time and it was an extremely difficult process.

So I want to reassure our Contracted Party friends that there's no grand scheme to try to revise the entire contract. We want a very narrowly-focused set of actions on DNS abuse, and we'd like to cooperate in a coordinated way to deliver a message to ICANN that Contracted Parties and the CSG are in alignment on dealing with DNS abuse at the contractual level. And in the process of doing so, if we can agree on types of abuse and what those contract amendments may look like and we can deliver a coordinated message to ICANN Org, then it seems like ICANN Org would be in a position where they would need to respect the outreach on the part of the CSG and the Contracted Parties.

It seems like there's something I'm forgetting in this process as well, and now I can't think of what it is. But Sam and Wolf-Ulrich, let me stop there. I'm glad to answer any questions or talk about the issue going forward. All right, thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Mason, for that. So with regards at least to the first item here under that, "confirm list of agreed upon types of abuse" and those issues you raised [inaudible], I would like to open the floor, though, for

any comments of that. How you feel about that. So the [inaudible] is going on here and the issues we may have within the community with those things. So any comment, any proposal for better handling that will be welcome here?

I know all of you have, almost every day, talked about DNS abuse either in your own rounds or together with the Board or in different compositions with other communities here. Maybe you're a little bit overloaded with that, but I would like to encourage you for any comment, please.

Please go ahead.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi, thank you. Ashley Heineman, chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And I this agenda item started off as, I think, a request from the CSG. There was a reference to that there was an agreement on all our sides on what's abuse. And I think we wanted to flesh out because it wasn't clear to us that we did have agreement on what was DNS abuse. And if we do have agreement, that's great.

But I think from, at least the Registrar Stakeholder Group and from the Registries Stakeholder Group, we have an agreed upon definition of what DNS abuse is. And for what it's worth and in response to what Mason was saying earlier—I won't speak for Sam—but in the Registrar Stakeholder Group, we did make a proposal to look to enhance our contractual obligations as it pertains to DNS abuse; to put language in there, very narrowly-targeted, as few words as possible, if we get agreement to go down this path, that would simply require us to take

action to mitigate or disrupt abuse. And that would be in line with our definition of DNS abuse.

So that's more on the technical side—malware, phishing, etc. And I think that would be … If we can get agreement to move forward in that direction and able to successfully negotiate, I think it would be an actual, real way to move the needle on this. And I think we could see a lot of potentially forward movement. And I think to do that in an expedited way, it's best that we keep to the agreed upon definition of DNS abuse. And we can move from there.

So I'll stop there because I know Mark has his hand up.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. I will speak on behalf of the Small Team on DNS Abuse from the GNSO Council. I can confirm to the community that our final report to be discussed on the next GNSO Council meeting will not contain any additions or divergences to the current definitions of DNS abuse, as they are in the contract and that has been locked in. So at least as far as our small team is concerned, there is no further discussion to be had on that matter at the moment. So we would be good to move forward. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Mark. Any further comment? First you and then Brian. Yeah? Brian, you [inaudible]. I'm sorry. Please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN:	Yes. Volker Greimann speaking, CentralNIC Registrar Stakeholder Group. One thing that many Registrars feel strongly about is that any contractual obligation that is enforceable by Compliance should not devolve to the level of a second bite of the apple for every single abuse ticket that we're sent. But rather, we're looking for a more holistic approach where systemic mishandling of abuse tickets would be actionable, but not every single abuse ticket. So I hope that no one goes into this with the expectation that once you have an abuse ticket declined by a contracted party, you can immediately go to ICANN Compliance and get that looked at again a second time because that's not what we're intending here. We're intending to have a process that is more systemic and holistic, and therefore is designed to find patterns of contracted parties not dealing with abuse in the way that they should be but not to look at every single ticket twice.
WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:	Thank you, Volker. Looking around. Mason, is there any action from your side? Because you were pointing [inaudible] point to the second point on the agenda item, "discussion on what can be done within the limits of ICANN's remit and Bylaws." So we were talking about contract on the one hand side, but we are talking about, also, ICANN's remit here.
MASON COLE:	Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Within the limits of ICANN's remit and Bylaws? Sure. If that's necessary to state in order to make progress on this, then

the CSG is in favor. That was the other point I was going to raise that I managed to let slip before. We recognize the difference between maliciously-registered names and compromised names. And we're looking for action on maliciously-registered names first. And that's perfectly fine.

And within the remit of ICANN and its Bylaws? Okay, great. It seems like we're becoming more and more into violent agreement here. And I think it's time that we try to take the next step and agree that we've got a handshake on this and that we're ready for the next steps.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Lori, please.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yeah, thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Lori first and then you.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yeah. I want to just make sure I'm following this in terms of definitions. We understand the voluntary framework. We understand that malicious low-hanging fruit, malicious registrations. We're there. Low-hanging fruit. Let's go for the low-hanging fruit. We're hungry. But I want to …

On this voluntary framework definition, is this a working definition or a definition that would be somehow memorialized in some way? Because to be frank about it, I don't mind going forward with a working definition that we can work from, but I do think my constituency would have more concern of putting that in any sort of contractual language or memorialized language that would take a legal effect. So I just want to clarify that point.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Lori. That's actually a great question. When we were proposing these initial contractual modifications, we are basing those off of the existing obligations and looking to enhance the existing obligations that exist in the contract already. And so the overlap and what the voluntary framework defines … And actually more, I think, relevant to this conversation is the Contracted Party House-endorsed definition which Alan provided in the chat. You can drop that link again if it went by.

That definition of DNS abuse is informed by what's in Specification 11 (3)(b) of the Registry Agreement. So just to be very explicit, it's phishing, malware, botnets, pharming. And those are kind of the core ones. There's a little bit of discussion of spam when it's used as a delivery mechanism for those other four. But it's really those four primary things.

So we're not, in this amendment, seeking to expand that definition, but rather to establish a baseline requirement for action in cases of those particular harms. The question of whether there could be future types

EN

of abusive actions that we don't want to ... I think maybe what I'm hearing you say is that you don't want to preclude those from future action through the process of this amendment?

I think we would probably agree with that. Right? As Contracted Parties, we need to understand that our business isn't stagnant. Right? The bad guys are not stagnant actors. So I don't think that we're seeking to close that definition with this. We're simply, at this initial stage, seeking to close what we see as a bit of a gap in the contracts where there right now isn't any requirement to actually take any action.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yeah, I'd like to respond. Thanks, Sam. I think that's a great clarification because I do want to remind [inaudible]. And thank you for dropping in the chat Spec 11. I'm not really ... As people know, I'm having a problem following chat. So I'm not really looking at the rolling chat right now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, no [problem].

LORI SCHULMAN: But I will look at it after this meeting. That being said, too, I did want to point out because I did see in the agenda about the limits of the remit. But I do want to remind you that even in ICANN's Bylaws itself in terms of the Mission Statement in Section 4.6(d), there is language, and I think supports all of us in terms of "ICANN will ensure that it will adequately address issues of competition, consumer protection, security, stability

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection."

So there's certainly language built into the Bylaws. Now, this is language that's related to the new gTLD program specifically, but I do think you can impute that responsibility beyond. So I think in terms of being comfortable with staying within the remit, this keeps us comfortably within the remit.

And in terms of, you know, there's been some rhetoric that, "Well, ICANN can't look at the content of every single domain name." And I just want to make clear that that's not the expectation, certainly not of the ISPC, the IS ... God, the IPCs. Sorry, the acronyms. It's very late. It seems like I can't follow scrolling or acronyms.

But you understand what I'm saying. That in terms of feeling comfortable moving forward, that we're safely within the remit. I think there's certainly enough language in the Bylaws. And there's more language, but I won't get into that detail that keeps us comfortable with addressing intellectual property concerns.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Ashley. Go ahead, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to jump the queue, but I just need to make it abundantly clear that this is still a proposal that we've made to our membership and we still have to get their support. And also to be clear, this will pertain to what we're currently obligated to act upon in terms

of DNS abuse and just making it a requirement to take that action, to take an action.

So I just wanted to make that clear that we're not really talking about ICANN's remit and Bylaws when it comes to contractual changes. We're talking about what we are already required to do in terms of what is abusive behavior, and adding some additional language that would require us to take action because right now in our contracts, there is no language that require us to take an action against, to mitigate or disrupt.

And once again, it's just a proposal because I don't want my membership to feel that I'm going way ahead of them. But this is our plan and what we would like to do if we get approval.

LORI SCHULMAN: Now I'm going to say thank you again, Ashley, for that clarification. I think the more clarity you have, the easier it is to move forward.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thanks very much for that. And I don't see a queue. Then the first one in the queue is you, Brian. Please go ahead.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I want to say thank you. Thanks, Alan, for posting the link in the chat. I think similarly couching this with the tentative, let's run everything by the membership. But I'm encouraged. Even more

encouraged than I've ever been with the list of stuff that it sounds like we're agreeing is DNS abuse and should be considered to be DNS abuse.

I think everybody knows that there's more stuff we think is DNS abuse, too. But focusing on what we agree on, I think that list is well done and the descriptions are nice. I think we might like it more than we thought we would, given just how well that breakdown is done in the link that Alan shared.

So I encourage the CSG folks to read that. And I think [inaudible] we're getting closer to agreement on what we can agree on. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Brian. And my question to you, Ashley. Has that proposal already been circulated as a proposal or is there a timeline for that?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: [Well, what's the spec]? So we have two separate proposals. So I will speak to the Registrar Stakeholder Group proposal. And it was verbally made for the most part, and so our next steps include me putting something in writing and sending it to my membership. And we're going to have a standalone meeting to discuss it again because I wanted the members to have a time to digest what I was proposing.

So once we have that meeting, then we'll consider whether or not to approve moving forward. So that's where we are.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: That's good. Thank you very much for that.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Sorry, Wolf-Ulrich. I didn't mean to cut you off. Very similar on the Registry side. We've presented this as an idea to our membership to consider. We'll be looking at the same timeline just in the next couple of weeks, really. I don't really want to see this stretch into multiple months, but just this question of whether the membership agrees to and is okay with initiating contract amendments. And when …

I'm being very optimistic by saying "when." If the membership agrees to that, if and when they do, we will be communicating this via written communication to ICANN Org that we'll be, obviously, available for the community to take a look at as well.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Sounds very good [inaudible] plan for that. Thank you. I think we can close this item. [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You've got a queue, Wolf-Ulrich.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: There's two more in the … Yeah, we have a queue on Zoom.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Oh, I'm sorry. I cannot see a queue here.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: James is next. I'm sorry. James Bladel is next.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, thanks. Thanks, Ashley. Thanks, Wolf. So stepping outside of the proposal that we've been discussing thus far, there's a couple of other abuse-related issues that were discussed here in Kuala Lumpur that I think would be worth raising with the CSG and possibly enlisting your support and your assistance.

The first one is that we've noticed an uptick in the number of incidents flagged by ICANN Compliance where individuals who are subject to abuse mitigation—that means their domain names were suspended for abuse—are going to ICANN Compliance and usually, through the narrow definition of the Transfer Policy, are able to get their domain names either reactivated or transferred.

Obviously, this is something that we're not in favor of and we're working with ICANN Compliance. I think we'd like to work with CSG. There is an open comment ... Or I think it's recently closed. The IRTP PDP that's being reviewed, the comment period recently closed and there's a discussion about possibly changing the reason for denial of a transfer—the first reason for denial—which right now is very narrowly specifically targeting fraud to include other situations and scenarios which could be considered DNS abuse. Essentially, we don't want people, bad guys using ICANN Compliance against us to get out from anti-abuse.

And then the second one is that there's a discussion between Registries and Registrars in ICANN regarding the AGP consensus policy which, if

you recall, was put in place to financially disincentivize domain name tasting. But it also has this knock-on effect of causing registrars in particular to exceed their limits when they are aggressively detecting and deleting domain names that are abusive.

Like, for example, algorithmically-registered domain names can put a registrar over that limit and then subject it to additional fees from ICANN and from the registry. So we'd like to raise these with you. And it feels like those should be fairly non-controversial topics where we could expect support from other elements of the GNSO in working to get these—let's call them headwinds—against registries and registrars who are taking action against abuse. And they shouldn't be penalized or economically disincentivized for their practices.

So, not part of the proposal, but just something to be aware of. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, James. And I see now the queue. And we have Mark, Brian, and Thomas. Mark, please go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. This is Mark Datysgeld speaking on behalf of the GNSO Council Small Team on DNS Abuse. We need to take a step back from Lori's statements. So let's be very clear on what is within scope. It is the working definition that has been in use by the DNS Abuse Institute that has been used during the discussions we had during the online [inaudible] which consists of malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, and spam as a mechanism to deliver the above.

This is the definition that we have been working with during this entire time, and when we say that we will stick to them, what we mean is that this is what has been consensually reached prior to the starting of the group.

And therefore, when we say we will not pursue anything further, we mean we will not initiate a discussion that would add to that list that has been consensually arrived at over the course of many, many, many, many discussions and that are actually being contemplated by the current tools and by the current actions of a lot of the contracted parties who are on the table.

And the difference is that under the current contract, there is a need to take reasonable action upon this distress. And what is reasonable? I can start from there all of the way here. And you will say, "Reasonable is A." You'll say, "Reasonable is B." The thing that we want to get right and that we are hoping to collaborate before our Contracted Party House colleagues is that we define a path of action that actually mitigates these issues within the entire universe of actors. Right?

So that is the matter that we're trying to advance. And hopefully, this is what we'll be able to move forward within the next few months. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Mark. Brian is next.

BRIAN KING: Thanks. Thank you for clarifying that, Mark. I didn't hear anything that makes me think that our position and support of agreeing on what we agree on would change based on what you said. Although I could get yelled at later if I'm wrong, but I don't think so.

Thanks, James, for the great suggestions. Two excellent suggestions that I can't imagine anybody in the IPC disagreeing with. I think those are great possibilities for things that should absolutely happen. And, again, I could get yelled at later if I'm missing something. Just speaking on the fly, but I think we could definitely get behind those. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thomas and then Mason.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah. Thanks very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And let me echo the comment that was made earlier that it's a great initiative to be meeting in this group. And we should do it again. You know, with so many different and polarizing points that are being discussed in the ICANN world, wouldn't it be great if we could just write down some of the points that we agree on and document to the outside world that we can have some quick wins and alignment?

I hear that the link to the document confirming the definition of abuse scenarios that we can all agree on is pretty uncontroversial, so maybe we can write that down. And maybe we can also pick up the points that James made that we would jointly ask ICANN, or ICANN Compliance for

that matter, to find ways to support the Contracted Parties in combating abuse scenarios with the points that you mentioned.

So if that were the case, I don't mean we have to do it now in this very minute, but maybe there's enough substance so that we can jointly write an encouraging letter to Göran and put that on the correspondence page. I think some consensus in this community is good and we should show it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Thomas, for that. So usually I'm personally also in favor of such an approach. It's not easy, so you have to see what is going to be written. And someone has to start with it to kick off that. So if you could agree upon who is going to do what, to start with that. Just a small paper [inaudible] that would be helpful. And then all others can chime in and fight against or adapt or whatever or comment on that. So that would be helpful.

But there is, from that discussion, I also take that there is some agreement on several points. So which could we lay down? So is there, may I ask, or is that … Is it too early to ask for a volunteer to do that? What do you think about?

MARK DATYSGELD: I'll step in very quick, Wolf-Ulrich. I'm very sorry. From the small team's perspective, our next step will be the sending of a letter from the GNSO Council to the Contracted Parties. That's what has been agreed upon, and therefore that would be the next step. And this is where we stand.

If you would like something that's further than that, then we could be asking the question. This is what's agreed upon until now, so would your question be an amendment to that? Do you understand what I'm saying?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Well, I understood. Well, if I'm right I understood more that way, that the small team is on the Council level in it. So we are talking about between CSG and the Contracted Parties right now, which is a different level. And that is what that's about. So is there something which could be brought together here and then be put forward? So that is my question.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Wolf [inaudible].

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And apologies to those in the queue. I just want to address this question. I think as we stated a couple of minutes ago, again, to reiterate Ashley, this is still a proposal out with our membership right now. So we do still need to go through the work of making sure that everyone in our membership is on board. I think we're both cautiously optimistic. This is definitely the direction that the community is heading in, and I think Contracted Parties across both of our stakeholder groups recognize that.

But what we're planning to do if and when that agreement is reached, is that we will send a communication to ICANN summarizing that agreement and laying out the plan for the contractual amendments. We also just contractually have to send a formal written notice to actually initiate those contract amendments.

But what may be helpful at that point is once that communication goes out, a letter expressing support of that approach or agreement with that approach, if that is where we all end up—and it seems like we're in a good place, we may very well end up there—that might be a good time to express that support.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. So let's do step by step. Okay, but we have something in mind. Thank you. So we have two people in the queue, Mason and Lori. Mason first, please.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I think I've heard maybe two or three different proposals about how we can jointly communicate to ICANN Org that we're in agreement here. So we've got something from the GNSO. We've got something from the Contracted Parties. We're talking about maybe a coordinated communication. Whatever form that takes, let's do it. Right? Once we get to an agreement—once Sam and Ashley are able to get their memberships in alignment and the CSG is in alignment—let's go to Org and put it down on paper and say that we're all in agreement.

We're in a position there where Org will need to take action. And that's the other half of the equation that we haven't really talked about in the room. So I do encourage this. Whatever form that might take, if it's a letter of support, a letter where we all sign our names, whatever you want to call it. I'm in favor of doing that. At least the BC can say that we're in favor of that.

My second point is one that I'm not sure that we've covered here. And I'll be brief about it. And that is that we've also talked about equipping ICANN Compliance with better contractual tools to enforce against the actors that everyone in the room agrees exist and need to be addressed. There's the infamous 8-10 registrars, or whatever you want to call them, out there. And Compliance needs better tools. Compliance has complained about not having contractual tools, and this is another positive step in terms of equipping ICANN Org on their end to doing something about DNS abuse. So I just didn't want to let that point slip.

So anyway, thank you for all of the good suggestions about communicating to Org. The CSG is behind that effort, and we're willing to take the pen or do whatever is necessary to make a coordinated communication. Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. Thank you, Mason. We have a Lori. And then I would like to close the queue with Ashley.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I just want to ask James a question. I think the communication effort is clear, but when you said you need our help, are there any … You know, the comment periods have closed. I think the IPC did comment on that, but I'd have to go back and double-check. But I'm pretty sure we put comments in, and I'd have to review them to remember precisely what we said. But the comment period is closed. So a staff report will be coming out.

What kind of actual help, in terms of functional help, would you like from our from our side in terms of moving forward, more than this letter? And if it's just a letter, that's fine. I just want some clarification on what "help" might mean.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Lori. Maybe that could turn out from that. Also in discussion to each other after that. So what could be requested from your side as well.

LORI SCHULMAN: I just want to clarify. So do you want me to ask this question post meeting instead of now? Is that it?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Well, I would like to ask you to follow up with that question—

LORI SCHULMAN: Okay, I get it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: —on the agenda.

LORI SCHULMAN: Noted. Okay, thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Ashley, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. We were just tossing out a lot of ideas, and I just want to make sure that we're all talking the same thing. What I heard from Thomas was that he wanted to just encapsulate areas that we have agreement on and have that out there somewhere. I did not foresee any need for a letter to Göran. I don't think that we need help in the sense that we need you to exhibit support to Göran for things because I think we're in a good spot right now. I don't want to make things any more complicated.

I think what you may have heard is that James was indicating some of the actions and activities that we're involved in. And it would be great just for you all to be aware of them and to note that sometimes it's harder for us to do things because they tend to conflict with existing policy or legal requirements.

So just know that we're doing a number of different things, and we want you to be aware of them. And if there's ever points of inflection to be supportive of these, it would be great. But we're not ... I don't think that

we need to have a formal communication because we intended to do that on our own and we already have support—at least based on Göran's comments this morning—that he's happy to work with the Contracted Parties should we decide to trigger a negotiation.

But I do like the idea of having an opportunity to, if we do have areas of agreement that we promote that when we can. Perhaps that's something we can do if we make this a regular thing where we have regular communication. That could be an output of our meetings together. "This is what we discussed, and this is what we agreed. And ain't that grand?" And that will keep us moving together and having dialogue.

So hopefully that's where we are. But I just wanted to make sure that we weren't going down a path of having some form of official communication to Göran because I think we have some ideas of how to proceed, and we don't want to make it any more complicated than it needs to be. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Lori. I'm looking around. To that point, as [inaudible], are there any other comments, some proposals tool to help to make use of it. Not just in theory, but later on in practice as well.

Philippe, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Just a question. I don't know if it's for you, actually, or for the group. On the timeframe, as you could tell from the Board and from

others. There's that issue of the window within which that development wouldn't be a problem for Org. And should this take too much time, that may collide with other projects.

I'm just curious as to how long you would think that investigation would take? How long do you think that Council might be in a position to weigh in on this? Or at least, first have a good understanding of, as Becky put it, what it is and what it isn't? And put Council in a position to endorse this or not for that matter? Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: So I don't know if Russ is in here. He's going to strangle me. But, no. ICANN has agreed to do a webinar, at least as of a conversation we had this morning. So I hate to make it sound more concrete than it may end up being, but the hope and the plan is to do it the next two weeks. So I think that's ...

And again, that's just to kind of gauge whether or not this is something that enough registrars could participate in to make it workable. But that doesn't ... I don't really see us as being the ones advocating for or against it otherwise. So I look to the CSG, as the users, to make that determination. But whether or not this is going to be possible operationally is what we're looking at, at this point.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. Lori, is your hands still up or is not?

LORI SCHULMAN:	Old hand, sorry.
Wolf-Ulrich:	Yeah, okay. [So then it's] Sebastian [coming in].
SEBASTIEN DUCOS:	Yeah. Just to add on to my message to both, actually. As the small team lead, we will want to have something to get back to the Council with by 10 October. And that something is, "Yeah, let's go with this" or "No, we need a bit more time. But here is the precise timeline that we need, and that sort of answer. Or, "No, we're not interested. Thank you very much."
	So if and when you have those meetings—Ashley, you said in the next two weeks. It seems like a reasonable timeline to me. On the other side, please also try to fit it in that window so that your delegates on the small team have time to come back to the small team well before the 10th of October in order to formulate that answer. Thanks.
ASHLEY HEINEMAN:	Just to note. It won't be "well before" October 10th. We'll do our best to do it before October 10th. And again, I think in principle there's willingness for a handful of registrars, at a minimum, to engage on this. It's just that we need to find out if it actually is going to be possible.
WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:	That is good to hear, but it's also [inaudible]. Thank you for that. We have Greg and then Philippe again.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, just kind of circling back. So we have the presentation so registrars can really understand, from an operational perspective, what's involved here. And then I think the other input we're trying to gather is how many registrars would be willing to use this as it's described because I think that's another input to send back to the Council. So I do think that could take several weeks to get all of that information together.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thanks for that. Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Just to follow up on Ashley's note that this is just the Registrars' approach on this, and that's not the whole GNSO. I think this is a gating question, clearly. The technical feasibility and how much registrars are [embarked] on this? Probably, and maybe through Council, the NCPH and the NCSG, in particular, we would welcome some feedback [ASAP] for us to move forward with our reading of what's proposed here. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Philippe. Brian King.

BRIAN KING: I saw a question in the chat, and I've heard some questions this week about knowing if or how and to what extent it would be used might play

into the calculus of the Contracted Parties on this. If it's any help, I intend to send a note to every MarkMonitor customer and say, "Hey, this thing exists. We need data. We need people to use it. Let's go." I can't commit to INTA, but I would imagine that Lori would strongly consider sending something to INTA members.

And I think people would be really excited that there's potentially progress on some step forward. So if that can give any comfort to folks that have those kinds of questions, I think many in the IPC will be looking forward to trying it and to putting requests in and to working in good faith on it.

Unrelated, my other point—or maybe a question. And maybe nobody has the answer for this now, but once we've assessed the technical feasibility of the registrars—and let's call it the Contracted Parties plugging into this—does anybody know what the Board is going to do with the data?

If it works and people are getting the data, is that good? Does that mean the Board's going to reject the accreditation recommendations that came out of the EPDP Phase 2? Because procedurally, we're sitting in a place where the Board needs to do something vis-à-vis the recommendations. Right? And that's why we're engaged in this kind of thing to get some more intel about would a lighter-weight SSAD be good if people use it? But then we don't get the data. What does that mean the Board's going to do?

Does anybody have any indication of what this is going to inform? I think the Board has asked all of us to get clear on what it does and

doesn't do, but where I'm not clear is what does the data mean to the Board and what's the data going to mean to the conversation between the Board and the GNSO. Any thoughts? And it's okay if no. I just want to put that out there. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: We have a queue, but Lori, you are the first [inaudible].

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you. My sense of things, the Board is going to sit on this for now. And I was rightly reminded that the GNSO has asked for a pause in any sort of Board decision making. So if we were to have an expectation from the Board, we would have to, in my view, ask them not to pause. That there'll be some point in time … I don't know what that point is because I want to piggyback on something you said. Because this has certainly been true with the voluntary efforts that have been going on like NetBeacon. And now, of course, we'll have [ACID].

We're happy to socialize solutions. Yeah, provided that the solutions are scalable, number one. Because for my group … I don't know what your client list is, but in my group we're talking about 30,000 people. So before INTA would commit to socializing anything, we would have to know for sure that it works at a large scale. Because the last thing I want to do …

Because it undermines the credibility of the process and, quite personally, me if I'm going to push a solution that's not fully ready to go. So I'm just going to dial back a little to say we would absolutely

support a community solution that works, that's scalable, and that will provide the type of resources that our members need. But that's a lot of bullet points to get through before we would get to that point.

And I think that goes to something that Ashley and Sam have made very clear on the other end. That, sure, we'll take something on if we can make it work. It's like, okay, we'll take something on as long as it's working. So I think there's a few steps in there. And as I said, in terms of the Board, my personal sense is that I wouldn't expect anything. And definitely not until the GNSO asks for this lifting of the pause.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thanks, Lori. Sebastian, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hi. This is Seb, as the leader of the small team again. So to Brian's point, it is something that lies with a small team now. The small team is a GNSO … It started as a GNSO thing, but we're working hand in hand with the GDPR Caucus on the Board side. So it's sort of a cross—sorry, my words are escaping me—but between the Board and the GNSO. It's a cross effort.

And so the small team will determine, based on the results that we see, how to go. Then for the GNSO to recall the recommendations or [inaudible] for the Board to say, "Hey, GNSO. We're sending them back to you," I don't know what the formula is. I don't know and we haven't looked into those details yet. But it lies between the two. It's not the Board that is sitting on it. It's not the GNSO that is sitting on it. It's with

the small team. It's part of our agenda. We will look at it a bit later once we know what that tool is going to be.

And to Lori's point, I fully agree. This is all built on a Salesforce framework that is hundreds of thousands—I don't know how many users there—but hundreds of thousands of users around the world. It's the same framework, the same type of tools that have been used for CZDS. CZDS is not hundreds of thousands of users [, obviously]. It is very robust. I think that it's fair to say that ICANN learned a few lessons early on with the new gTLD program about building these things. And I'm doing it now with all of these things very much in mind.

And part of the development project is also outsourcing security and that sort of test. It's all in the paper, but they're taking that very seriously. We wouldn't do it. It's not because it's called a Proof of Concept or a project light or anything like that. But it's been done with a bit of duct tape. It's done with all of the seriousness that needs to be put in anything ICANN proposes to the public.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Sébastien. I think I'll close the queue here, as we have the last point. We have five minutes to go, and the Accuracy Scoping Team we would like to touch on as well [for some minutes]. Please, go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. In the interest of time—there's only, now, four minutes left—we just want to say we recognize that the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team is something that's quite important to the

community, and it's quite important to our colleagues in the CSG. It's obviously something that the registries and registrars both also find very important. That's why we've been participating in that.

So I think really, for today, we all know that group is looking for a new chair as it embarks on the next phase of its work. So I think this is a good time for us to collectively like reach into our networks and think about who would be good to lead that effort. And if we can be helpful at all and communicate amongst ourselves who might be good for that, let's do that in the time between meetings and find someone great to keep this work on.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for that, Sam. So I was following, also, the debate yesterday and the presentation which was given by Michael. And it seemed to me he was a little bit … He was not satisfied with the outcome of that group. And I think it's not easy for anybody to step in there with such a, let me say, a feeling that he or she might be failing to succeed in order to push that forward. It's really not easy. [inaudible] really hard work here then the community to convince people that it is necessary to have that and to come to whatever. But to [inaudible]. And I'm sure this community has people who could run that.

But anyway, that's my personal comment. Somebody else who would like to chime in to comment on that? Lori, please.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

LORI SCHULMAN:	Yes. Having been a member of the team [inaudible] here. It was a struggle, I think, in some ways over the last year. But I didn't see Mike's presentation yesterday. I'll have to look at it. But I actually think at the very, very end we did come to some consensus on some very important points about lack of data, needing data, how might we get that data, recognizing that the issue is ... It's ongoing and evolving, and it's certainly impacted by new regulation and potential regulation.

So in that sense, I can't say it's super disappointing. But it is hard work. I would maybe suggest, as we're reaching into our networks or thinking about potential leaders, when we get leaders who are subject matter experts—and I saw this on Rights Protection Mechanisms very clearly—they all come in with points of view. And on the Rights Protection Mechanisms side, we had three different chairs because we knew there would be three different points of view.

And so when we look for a new chair, I might argue that we're looking for a facilitator. We're not necessarily looking for someone with a strong technical background and a point of view as much as we need somebody to facilitate work and who is very good at administration.

Now we all know Mike and know he knows his business. And I will say that I think he really made a strong effort to remain balanced or as balanced as is he could be, given his own knowledge and his point of view. And so I thank him for doing what I think was a hero's job this year. But that being said, as we move forward, perhaps ...

I remember this with SubPro. That when they were looking for leaders, they looked for people who maybe weren't as vested in the outcome as

others. And that might be a very good place to start with Accuracy. There may be a community leader now who's in between working groups, in between projects, who might very well step in who understands the process and who understands the consensus building. Which doesn't mean Mike didn't.

I don't want anybody to defer that otherwise. As I said, I think he did a very good job. But I think his frustrations of the outcome do come from having a point of view. And it's a well-earned point of view, but maybe we need somebody else who's not quite as vested in the outcomes.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Lori, I think that's absolutely spot on. What we're looking for here is not a subject matter expert. We're looking for a kickass chair. We all know a few. Right? I heard Philippe's got some free time on his hands.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I knew it would be coming, but no thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Before you vote on this, I would like to close the session because we are accurately at the end of the session. Thank you very much for that.

Does anybody know where the drinks are? The farewell drinks? There is nothing? So this is frustration, I would say.

Thank you very much. That's the end of the session. Thank you.

SUE SCHULER: We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR