ICANN76 | CF – At-Large Session on Subsequent Procedures
Saturday, March 11, 2023 – 15:00 to 16:00 CUN

YESIM SAGLAM: Hello and welcome to At-Large Internal Session on Subsequent Procedures. My name is Yesim Saglam and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session.

Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select a language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hands in the Zoom room. And once the session facilitator calls up your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

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 tool bar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN Multistakeholder Model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, 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 this, I will hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, the chair of ALAC. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. And welcome, everyone. We're going to begin to have a conversation about subsequent procedures and it is just the beginning of a conversation. This is going to be a longer one.

This morning, the SO and AC chairs had a meeting with both Tripti and Sally and obviously, the topic of subsequent procedures came up in that meeting as it will probably come up in every single meeting this week during the ICANN meeting. It is certainly the topic that sits atop the new priorities set by the board for Sally and for the organization. And it is going to be a very frequent topic of conversation here as well.

One of the questions that was asked at the time of the meeting this morning by Tripti is, when would you like to get an estimate from us about when applications will begin to be accepted? When will this new round begin? And the options were in Washington in June or in Hamburg in October. And there was definitely a discussion about that but I think it resolved itself as being the earlier time. So there's some impetus for at least the basic sort of skeleton of a schedule to get laid out as early as June at the Washington meeting.

And so, it became an interesting conversation about well, is that a soft schedule? What does that mean when you set those dates? And there were two interesting aspects to that conversation. The first was that a deadline can create focus, right? And so, there's some value to that coming out. So while some might have expected me to say Hamburg instead of Washington, I didn't because I think that having a deadline will help to drive some of the conversations that need to take place about critical path issues.

The second question that came up is about what kind of project management or what kind of critical path issues that were going to be associated with that. The GNSO actually has its own list in which for example, the ALAC recommendations are listed as an item, right? And there's several of them at this point that are outstanding and under consideration. And so, really gaining an understanding of what that Gantt chart looks like. What are the things that need to happen before those applications begin is going to be a big part of the date the board set and also the things that we need as a community to try and accomplish before that goes on.

When we went around the table and we were kind of asked for our priorities, I said that it's very interesting representing the individual end-users because we could be thought of as the ones upon whom unintended consequences are most likely to fall. This is not entirely true. Digital archery certainly affected a lot of people last time that are in the community but we think about issues of DNS abuse, the success of applicant support, communities, etc. The folks whose interest we are trying to represent are the ones that are most concerned about these unintended consequences.

And so, I said, one of the focuses for At-Large at this meeting and between now and the start of any new round are doing whatever is necessary to try and mitigate those unintended consequences. The ones we saw at the 2012 round as well as any nuance that might crop up. I also said that we have a particular eye toward what we might consider intended consequences. As we talk about the value of this round, we have in the past had folks raise the point, well, there's not demand. We don't need a new round or something like that.

But it's certainly the case that there's opportunities that present themselves as a result of a new round including getting applicants from underserved regions that we didn't see any of last time including seeing more communities participate in the next round including IDNs. And so, there are areas of real interest to us where we hope for successes to take place. So there's unintended consequences we want to avoid and there are intended consequences we want to have happen. And so, those are sort of the conversations that we want to begin to have here in this room.

And in a sense, what we're doing today is talking about the framework of that discussion generally. And then it will probably then result in small teams within the CPWG and the OFB Working Groups to generate some of these prioritization efforts to really harden our notions of what we really consider to be critical path. What it is that can be happening in parallel to new applications? And what are simply things that are ongoing.

So one of the things that's interesting is this idea of prioritization is something that's being wildly discussed not only within the At-Large

community but also the community as a whole. So we went through and a small team, small sub-team of the OFB Working Group, we went through our own prioritization effort of recommendations from the CCT, from SSR2, from workstream2 and from subsequent procedures and from WHOIS. There are a number of different recommendations that are outstanding there and we went through a prioritization effort.

Subsequent to that, there was a community-wide prioritization effort that was led by Xavier. And we sort of rank ordered a number of the recommendations and there's a pretty good alignment. I think Cheryl will agree with me as we've participated in that community-wide process. There's a pretty good alignment to those community-wide priorities to the ones that we had set as priorities in our internal session. So that preparation was well worth it.

But one thing that was missing from both of those efforts intentionally at the time but is of significance now is this notion of critical path. In other words, they're sort of ranked in order of importance and priority in both cases. But the idea of what has to be done and what does success look like prior to a new round is something that we haven't dealt with in a comprehensive way internally. And it's certainly going to be an ongoing conversation for the community as a whole. So it's what has to be done? What's a success of something in particular look like? What's good enough?

And that's going to be the kind of conversation that we want to start to have in this room almost as a kind of a prototype conversation that's just meant to begin the larger conversation that will happen with these small teams. Any questions about that or the things that I've just talked

about and our intentions here? So you don't need to consider anything today final. We're going to just talk about a couple of different topics to get our juices going and I really want to get you interested and committed to being a part of this prioritization effort that will take place under the offices of the CPWG and the OFB, okay? Are there any questions or hands up online or anything like that? I'm not looking.

So next on the agenda, I wanted to give the microphone to Cheryl to talk a little bit about a tool that she was involved in preparing that's kind of a subset of the more complicated tool that we had built for our initial prioritization exercise that will help just give a kind of framework for how these conversations will take place going forward. So without further ado, Cheryl. Take it away.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And I like a bit of further ado. That's all right. We can have some further ado. I'm assuming that there's a screenshot of our tool and that the magic is going to happen in just a moment if I keep talking long enough but maybe not. Never mind, right.

Some of you will have experienced the presentations that we've done at previous meetings on behalf of the operations, finance, and budget subcommittee, and we keep saying things like OFB Working Group. We've got to remember not everybody speaks letters like ICANN veterans. And so, the Operations, Finance, Budget Working Group has a sub-team which has spent a huge amount of time ably assisted by some fabulous staff. And here, particularly Jonathan would like to call out Susie Johnson. She's been unbelievably clever.

This looks fairly simple as we look up on screen. Well, maybe it doesn't look fairly simple but if you knew what was behind it, this is simple. There is some very clever stuff goes on behind each of the sheets in this tool. And what you're looking at is almost a glorified snapshot of some of what we have worked on over considerable years now. Noting that in many cases these recommendations for example out of the CCTRT reviews have been in place for a great length of time.

So what the small team did in the larger prioritization assessment tool, and so, we ended up calling that the At-Large or ALAC Prioritization Assessment Tool. Therefore, we have to make a small word which is APAT. We have it not just to record what us as a community said when these recommendations came out. As in this we thought was essential before a new round could go ahead but where we thought it was in terms of a ranking order or priority.

But also, we've tracked with these recommendations [inaudible] literally hundreds of others, is where they are progressing through ICANN. So when they become board approved and therefore, can be prioritized to then be considered to go into a budget that happens in a particular annual cycle. All of that is tracked in this bigger document.

What we have here apart from very colorful things is a very condensed version looking at just a couple of points from the SSR2. This is Security and Stability Specific Review and the Consumer Choice and Trust Review, the CCRT. Then there is a snapshot of this larger tool and thank heavens for Chantelle who is here because she's been a huge part of trying to make this almost understandable to the average human. Not that it is necessarily yet.

You'll see that there is a color-coding so it needs to be seen as approved by the board or it can't even be considered. Our recommendation when we did this review of where it should fit in a schema was that all of these things are high. And there was high and there was high plus, plus. In fact, I think we got to a high triple plus. Now if we went through all of the recommendations, and this is just a sample of them for today, there would be so many high plus, pluses like it would be ridiculous.

So we now have to get to the point of, amongst what was considered high when we reviewed these recommendations and put them into some sort of order. What is most important? What has to be done as a prerequisite? Something that has to happen before. What can be started, committed to and continue? What has to be completed before? So we now need to look at, while we recognize all these things are important, and all these things we'd like to have done, what are the absolute must-haves before a new round as opposed to what we are committed to and that are still should-haves? We should have these. We stand firm on these. We want these to occur.

And what was—we still want them to happen, the could-haves? If necessary, we can delay but we will not forget about, okay? So it's not a matter of ditching anything, all right? So as you're making your inventions, as you're having these conversation, don't feel you have to defend the right of any of these recommendations to exist. They do exist. They will continue to exist as important to us. But really, right now, we're going to look at what is an absolute must-have. What can be maybe a should-have and is there a pile of could-haves as well? Jonathan, have I done enough on this without boring people too much?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, it's Jonathan. I'm Jonathan. Thanks so much, Cheryl. And thanks to you and Susie and the small team, Sebastien, Alan and many others that worked so hard on our internal prioritization effort. And that work continues to be important. So all that's really changing in this exercise in the near term, and I mean near term in the ICANN context, is the idea of a prerequisite recommendation, an outcome, et cetera, that we think needs to happen prior to the start of a new round.

And so, part of what we might want to do is think a little bit about what principles to apply to those recommendations to make that determination and a little bit of what those conversations might be like and what the basis for those things might be like. Those conversations that need to take place.

So in one case, for example, if we have high priority things that don't have a high potential to affect the timeline, then we don't have to feel guilty about asking that they be pre-requisites, right? If they have a high potential to affect the timeline of a new round of gTLDs, then I think that's the area in which we really need to have our ducks in a row as we say sometimes and really know what we want and be as specific as possible because it's come down to that time.

It's very interesting that the board's questions to us are like which of the CCTRT recommendations are most important for example. And so, there's a recognition that some things need to be done. That there's some things that are critical path. But for lack of a better term, this is a little bit of the horse-trading part of this exercise where we really need to figure out what's critically important before a round can even begin, all right?

So what I thought I would do is lay out a couple of topics of discussions and not necessarily in a completely dispositive way. In other words, it's not the end of that conversation. But to just lay out two sides of an issue and then hopefully have a conversation amongst us about what we believe should be pre-requisite or not a pre-requisite in the context of that issue. Does that make sense?

So the first thing that I was going to talk about is one of our old favorites is, DNS abuse. And DNS abuse is something that the At-Large in particular has been talking about for some time since ICANN66 or something like that. We did a number of sessions on DNS abuse that included conversations about potential changes to contracts, incentives for best practices, thresholds for DNS abuse, that was one of the recommendations of the CCTRT. We talked about bulk registrations and what makes sense there. We've done a lot of prompting the conversation for the past several years. And without question, a lot is now happening.

As Maureen mentioned and I mentioned in the first session, there was the formation of the DNS Abuse Institute that is trying to take some things outside of ICANN to deal with creating a portal for reporting

incidents but also data and statistics on both malicious registrations and how reports are handled by contracted parties. So that's an exciting development.

We know that there are contract negotiations that are currently taking place between ICANN and the contracted parties to add specifics to what was previously a more vague part of the contract with respect to what actions contracted parties need to take when they receive a party. It's incredibly important that the contracted parties have come to the negotiating table to allow changes to this contract. It's a very big deal to them to see this contract because they're already subject to things that happen in PDPs that make their contracts always seem like a moving target. And so, this is a real change to the contract and I think it's really exciting that they're having these negotiations that seem to be going well.

There's also the registry and registrar stakeholder groups have started doing a white paper series on a number of different issues related to DNS abuse like properly formatting reports and what to do if you've accidentally had your website shot down, etc. They've started to do a lot of research and put out information so that we can all be better informed about how DNS abuse is handled. The steps that they're taking, etc. So there's a lot going on there.

ICANN itself through John Crain's part of the organization, they developed the DNS abuse report tool, DAAR. And there's a version 2 of that coming out before too long that even includes one of the things that we've talked about which is predictive analytics. So that's a potentially exciting movement in this area of DNS abuse. So I like to say

that we began this conversation by banging a wooden spoon on a frying pan to get attention to it, but now there's a lot going on that's very important and very exciting from the standpoint of individual end-users. And so, we need to make sure that we're always aware of it and get familiar with it, give briefings on it, et cetera, so that we really understand all of the work that's taking place.

One thing that happened however that is important in this discussion was a decision that was made by the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. They ended up making the determination that because DNS abuse isn't specific to new gTLDs but instead happens across all TLDs that it wasn't something they addressed directly in their work. So some of the CCT recommendations that were forwarded to the Subsequent Procedures Working Group weren't addressed because they weren't considered to be specific to a new round. And so, I think that's a very important point and one that we need to consider and discuss.

The flipside of that argument is that many of these things that are going on right now we don't yet know the outcome of them. In other words, there's a lot of efforts in place now but we haven't had enough time with them to know what impact they're having. In fact, we haven't really necessarily settled on a measure of DNS abuse. There's been sort of proposals by both ICANN and the DNS Abuse Institute to look at what those measures might be, those metrics might be and where we might then look for movement as a result of some of these initiatives.

And so, one of the questions then becomes, is it enough that these initiatives are taking place in good faith and that we should forge ahead and just keep on top of this issue as an ongoing issue or do we need to

see movement in one of these measures. And so, that's one of the conversations that I think that we need to have as well. Because as we think about it as an ongoing issue or a pre-requisite issue, it's important.

One of the things that the CCT review found was that almost immediately, a lot of DNS abuse moved over to the new gTLDs however. So in that sense, there was something specific that took place. Now one of our frequent contributors, John McCormack would make the argument that that largely had to do with price. But at this point, price isn't something that's on the table. And so, the question then becomes, do we need more study? Do we need a more formal study of what took place in the previous round to see what happened in the previous round and therefore, what needs to happen differently in this round.

So those were the sort of—I wanted to lay out both sides of those issues because they kind of determine where we as an advisory committee are coming down in terms of, is there enough going on? Is there enough initiative? Have we gotten past the inertia toward more of a momentum that we feel comfortable about what's going on with DNS abuse and that it's no longer something that we see as in the way or critical path to subsequent procedures or is there enough still not yet understood about the previous round that we need to study?

That's one of the things that the SSAC recommended for example or do we need to actually see success of some sort? Some movement, some delta of a measure of DNS abuse from these efforts to feel more comfortable about moving forward. That's kind of the conversation I wanted to try to have for a few minutes. And I welcome people to raise

your hand, raise your card and give your thoughts on where you'd fall on that dichotomy if I've set it up clearly enough. I hope I have. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Hadia for the record. So as he mentioned, what we're looking here for is the, are the anti-abuse efforts that we would like to see happen before the next round gTLDs already there or not? And again, how do we determine or look for that in a way that is I would say, systematic and not ad hoc. So you mentioned many things. One way of going is looking at the policies that have been already approved by the community and related policies that have been already approved by the community and see if it is necessary to have them implemented before the next round.

One way is to look at the SSR2 recommendations because under ICANN bylaws, ICANN is committed to periodic reviews of ICANN's execution of its commitment. So far, ICANN had two iterations of those reviews and it is now in the process of implementing SSR2 recommendations. So one approach could be—one exercise that we could do is to look at each of those recommendations to first make a determination about the relevance of the recommendation.

And second, make a determination about the importance of the recommendation to be implemented before the next round of new gTLDs. So the objective here is to streamline DNS abuse to reduce severity and duration of victimization of end-users. Also, another point is—and I think—

JONATHAN ZUCK: You want to choose one. I guess, the key is that, we want to have as much of interaction as possible. Do you want to choose one of those recommendations and start a conversation about it?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So maybe I would pick one right now but I would refer to what you mentioned about registries and registrars and who would be the main entry point or the first respondent. You did mention universal expectations and standards. Who should do what when?

So as an example, in some cases, the first respondent could be the registrar in charge while in other cases, the first respondent could be the registry if the domain is maliciously registered. And also, escalation path. So do we have standards for that? Do we have timing for that? That could be also part I think of one of the recommendations. I cannot recall one right now. We did discuss, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So yes, without question, the actual exercise when we go through this, we'll go through the recommendations one by one. No questions. So one of the recommendations from the CCT review for example, was to ensure that the—sorry, my brain just fritzed out on me. One of the recommendations from the CCT review on DNS abuse was related to incentives for example. Putting incentives in place for actors to adopt best practices for example. And is that something that we want to implement? So we'll do that one by one. Thank you for input on this. Sebastien, I see you've got your hand up. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. We used to walk quietly and it seems that you say now that we need to run because before Washington, we need to be ready. I feel that was suggested here a good way to do it but I need to be sure and Cheryl will tell me if I am not wrong, it's to go back to the tool and to do the work we have done already to update it. Taking into account your way of thinking about prioritization to review them. And therefore, as we have a group already set up and the participation of the people who have a good knowledge of each and every of the review and community committee. I guess, it could be not easy but we already have the tools, the people we need to do the job and we don't need to reinvent a wheel, I guess.

My second point, it's about what you say. I love when providers set up groups as they say they will do that for us. I would like to be sure that ICANN, where we are a part or taking the good step about DNS abuse and not just saying that somebody outside is taking care of us. It's very important that this topic is taken care here. Even if I have no problem with the people doing it outside but it's not the same. Here we are a voice and [inaudible]. We are a voice if they give us a voice. That's not the same thing. That's the two things I wanted to say. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Those are definitely important points. Thank you, Sebastien. I think part of the reason that it's an external organization is that it can potentially deal with things that are outside ICANN's direct remit and potentially be more comprehensive in the things it tracks, etc. So I think it's good that they're doing that work. But obviously, defining what is an internal

statistic that should be used by the ICANN community is something that needs to happen inside. But that statistic may be the one that's generated by that outside group is all I was saying before. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the recode again. Just to follow on from Sebastien's point, I think it really is important if I may to suggest that those of you who get passionate about this area of interest, those of you who want to seriously understand how the pluses and minuses and strengths and weaknesses and wins and hows of recommendations made, whether they fit into can-be-done before or during or after a round initiates versus have to be done before. That's a very broad line that we need to try and establish.

If that gets you excited, even if it doesn't and you just want to do it, we do have as Sebastien outlined, as a sub team in the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group. It's just short hand is the Prioritization Working Group. You can join it. Then you will be entrenched into what happens behind that tool and be part of the conversation where we seek information we want to ratify. When we did our first prioritization exercise, we went to the leads and/or offers of the recommendations and said, this was relevant when you wrote it. In some cases, we said, you wrote it, what on earth does it mean?

And we had the conversation with the people who knew and then we did our prioritization based on, dare I say, actual facts as best as we could collect them. But if you want to be part of this, and then what

happens process, then please, let's staff know and we will soon be starting up those actual weekly meetings to get this work done.

But right now, get your appetites whet. Get some thinking going. And to that end, if I can address you in particular, thank you for brining those SSRT ones forward because each of them we will have to deal with. But I guess, I'm playing the devil's advocate because I like that. Why is anything you said going to stop a round going ahead? Why should we have any of those as a bright line? I'm going to say, sure, need to be done, shouldn't hold anything up. So I'd say, no to all of those of being a must-have. Now that's me being the devil's advocate. Hopefully, someone else will argue with me now. I've got you started.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. Yes, and that's why I said in the beginning, the exercise is to go through them, determine the relevance and then determine the importance. The necessity of going ahead with the recommendation. So the exercise would include both. And yes, we might say no.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So great, I don't mean to cut you off. So let's take an example. That's what I'm really trying to get to. I want to talk about DNS abuse, not the process anymore. So let's look at the issue of measures of DNS abuse both DAAR and DNS Abuse Institute have come up with measure of DNS

abuse. Metrics like a numeric value on number of maliciously registered domains, average time to respond to a report for example. So who here believes that it would be important for those metrics to be decided upon. And if so, whether or not we would want to see some output from some of these efforts prior to a new round over the next whatever it is, three years or something like that, that it may take to get to new applications. So that's what I'd like to talk about, not revisiting the spreadsheets again. Who do we have? Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand was up from a previous thread and I took it down.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So please, raise your hand and give your thoughts on this topic for example. Bill, go ahead.

BILL JURIS: Yeah, this is Bill Juris for the record. I think it would be a mistake not to have those metrics in place before the next round simply because we need to have them to be able to judge did the new round cause an increase in the problem which in turn will drive whether we feel we need to make a note of what we did wrong this time so we don't do it again in the future. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thank you. Yeah, there will likely be another CCT review after this. After the round at some point. Hopefully, a little bit further after it than the previous one was. But other thoughts? Yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I agree with Bill. And the rationale is the following. ICANN introduced new gTLD in 2000 and data was supposed to be collected. In 2004, new gTLD, it was supposed to be collected. We had some in 2004 and that has never been collected. ICANN was very bad at that. Therefore, if we want to have some data, we need to be sure that it's a done deal before we launch anything because if not, we will never get the data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So for example one request could be that there's some movement prior to a new round or that there's a commitment to try and make progress within a certain amount of time that could be pass the new round for example. So there's other ways to look at how those statistics might be used in addition to just creating a baseline. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to say, careful what you wish for. For the very reason that Sebastien pointed out, if you're waiting for definitive numbers that demonstrate things without any doubt, though they're not conflicted out by a directly opposite report, we're never going to get that. So as desirable as it is to have some numbers, and we should be collecting them and we should be insisting that they be collected in the future, words like we need metrics before we can take action are a guarantee for no action. My personal opinion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Interesting, because we actually made an effort to collect some metrics prior to the previous round in order to go forward. So I have difficulty with that presumption.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've tried a lot, but as I said, even when we have metrics, usually you'll find another study which shows the opposite. I mean, we've seen in the last two years reports saying domain abuse has gone up and domain abuse has gone down. They both can't be true.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, yeah, that's an interesting point. In a way, they can both be true because I think the actual measures that have come out of DAAR and DNS Abuse Institute have to do with the number of malicious registrations which is not necessarily a measure of DNS abuse, right? And so, that's part of why because they don't know the frequency with which those malicious domains were used, etc.

I mean, that's part of why I'm asking the question about establishing the statistics and agreeing as a community to live by a particular metric as the way that we're measuring this because I think in a way, we owe that to the parties involved, to the contracted parties to settle on a metric. Otherwise, we will have indefinitely conflicting studies and things like that. I think that's something we have to do. The question is whether or not it has to happen before a new round. The decision to use a particular metric is what I'm talking about. Yeah, go ahead.

BILL JURIS: I think you're making the mistake of saying do we need a metric. And I think it's pretty clear we need multiple metrics. We need to know both how many malicious registrations were there and how much problem did those registrations caused. We can't just get a number. We're going to need several to make—

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're absolutely right. I didn't mean to imply there's only one number. What set of metrics or something like that. But I will caution you that that second one is very abstract and something that is not currently part of things that are available within the ICANN community. There's data from the FDC. There's data from the European Commission, et cetera, on the impact of DNS abuse but it's not collected in a way that's particularly precise to the thing that we're trying to do. And so, that's going to be a problematic metric. We may need to choose other objective criteria that is captured by DAAR or by DNS Abuse Institute to be the metrics that we use to see progress in the things that have been put in place. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So I think that we need to agree in the metrics and then the metric can be the metric that we need, maybe the data that—the way we are recording it is incorrect. That doesn't mean the metric is bad. See what I'm saying? It could be the way you collect that data. The metric might be very valid. So we may have to look on that side too.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Again, I think almost any metric that we've started to see, the ones from DAAR and the ones from DNS abuse can be legitimate. The DNS Abuse Institute came up with this new methodology study. DAAR has its ongoing methodology and a new version coming out, etc. So I think they can be legitimate. The question is, as a community deciding on one to say—one, many, several, right? There's number of malicious domains. There's average time for a response to report. There are several metrics. S when I say a metric, I guess, I mean a group of them or something. But my follow-up question is, whether or not we need to see movement in that metric or is it enough to have defined one?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. Statistics, I think, complaint statistics. So this is very important because this will let us see where we stand. And complaint statistics is also very important in order to determine different roles of different types of DNS abuse and the relevance of each type and how severe the impact could be on end-users. So statistics, I would say, statistics are very important to know where we are, where we were and to see where we're heading. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree. Other questions, comments. People that haven't been speaking. We want to make this as inclusive as possible as we move forward. So part of what we're going to do is have conversations like this and try to really—in a small team initially but then try to really achieve consensus because the value of a consensus is that we have a unified voice when we come to the next ICANN meeting and try to really

express those pre-requisites and those critical path issues that need to be addressed.

Right now, the recommendation that we have into the board says that we want to see a metric defined and movement in that metric. Movement in that data, I mean, not the change of metric. So that's a pretty hard-core recommendation that's currently in place. And that's why we need to have these conversations is because we need to really choose what subset of our recommendations that we think need to happen. Generally, need to happen prior to a new round, okay? Questions or comments, yeah please.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, this is Naveed for the record. I remember I was part of the SSR2-RT actually and we had some discussion on this DNS abuse activities especially the two DAAR that we have. And one of the observations, I'm not sure if that is part of recommendation but certainly observation is that the activities around DAAR that ICANN collect as organization remains pretty much internal to ICANN and not made as public as it should be. And one of the observations is made that effort should be made towards making that publicly available and analysis of that to be done independently so as to see the outcomes of that. So I think unless we have that data, we are going to have the same problems even if we start the new round of this gTLDs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, thanks. I mean, one of the biggest challenges, I think for this effort is that both the DAAR and the DNS Abuse Institute, it's called Compass,

make use of reputation block lists for this data, and that's licensed data. And so, it's not something that they're free to share at least in that raw form. So I think what we're probably going to need is to be very specific about what kind of information we want to out of that data because I don't think ICANN is going to be in a position to license it for the public. And so, in both cases, that information is coming from reputation block list but the methodology is slightly different.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, this is a second follow-up. Naveed again. So the important thing is the outcomes of that rather than data. It's analysis. Some kinds of outcomes and lesson learned around would really be effective if the efforts are made towards that. Even if the data remains private. Some lessons learned, some outcomes of that, some analysis, some kind of that, I think. We are waiting that to happen to have an effective work towards this DNS abuse going forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, definitely. One of the interesting aspects about public debate is we sometimes use the term name and shame, right? Can the pressure be applied to different registries or registrars based on bad patterns of data over some period of time or something like that. And the DNS Abuse Institute has plans to make that kind of data available, break it down by registrar or registry, et cetera, so that there's an understanding of where the problem spaces are. I had a really good conversation with Rowena from PIR who talked about the fact that even the fact this data exists privately now is having an impact on behavior because they're

seeing things that they can do, policies they connect that change the results of this data.

I heard from Susan Payne that even registrars that thought they had no problem realized that they had some, right? And so, there's been some positive benefit from even that data being revealed to the contracted parties themselves. Any data that's going to affect behavior is something you want to be very sure about. And so, we first heard that we were going to get something in November that made this data more public. But I think what they're saying is that people are trying to respond to the data in a way that involves changing policies, adopting new frameworks, et cetera, to deal with DNS abuse.

And so, that's a positive as well. But that question I think is still a good one is, will there come a point by which we really want to see that data become public and not just something that's dealt with privately within the contracted parties. And so, that will be another question before us for sure. Anybody else that wants to speak? Sebastien, go ahead please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I can speak outside of your example here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It seems that there is a restart of the discussion. How we split into tracks for the next round of TLD or subgroups of TLD and application. I remembered something we suggested with Bertrand de la Chapelle in

the last round and it's never happened. So question today is, if we go into that direction, which one of the applications we would like us, as end-user to push ahead? And the one we think it's not so urgent to be seen because there are already people with [inaudible] for example who are pushing for [inaudible] to be the first ones. I am not sure it's what we need as end-user but it's something we need to discuss, I guess. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. And that's a very good segue to this topic generally. As I was having the conversation with Sally and Tripti this morning, I said that there are particular issues and particular constituencies of interest to the At-Large and that there's an interdependency to some extent. The people that we most want to see participate in a new round are the ones that would probably be slowest to do it, need the most help to do it, have the most complexity to do it. And the people that most want a new round are probably the ones for whom it would be easiest.

And so, it's a tough problem because there's definitely a concern that a brand round could swallow up a lot of names that might otherwise be applied for by communities. We don't know what kind of speculation might happen in a new round as far as applying for labels, for commerce later. So I think that we are going to have to make some very hard choices about what we're holding out for.

Again, if you recall, when we had our applicant support session, at the end we asked the audience and the panel, would you rather see a really great PR program around this or would you like to see two successful applicants from underserved regions? And the overwhelming response

to that question was the two successful applications. And so, that really affects the design of a program.

And so, again, we need to make sure that the communities and the constituencies that we represent or whose interest we attempt to represent are part of the process at a point of which they're not disadvantaged by a frontloading of other applicants. Any other questions or comments?

So in large measure, this was to lay out the kinds of questions we're going to have, the kind of discussions we need to have. Most of the prioritization work that's happened thus far has not had to do with subsequent procedures itself or with the start of a new round. It's just a question of prioritization, high priority, and things like that. And so, determining what needs to happen.

There's a lot of discussion about what type of data do we need to understand prior to a new round. There were data recommendations in the CCT review for example. So there's a number of things that we need to really figure out if they're pre-requisites and—is there somebody with a hand up again? Oh, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jonathan. I like the instantaneous reaction. Oh, it's a Cheryl hand. I can wait. It's okay. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Just on that because I know you're wrapping up now. We did mention poll on the agenda, I just wanted to say. What we might do is use polling of our community in the wider concept and that includes to the [inaudible] now. If you can have a number of people and they don't have to be from

around this table. They can be talented individuals from your own regions, join us in the small team to get down and dirty and do this work, and have the deep and meaningful conversations, they will be interacting obviously. What happens there goes back, is talked about with the big working group.

And certainly, back to ALAC. But let's use some polling in a sort of controlled way for your regional meetings or distribution or something because I think it is important to recognize we don't expect just one voice here. We do expect diversity in voice. And if we can get some more, dare I say it, data points about the diversity in voice, that also helps us. So we're going to, I think suggest use polling as a tool but that means ladies and gentlemen, you guys have got to actually do it. Push it. Get them done. They won't be long. You need to help us. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, we have a session on that later generally. So I had prepared a couple of poll questions to see if we've gotten to a point where a poll made sense today. I'm going to call it. It doesn't make sense but really, I wanted to introduce you to the framework, to the idea of the kind of conversation we need to have. And to really encourage you to join this process and these discussions. And we'll probably break them apart and not just have one small team on them. They probably won't all be under the OFB. It will probably be some under CPWG and some under OFB based on the types of issues that we're talking about.

But I really encourage you to figure out the parts that you're most interested in and participate because this is some very serious conversations for us and a very serious opportunity to have input into a

process at a really critical juncture and make sure that things are the best they can be before—reasonably it can be before the start of a new round. So with that, I'll end the meeting and I appreciate all of your participation. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]