
ICANN77 | PF – GNSO: NCSG Policy Committee
Monday, June 12 2023 – 10:45 to 12:15 DCA

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello and welcome to the NCSG Policy Committee 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, which I will note in the chat shortly. Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name 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 this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the close caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the 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. And with that, I will hand the floor over to Tomslin. You may begin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Andrea. And welcome, everyone, to our policy meeting for NCSG. Thanks for putting the agenda up, Andrea. I've proposed a little

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

change to the agenda today. We'll do something different, because I think we have a lot to talk about. And so I've moved the review of the GNSO Council meeting agenda to the last item on our agenda today, so that we have an opportunity to discuss or have some updates on some of these policy issues that we're interested in. And the other thing is most of what's on the council agenda include a lot of the things we're going to discuss today anyway. So I didn't think we'll spend too much time on that.

So with that, Rafik is online to give us an update on the applicant support. And I'll hand it over to Rafik.

FARZANEH BADII:

I want to add, I want to make some comments on the bilateral negotiations that are going on with the contracted parties and ICANN about DNS abuse. Thank you. And the [inaudible] of the multi-stakeholder model.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Farzaneh. Noted. Okay. Rafik, over to you on the update.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Tomslin. I was trying to share a quick or brief update about the GNSO guidance process for the applicant support. As overview, it started in last November. And that was a response to the initiation request from the GNSO Council. And the working group was tasked with six tasks. Basically, the two first are more like a review of several reports, like the one from the SubPro with regard to the

applicant support and also about the previous work done by the applicant support working group or the JAS. That was more than 10 years ago. And also regarding a review of the implementation by ICANN org.

Kind of just to highlight what's about the task, it's first to come up with indicator of success and metrics about the applicant support program. And the last task, number six, to come up with mythology for allocating financial support for the funding to all qualified applicants.

As a reminder, GGP is not tasked to come up with any policy recommendation, but to come up with guidance for the implementation of the policy recommendation. So for the working group, so we started since last November, I said, we continued in the beginning with the bi-weekly calls, but at the later stage we went with weekly calls to try to make progress. And there is already, we are kind of at the level that we can produce or deliver the draft report to be put for the public consultation. But before that, we have tomorrow a call, if I'm not mistaken, a session to review, to finish or finalize task number six, I said it's about the methodology for allocating financial support. So we will review the language and just to finalize or I'll say respond to the comments there.

For the previous task number three, four and five, which are regarding the metrics and indicator of success that were already done, but we will finalize more the part regarding the rational and explanation that we'll need to support the guidance recommendation that the working group produced.

So what I can share in terms of substance, I believe what the working group come up with something we can support, but I would recommend to the NCSG when the draft report is ready for public consultation to review and share our input of the matter. I try to do my best with my understanding of previous NCSG position to represent the stakeholder group there, but I'd say more opinion and review will be helpful to help to make any amendments or changes for the final report.

Maybe there are some points that can be of interest, but in general, I think that's something we can support. Again, it's regarding giving implementation guidance. It's not really about making change in the policy recommendations. So you won't expect or you'll find something revolutionary there, but it's more to help in terms of implementation and to support such program like the applicant support that to some extent failed in the first iteration. So here we are trying to come up with how to assess the success and that we can review the effectiveness of such program and also give more, say, the kind of metrics to help to guide in terms of implementation.

So that's a quick overview of what was done, but I'm happy to respond in more detail. Sorry, I didn't prepare any slides, so maybe it's not that easy to follow, but I am happy to respond to any question or provide any clarification. Just for information, I shared some quick update a few days ago that there is for those who are interested.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. I'll check the queue if there are any online. Okay, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Okay. Hi, Rafik, Kathy Kleiman. Good to hear your voice. Okay, so my understanding is you're working on metrics. I want to know two questions. One is how do these metrics help us get more applications from the Global South? Metrics are normally something you do afterwards, right, to study something. So let me ask, is there—what in what you're doing helps more applicants know about and apply for gTLDs that they're going to need going forward? And just your personal opinion about what comes next and how do we help more Global South applications come through, especially from the noncommercial community?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Kathy, for the question. So maybe one first thought is that when we thought about the metrics, one idea that came up is like we think in terms of the life cycle of application and so to assess at each level with the different metrics. So it's not just one metric to cover everything. And that will give, I think, a better understanding about the situation. So that's one point.

We also spent some time to think about what will be kind of the level, minimum number, if I can describe it, that minimum number of application. So there was a lot of discussion. There is something maybe I am not kind of sure about if we can state or determine the exact number, but it gives us some idea how many applicants are asking for support and how many they got it at the end.

Also, you're asking about knowing or being familiar with the program and something that was discussed in length because that's something that was determined in the previous program that was missed, was not

enough outreach or enough information for people to apply. And we end up mostly with incumbent to describe that.

So there was several discussion about how we can describe or like to measure how many try to get information and they get a response to their question and so on. So I'm happy to respond maybe by email about the specific metrics or indicator of success regarding those points.

But for sure, we covered like in terms of the life cycle element, the one first point about outreach and awareness and trying to measure that. But [inaudible] is it enough or not? I'm not really sure. Because at the end, we were asked how we can measure and come up with some metrics that can help us to see if we succeeded. And so we will measure or assessing against those indicator of success.

But at the end, I think it will really depend on how the program is implemented and also about the time where we can inform applicants at early stage and they can digest or understand what does it mean to apply for the new gTLD. So we have different indicator of success and metrics, but just to help us in turn maybe to measure. But I think a lot of effort that need to be done prior to that anyway. I hope that respond to your question, but I'm happy to follow up maybe my email with more details and specifics.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Rafik. Did you have a follow-up?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thank you, Rafik. The metrics sound really good and they sound like they're really being broken down into different stages. So the next question is for our GNSO councilors. As Rafik said, he's measuring implementation, but the subsequent procedures working group did not do a lot of details. We did a lot of details on some things, but we did not do a lot of details on applicant support. So, to our councilors, who is doing the details of the future policy for how applicant support will be marketed, shared, paid for? The board right now is proposing not to have some of the what we call the in-kind support, technical support, legal support that the subsequent procedures working group advised. They say there's a conflict of interest. There may be ways around that. There are ways around that. Who's out there? What happens next? How do we get the policies we need to get noncommercial groups in the Global South to apply? Which, for anyone who's studied this, we virtually, just a fraction of all applications in the first round of new gTLDs came from the Global South.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Kathy. Does any councilor want to take that? Manju, please. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Hi, Kathy. So I think at council, we actually just learned yesterday, too, that ICANN board, they're preparing to not adopt several recommendations regarding applicant support. So it's not like we are already preparing to do whatever because we literally just learned yesterday that there are several recommendations they are hesitant to adopt. So I think it's starting now that we will start talking about how

we will deal with this situation. Maybe we develop supplementary or kind of modify recommendations to cater to the concern, to ease what they're afraid of, what might happen, what's the legal risk, anything. And then it's like a long discussion we will have to have in the council level, probably in the small team. We haven't decided how to do it yet because yesterday it was mostly we receiving updates from the small team and from the board. So I guess starting probably like after this week, we will discuss in council on how to do it. Yes. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. Are there any other comments or questions on Rafik's update? I don't see any hands in the Zoom room. Benjamin.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you. This is Benjamin for the records. Rafik, I'm going to ask a question, but if it's stupid, just tell me. Just look for a kind way to respond to me. So this question, I heard it from a meeting I just attended, and I'm wondering if there's any metrics around it or against it. So there was a concern about applicants getting involved in gaming of some sort. I don't know if you can relate with that. Some concept of if somebody knows willfully that they're not going to get it, but they apply anyway, and then somehow some collude or I don't know. So if you understand what I'm saying, I'm just trying to ask, is there any metrics to measure that if it's willful or not willful, if it's just a normal occurrence? So if there's any metrics around that so that some people in our community that we're trying to advocate for don't fall into that kind of bracket or trap. Okay, that's my question.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Just trying to understand your question here. You're talking about gaming in the way that those who might not be eligible for applicant support, but applying anyway?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yes, that's what I mean.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Right. So such discussion is not really new, but it happened at the just working group level, so quite a long time ago. My memory might fail here. I think it was raised as a general discussion, but that's not really something that we were tasked with, like to determine how many maybe failed applications because they are gaming. That would be also hard to determine. It's not within our scope. So I assume it's by my familiarity with the just working group, that's a real issue, but that's not really for the GGP. So I think we were discussed at some level just during one of the calls, so I need to check the minutes or the notes to have the correct information, but I don't think we have any metrics that can kind of monitor such behavior. I don't believe that's what really we are looking for here. I think that's more like for evaluation, and that's different, but that's not for this GGP to work on. So I hope that to respond to your question.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yes, thank you very much for your kindness.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you very much, Benjamin. No other hands, comments?

NOJUS SAAD: Hi, everyone. I want to like address the question that one of the lady over here asked about the applicant support, like in the global south. So you know the most important challenges that applicants face you know when it comes like the access to the detail these is, first of all, the lack of digital literacy. We have like the internet access, which is a huge problem, especially in the rural communities, and also especially and there's a lack of awareness like on the actual like importance of having like a gTLD.

So let's suppose that I am a noncommercial stakeholder applicant or a potential applicant here. How would you convince me that having a gTLD is actually important for me as a noncommercial actor? This is this question is very important, especially coming from a civil society perspective when we like organize educational campaigns for the public. We need to answer this question, why someone from the global south with limited financial capacities should actually have a gTLD if it's not for commercial purposes. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: New gTLDs are not important for access. I'm sorry, but that's the reality. And a lot of people might disagree with me, but it's not a priority in the global south, because they have other priorities. And to be honest, if they don't have access to one new gTLD, they can have access to another so it doesn't really affect online presence. And I think this whole new gTLD process that we are going through is done by the privilege

and those who want to expand the DNS for no reason at all. Like, just get the riches richer. I'm sorry. Oh my god, I said all these things. All right. Thank you. That was my personal opinion and not the opinion of NCSG. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I might give some response. Just to make it clear so it's not related to this GGP working group. It's [not exciting] to see that we have kind of limited or narrow scope, but in general about why maybe it's good idea to have more applicants from developing regions, developing countries. I think it just more in relation to DNS industry in general is to try to develop Internet infrastructure. So while there is a lot about Internet access on itself, but that's not really our target, but here is to think more about the other part of Internet infrastructure and something that's not maybe always thought about here. It's about the DNS.

And so how we can have more actors from developing regions and having more registries. Of course, there are like ccTLD registries in developing countries, but expanding and I would say fostering a kind of a DNS industry, creating or encouraging some business model. That's in general. But I think for noncommercial, I think it can be about identity for different community. So they can have that presence.

But I can maybe to agree to some extent to what Farzi is saying, not necessarily agreeing for what the whole what she said, but just maybe to think it's one way to help, but it's not necessarily the only target to try to reach. So I think it can be helpful if you think about Internet infrastructure in general, it's just going to be one building block to

foster more like that kind of industry, to build some business and to provide that visibility, but just one way. So it's not everything. I hope that respond to your question, but I'm not sure really. Anyway, thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. Thanks, Rafik. We have a Q, so I have Julf then Anne.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Let me try to go somewhere between the two extremes here. I think it's important that we make sure that people who want a domain for their identity or whatever have a possibility to get it, but we are not in the business of marketing domains or if they don't have a need for it, that's okay, too. But if they feel they need something for their identity, it should be available. ICANN outreach does more than enough work to sort of market the idea of having domains. That's not our problem.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Julf. Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks for letting me make a comment. I'm NomCom appointed nonvoting to GNSO council. Yeah, some of us are quite concerned that recommendation 17 was signaled for non-adoption and I'm trying to help work on the small team. We'll see where we can go with that, but I wanted to mention that yesterday in the meeting, board members representative of this effort talked about the fact that folks would be able to apply for grants. The ICANN grant program, they would not be excluded from applying for consideration in the ICANN grant program,

which is supposed to launch, I think, last quarter of this year, maybe first quarter of next year. And it occurs to me in relation to the question of why should noncommercials seek a new gTLD, that there could be an opportunity to apply for grants with respect to development of a business plan. By the way, I'm not in any sort of consultation role or any legal role. I'm just a retired person volunteering, but I think that trying to get the word out with respect to the availability of the auction proceeds, ICANN grant program, seeking a grant perhaps to develop a business plan for noncommercial gTLD would be, if you can get the word out about it. If you can get the word out about that, it might be one way to help. Thanks.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And the name of the grant program is the ICANN grant program.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay. I think there's a webinar that occurred before, during prep week, I think there was an ICANN grant program webinar. I think the amount that was allocated for the first round of grants was \$10 million, and that they anticipate that the average grant might be around \$50,000. So if you're talking in terms of the ability to develop a business plan, where you would go with it and if there are a lot of applicants to do that, that would be a good sign.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. I have Caleb in the queue.

CALEB OGUNDELE:

Thank you very much, Tomslin. So I'm just responding a little bit to Farzi's question and a little bit of some views from Rafik. So I think that we should look at new gTLD from the perspective that yes, for identity, and for a couple of other reasons. Take for example for the global south. Yes, we understand that it's not needed for internet access and the rest of them like that.

However, I want to give a classic example of reasons why noncommercial should also be interested in new gTLD even though I know that the scope is limited. One example is the fact that, take for example, ISOC in the early days carved out PIR, and ISOC till today is still a not for profit as we see them, right? And PIR seems to be able to fund some of the nonprofit initiative of noncommercial related issues that ISOC is doing today. So why should we support non-for-profits even in the global south or even anywhere in the world to be interested in new gTLDs even though we know that the scope is also limited like Kathy said, like it's just for educational purposes?

But then I also do feel from my own end that even non-for-profits need financial support in everything they get to do, even for them to still be able to run non-for-profit. Non-for-profit still needs funding for a couple of other things. So my own view is just that yes, the scope is limited, but then I still feel that even non-for-profit needs a little bit of encouragement to get involved in new gTLD as well if they can, even though it's not basically for access. But it helps to fund initiatives and programs that support noncommercial purposes.

Otherwise, every time we keep saying that noncommercial do not have equal finger at the table, it's simply because we don't bring the money

to the table. It's the DNS business for crying out loud, right? And so if we have an opportunity, yes, let's grab it. If not, these are my own personal views, though. Like Farzi said, that we don't have any business with access and all of that. But these are also my own personal view and not representing any other view.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Thanks, Caleb. Benjamin, is that another hand? You go, then we can close that on this.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you. This is Benjamin for the record. I totally disagree with Farzi. No, I'm serious now. I think we need applicant support to get more people from the Global South to participate. For the sake of cultural representation, identity, sustainability. At this moment, I think the way the Internet is designed, either you agree or disagree with me, has embedded within it a lot of Western cultural hegemony. And applicant support for new gTLDs that can reflect the Global South totally brings new demographics, new cultural values, and new norms to the Internet. That doesn't have to always be underlined with red after being defined in English. So for that reason, and especially at this time that digitalization is becoming compulsory, you can't opt out of it anymore. You are mandated to be online. So you should be able to carry your name, your values, your culture online. And I think that's the essential reason. And then thereafter, we can now talk about access. But right now, the fundamental infrastructure should reflect the global cultural norms. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Thank you, Benjamin. I think we will move on to the next item so that we have enough time to discuss the other issues. The SubPro recommendations discussions that have been going on in the Council. Stephanie, I don't know if you are still available to give an update on this.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi there. What exactly did you want me to update on? Because if it's anything on SubPro, I think we should get Kathy to talk about it. Seeing as how she's in the room, she's much more knowledgeable than I am.

KATHY KLEIMAN: But Stephanie, I wasn't in the meeting yesterday.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Sorry. This is not to go into the actual substance of the SubPro itself, but rather an update on what the Council has been discussing on this issue to the members.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Well, basically, the small team has been meeting regularly to try to go through the recommendations that the Board has had reservations on and figure out which ones can go forward and which ones need to be held back and have further work. There's a question as to which ones that the Board has reservations on are policy-related and which ones are implementation. And as I think we've discussed in the

past, there's a great deal of reluctance, anxiety that we will be pushing unresolved issues into the IRT and leaving staff and the IRT members to sort them out. And that's not where policy is sorted out. So they were trying to, in the small team, tease apart these issues. And there is a very good chart that was presented at the meeting yesterday. I wish I had the URL very handy because that explains all of these things in the reservations. Maybe what I'll do is I'll drag that up if you could go to other speakers while I see if I can find it. Ah, there we are. Thank you. Any way you could share that on the screen, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: It's coming up. So do you want the landing spots slide? Maybe?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No, I want the... I'm not sure this is the one I want. I want the grid that the small team came up with. I really apologize for this. I thought I'd be there with you. But Paul McGrady is in the room somewhere. Maybe he could forward it. I think maybe I'll just ramble on while you discuss this.

Clearly, one of our main concerns is sorting the policy on the fly in the IRT. That's why we would welcome other members coming forward to join the IRT. So that we have enough folks on there.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I could give an update regarding the members going to the IRT. We've already appointed a rep and an alternate to the IRT. Ephraim is our representative, and he will be supported by Juan as an alternate. So those are our reps to the IRT at this moment.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you to Paul. Stephanie, is this the document that you were looking for? I'll show you the grid. It's Kathy.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That's the one.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yeah. Good. Okay. Where in particular would you like to go on this?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I thought we could just scroll through so that folks could get an impression of the kinds of issues that we're sorting.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Do you want to tell people a little bit about the columns? I've had a chance to take a look at this, and kudos to everybody in the room whose immense work on this was filling these columns. But Stephanie, what are we looking at, please?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Unfortunately, I can't see very well.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Tomslin, do you want to walk us through what this is?

-
- TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think it would probably take a bit of time to walk through this if we're going to walk through each of these items, because this is a very detailed document. Perhaps we should just give an overview of how the small team has decided to move forward with those 38 recommendations that the board hasn't made a decision on yet. And those potential landing spots of these recommendations, where they might fall, because I think members might have concerns regarding which direction is taken for each of those. That's what I was thinking we'll quickly show rather than go to each of these recommendations.
- STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, it's too much. It's too much to go through. I think really the bottom line is we will have to watch whether what happens with—I'm having a blank. I'm sorry.
- TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I think Paul is in the room, and Paul has kindly suggested to give us a three-minute update since he's the chair of the small team.
- STEPHANIE PERRIN: That would be wonderful. I apologize. I'm not myself.
- KATHY KLEIMAN: But if I might, the outsider's view of this, and then we'll hear the insider's view of this, and the council, our council members should know this document is making the rounds. A lot of people are reading this, so thank you again for all the hard work. So we're looking at four columns. One is the one on the far left is the recommendation of the

subsequent procedures working group. So recommendation 17 on applicant support is what Anne referred us to.

Second column is the board's concern out of the hundreds of recommendations of the subsequent procedures working group. The board called up about 38, but some of them are broad and have multiple pieces. 38, and so this is a summary, I believe, of the board's concerns. And then the small team responding and kind of trying to push what the GNSO policymaking process wanted, and then propose speaking points, which I think are part of the negotiation with the board. And let me hand it to the expert, Paul, but thank you. This enormous amount of work in this document, a lot of people watching.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you. So this is Paul McGrady, and I'll just be super duper brief. And I disclaim the word expert. I'm just some guy that wants to see this done so I can get on with my life. Yeah, right. And then the last column is where the small team thought we would land, and we're calling that landing spots. And those landing spots really break down into just a handful of categories. One of which is that the small team and the board both agree that they have enough information now that their concerns are handled. They don't need any kind of tweaks to the recommendations, and those will go to the implementation team. So that's essentially just as if they had been approved initially by the board without any feedback or pushback from the board. So that's good news.

The second group are called non-adoption. The board doesn't like to reject things, so they are going to non-adopt several of these. I know it's great fun, isn't it? Of the things that they are going to non-adopt, all but two, they appear, and this is all very preliminary because they've not made final decisions. It's all very fuzzy, so for those of you that were like me that studied liberal arts, you're comfortable here and everybody else may not be. It is super fuzzy stuff, but it appears that they are going to send those back to council with an opportunity to do what is called a supplemental recommendation. And the supplemental recommendation is a quick process where the council basically gives them some additional tweak to the recommendation or something along those lines to try to save the underlying concept in the recommendation, but in a way that will make the board comfortable to go ahead and vote.

And so that's where there is a more complex process called the Section 16 process. It takes a long time, and it's not our favorite thing. It may happen, but we're really looking at, for those things that are non-adopted, the supplemental recommendation seems like the quickest, best way forward. And all of your councilors will have opportunities to help draft those, vote on them, all the things, right?

And then there are two things that they are going to non-adopt, and those have to do with terms and conditions, and they've just told us we're going to non-adopt it. And they're not inviting us to do a supplemental recommendation. We're still free to do a supplemental recommendation, but the signal from the board is that no matter how much they talk to us, they're not getting comfortable.

And so those are in the chart that Tomlin's been sitting around, and they're marked in red, I think. And so you can look at those and compare them to this bigger chart and see what those issues are. Those seem to be non-starters for the board.

There are a couple of things that remain in the category called further discussion. And the further discussion items are, the biggest one is a clump of recommendations. And those recommendations have to do with protections for applicants. So the SubPro working group said, we don't want a covenant not to sue unless there's an appeals mechanism, for example. That's one of the things that's in there. And then there are some details about the appeals mechanism, some additional recommendations about that. And the board has said, we don't like those. We want to reject whatever application we want to reject. We think the appeals mechanism that would protect an applicant are too cumbersome and circular.

And that's the right lawyer answer, but in terms of the community wanting to feel protected from board decisions that don't feel like they're anything but arbitrary or political, that's the wrong sort of answer. And so that went from, we talked them out yesterday from non-adoption back into let's keep talking, because I think that's one that we need to keep talking about.

The other items in the keep talking about category are the discussions between the GAC and the board on proper GAC advice and also GAC early warnings and how those will be treated in the next round, because we did have a bylaws change that affects that. And so the board and the GAC are going to be talking about that, and they may or may not invite

the GNSO into trilateral discussions on that issue. But that is in the continuing to talk category, so it's not dead, we're still talking.

And then there was an issue, there was a category that has now gone away, and this is important. And this has to do with the PICs and the RVCs. And originally, that was in a category you'll see in this bigger chart that's now been overtaken by some events, partially overtaken. And that was the possible outcome on that was to explore a possible bylaws amendment. And we went back and forth and back and forth with Avri and Becky as sort of the representatives of the board.

And ultimately, the board didn't get comfortable with exploring a bylaws amendment to deal with the PICs and RVCs questions. And instead, what they've said is what they want from council is a clarifying statement on these saying that we're only for PICs and RVCs if they are enforceable. So we'll say anytime that there's a PIC or an RVC in the recommendations, we think those are okay if they're enforceable. If they're not enforceable, then they're not okay, which is a common sense thing, but the board wants the comfort for that. Nobody wants to see a PIC or an RVC that's unenforceable, right?

And so that's how that landed. So I think that's what the council will do next. And then the issue of to explore a bylaws amendment, how do we ensure something is enforceable? How do we ensure something's in mission? All those things. The board has said they are going to open up their own community-wide dialogue process on that. So eventually, they've taken the council out of the middle of that, to which we all say, ooh, because the council running that, where that's going to be GNSO inputs, ALAC inputs, GAC inputs, you name it. Everybody's going to want

to have an opinion on that. The board will be running that discussion in parallel with implementation on the idea that to the extent RVCs and PICs are enforceable, then those are okay.

At the end of this parallel track process, the board will make a final decision on whether or not certain PICs and RVCs, some are clearly enforceable from their opinion, some are very much on the line. They'll make a decision at that point after listening to the community whether or not a bylaws process is necessary. So that's probably four, six, eight months away from today. So explore the bylaws process has not gone away entirely. It's just been kicked. The can has been taken from the council and kicked by the board. And so I couldn't be happier because that's messy. But that's where that lands. So if you feel like the explore bylaws process thing has just evaporated from underneath you, it hasn't. It's just on a different track now. Or at least that's what the board is signaling to us.

So that's kind of how everything landed. I know it's super complex in charts and charts and charts. But I will say I put into the chat my email address. So if anybody this week, next week, whenever has any questions about anything the SubPro small team is doing, you can reach out to me. Anne serves on that team. You can reach out to Anne. You'll never find a procedural list that operates at Anne's level. So especially if you have a process question. Oh, my God, she's amazing. And I went like seven minutes instead of two or three. I'm sorry. And now I'm off to visit the ISPs who probably are not as much fun as you all.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Paul, for helping with that. And I know Paul is leaving the room, but I wonder if there are any comments or questions around this from the room or in Zoom. It's fun that there are no questions because I'm happy to move on to the next interesting topic, which is regarding closed generics. And I'd say interesting because up until a couple of nights ago, we didn't know what was happening in that group. So we have a lot more information now. And Kathy's here who was representing us in the group to give us an update. So over to you, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thanks, Tomslin. And I just want to apologize to everybody. I'm sleepwalking. We hosted the North American School of Internet Governance at my university at American University for the last two days, Saturday and Sunday, and had a great group of students from around the world. And that's what they were called, students, but fellows and NextGens and other people who applied to come directly. So we've been talking about this for two days and going strong. So and I know council has been going strong, too.

So I did these slides for you at midnight last night. So if there is a mistake, just take it with a grain of salt. Sorry about that. We're going to do how much time do we have time and I'll stay within it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: [inaudible].

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Well, that's why we have slides. So it's all here and people can see it afterwards. I was appointed on to the closed generic small team, which actually just reported out in the last session for the first time. And our framework, we're so sorry it took so long to get it out. We've worked on this for six months and we should have been working on this for six years. But in some ways for people in the room, we have been working on this issue for six years and longer.

I'm going to very briefly cover what is a closed generic. What was the close generic small team and what is our proposed framework? I do want to say that my representation on the close generic small team was as an individual, right? The council specifically said that we were there in our own capacity. So I was not representing NCSG and in fact could not come back to NCSG for input because of Chatham House rules, which is why we've all come together.

It was an experiment that put together equal numbers of GAC representatives and GNSO representatives to break the logjam of the last 12 years on whether to go forward with closed generics. Let me tell you what they are and then you'll know why they're so controversial.

What is a closed generic? So first let's just go back, forget closed generics for a second. How do we get domain names? Registries run the databases, right? They're responsible for security and stability of our generic top level domains. They sell domain names through registrars, right? Verisign doesn't sell the domain names, GoDaddy does and Blacknight and all the others, Tucows.

So registries sell through registrars to registrants. Closed generics turns that model on its head. So most gTLDs that we can think of are open or

what's called open .com .org .net .xyz .horses. I'm not sure actually VIP and club, they may have some requirements, but anyone can register in .horses and .xyz, of course .com and .org, .net. These are voluntary classifications that we go into. So we generally migrate towards .com with commercial stuff and .org for noncommercial stuff and .net for tech. We all know this, it's intuitive.

Come the last round in 2012, boom, on reveal day we suddenly saw that the largest companies in the world had applied to own the generic words of their business or industry. Google wanting .search, Amazon wanting .book, many, many more examples. Not just the top level domain guys, they wanted to own each and every second level domain. And I've got to tell you, some of us hit the roof and some didn't. But there were dozens and dozens of GAC early warning problems on this and ultimately GAC consensus advice that says that closed generics would be stopped until the applicants should show that they serve a public interest goal. No one knew what that was and ultimately the board wound up barring closed generics in the first round.

So now, what is the closed generic small team? I've already told you a little bit about it. Our job is to kind of figure out what the public interest goal is. I've already summarized some of this. So let's go down to the bottom. You'll see, again, me, different people from the GNSO who you know about, Jeff Neuman, Sophie Hey, John McElwaine, of course, our vice chair, Philippe Fouquart, prior chair.

What's really interesting here is we've never sat down at kind of a framework level and worked with GAC members. And we had GAC members from Canada, the UK, Nigeria, Australia, Egypt, and

Switzerland. And guys, they got down in the weeds and really, really worked with us. It was remarkable. We worked very hard. We are not creating policy. We are creating a policy framework, which is also a new concept. What are kind of the guardrails of this new system? And we were told, don't go to either extreme. Don't ban all closed generics and don't allow all closed generics. Find some middle ground.

So we just published our framework on June 8th, just a few days ago. And there are three parts. So here's a kind of quick introduction, because it's hard to have comments and questions on something you haven't seen yet. Three parts of it. We broke it down into the application, the evaluation process, and contracting and post delegation. I will give you just a few highlights so you can see them.

For the application, we're going to ask the applicant, explain the purpose of your closed generic gTLD. Why do you want .truck? Are you one competitor in the field trying to block out everybody else, or are you going to use it for—Why do you want to use this? The applicant must provide information. This is 5.a. Clearly describing the intended purpose, which must not be solely to exclude other people from using the gTLD or solely serve the applicant's own commercial interests.

Number six, explain in detail how you intend to use the closed generic gTLD in practice. How are you going to use, delegate, share, or not the second level domains? Number seven, provide a clear and concrete rationale for why operating the gTLD in a closed manner, as opposed to other ways you could do it, like a community application. And particularly as opposed to an open manner, better serves the public interest.

Okay, so I'm not going in order here, but this is hard. We spent a lot of time on the public interest. But the applicant has to tell us, specify the public interest goal that the closed generic gTLD is intended to serve. And this is hard, but we're talking about positive social benefit, contributing to general welfare and welfare of the public. In just a second, we're going to talk about competition goals, too.

Number nine, provide evidence demonstrating the nexus, the strong connection between the applicant, the closed generic term being applied for, and the public interest goal specified in the application and the applicant's intended use of the gTLD. Really lay out your plan here. If you're going to take the generic word of a business or industry, again, like truck, like conference, like something that you would never be allowed to get a trademark on because it would deprive other people of using the basic word of the term, how are you doing it?

Number 10 is really, really important. I'm introducing it here, and I've got more detail. Demonstrate the requirement of representativeness or of non-anti-competitive behavior. This is big, and there's lots of it. So dive into number 10 of the application section. I'm not going to read it all to you. We don't have time, but track one is a representativeness concept. The applicant can demonstrate that they represent all or a significant part of the businesses in the industry or group related to the closed generic term. You can imagine a trade association, a membership association.

But track two is a little more complicated. Show that you're not doing that representativeness, but that you're committing to the use of this closed generic gTLD and ways that are consistent with the principles of

competitive neutrality, non-discrimination, and transparency. And guys, we talked about every single one of those words at length.

Okay. The evaluation process talks about how the evaluators are going to look at each of the things that the applicant has put. Actually, we started with the evaluation process and then realized if we're going to evaluate the applicant on the nexus, we better ask them to tell us the nexus. So we kind of work backwards from the evaluation into the application. And then contracting and post-delegation.

A note to our SubPro people, our council people, number 25. The subsequent procedures group really doesn't make you have to roll out a new gTLD. You have to go through contracting, you have to go through initial delegation, but you don't actually have to use it. There is a request in the framework that we use it. If you're going to go through all these steps, use the gTLD. Get it out there in the world. It is expected that a delegated closed generic gTLD will be put into practice in a timely manner. GNSO processes get to figure out what that means. And that should be funny, guys. We all get to, like, figure out the details of all of this, which will be fun.

And then a periodic post-delegation review. If you commit to it, do it. And in fact, we're going to ask the applicant to kind of tell us how to review and what to do and to review. We're going to look at the commitments the applicant made, kind of a self-audit practice, and have them work with us to show. It's not us saying, you didn't do it. It's they're saying, hey, we did what we were supposed to. It should be a cooperative process. And that's how they do it.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Kathy, because like Steph put in the chart, a lot of council members haven't had a chance to read this document because they were traveling and all have read it in bits and not really consumed it that much. So that explanation really helps. I note that Stephanie had a question in chat regarding whether you could provide an example of a closed generic that serves a public interest. Then I'll ask a question I have. I don't know if you could take that.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Stephanie, I'm not sure I answered—I know the question because we barred all closed generics in the first round. So there is no closed generic gTLD that exists now in the public interest because that was a question that was asked. We did explore different types of what we called use cases. So you can imagine a protocol that's created by a community. We'll call it dot protocol, for lack of a better word, but protocols have names.

And maybe one, and this is actually something we talked about, one member of the group that created the Internet Protocol or the technical standard comes forward to run the gTLD, but they're running it on behalf of the entire group that has agreed to the technical standard or the protocol. They're not pushing them out. They're bringing them into running it together. That was kind of one example that we had for a closed gTLD.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. So you can imagine that if you were a commercial actor like Honda vehicles, you might want to get the closed generic Honda because you wouldn't want anybody else talking about Hondas on your site. Is that an example?

KATHY KLEIMAN: That is not an example, Stephanie, but thank you for raising it. Dot Honda would be a brand, a brand gTLD. So we decided a long time ago, and Anne can correct me if I'm saying this right, we decided a long time ago. In fact, actually in the first round, we realized this as well, a number of groups applied for dot brand. If you have a dot IBM, how can you make IBM sell domain names kind of on the open market through registrars to the public? So brands are closed. They operate under special terms under specification 13, which exists in all .brands. So Honda is a trademark. It is a brand. And so they would own all second level domains.

But let's go further. What if Honda wanted dot auto and wanted to control all of the second level domains in there for their own purposes, Honda's purposes and those of its customers, but no other car competitor? My sense of this framework based on the rules, words, not rules, but words we just read in the framework would be that would not be permissible now.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: And yeah, pardon me if I push this because I'm having a hard time imagining these things in a vacuum. I can't think of a closed generic that

really serves the public interest. Why would you allow people to close them? Doesn't make sense.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Ken is going to try to give this one a shot.

KEN HERMAN: No, I'm going to ask a question because what comes to my mind are trade associations. I think I've heard that mentioned in the close generic discussion this morning. Kathy, what would trade associations be a use case for? So the automobile industry, they're a lobbying group, they have members, etc. And I can see why they might want to have control over their membership, etc., which is broad and vast.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yes, let me give you the use case, though, that I actually worked on in its public. So I can tell you this was a client. So .mobile is considered a word that's generic for the mobile wireless industry. And two members of CTIA, the Wireless Association applied in the first round for mobile as a closed generic. And the association went nuts—and they don't normally get upset at their own members, and they went nuts because .mobile, to not be able to use this word, they thought it should belong to all of their members, not necessarily you and me and Dave over there, but members who participate in the mobile wireless industry. So absolutely in the future round, rather than filing a very expensive community objection, they would probably much prefer to file for a closed generic.

KEN HERMAN: If I may, thanks, Kathy. And in fact, that that helps to clarify. Thank you. Because there might be industry members that are not part of that association that wish to be, which may wish to participate.

But I guess the biggest problem I have is with this public interest concept. And perhaps you can explain a little bit better how that's getting defined. And has it been finally resolved as to what it means to be in the public interest? Because it seems like it can be an arbitrary bar to clear for evaluating whether a particular TLD.

KATHY KLEIMAN: So read through, please, the application and the evaluation and you will see embedded in it where we think public interest aspects are coming through. We tried to make them as concrete as possible in a general framework. But they're coming through in this concept of the nexus and this concept of representation of non anti-competitive behavior of operating the TLD with principles of competitive neutrality, non-discrimination, transparency. You can't just say public interest. Public interest means so many things. So please go through and let me know what you think as you read through this. It's a really, really good question, of course, where we started.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Kathy. I see a queue forming, but I just wanted to ask one question before I go to—This framework that the team has developed, from the team's perspective, what is your expectation? How do you see this going forward? Could this be modified based on public comments

that will come or is it this is what you're giving the GNSO to run with for a policy development process?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

I am so glad you asked that. Initially, the call went out just a few days ago to SOs and ACs to comment. And we're certainly looking for that. And there's an email address out. For the first hour and a half of today, there was a call for individuals to be able to submit comments. And we'd certainly love to hear from individuals as well, from organizations, from businesses. So I think we're going to hear, although I don't want to say it, I think we're going to see a place where these comments are going to be posted. Although this isn't a formal comment period, we are told.

As for the rest of it, we're still figuring it out. We have thrown it out to the world for I call it sharing the baby. We really want to know what people think. But we're still working through what happens next. I mean, it's going out to the GAC, the GNSO. So you probably know more because you guys were talking about it yesterday in the council meeting. But certainly the comments are currently going back to the current small team. But maybe where it goes from there and then whatever comes out, if there is agreement, goes on to a PDP process, a policy development process.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks. I don't think we went that far yesterday, but maybe the next question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Kathy. So I actually have two important questions that are really important for us to focus on. So the first one, when you mentioned like in the criteria, an applicant must represent all of the business. Does that also like translate into like the applicant should be the monopoly of this industry? Like, for example, like if Amazon like loses its dominance over the market of selling books, like in the future and another monopoly comes in the market—

KATHY KLEIMAN: Let's stop with that. The applicant may not be monopolizing the domain name to the exclusion of all competitors. That is an underlying principle of this framework.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And if that changed, that designation would change in the future as well. Right? If, for example, somebody like dominates that market in the future after the designation has been done for the closed generic.

KATHY KLEIMAN: The whole idea is not to have the dominant player.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. But if that changed, like in the future, that's what I mean. If they become like a dominant, like a monopolist.

KATHY KLEIMAN: The whole idea of a generic—we should talk about this offline. I think the answer is no.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So my second question, a really quick one. Sorry. So that's an important issue that actually might not be really important now, but like might become—certainly will become in the future is like when we think of the internationalized domain names. Like, for example, like applicants, for example, like when they have like the ownership over one close generic, does that mean that they—this ownership, does that translate also like into other languages as well? For example, in .book in Arabic and Spanish, does that also, for example, should belong to the applicants, for example, like Amazon?

KATHY KLEIMAN: It's a good question. And we were very careful to stay in our lane. That is not unique to a closed generic. That is a question for open gTLDs as well. I will point out that China registered something equivalent to a Chinese dot org, which the registry is not the Public Interest Registry. So this is a question, but not unique to this. So it wouldn't have been in our wheelhouse.

What other groups are doing, however, is actually applying for their name in other languages. So Verisign, I think, applied for the kind of language equivalent of dot com in at least four different languages and maybe more for different scripts, IDNs in the first round. So what you're talking about is an area of great work. Please dive into it. It's really, really cool policy making stuff. Thank you.

-
- JAMES GANNON: Personal comment, query, interest. How do you account or does the framework account for closed generic terms that have multiple contextual uses? Let me take the dot protocol. It's actually a great example. So we would look at that in this community in terms of technical protocols. My day job is health care. Clinical protocols are probably actually an even bigger use of that term. So how does the framework account for where that one term has multiple distinct communities that use it in their own context?
- KATHY KLEIMAN: Protocol was an example. You'd actually fill in the blank for what the protocol is. So dot S.I.P. is a protocol.
- JAMES GANNON: Yeah, but if we also look at that term from a health care industry point of view, the health care industry uses clinical protocols, which are nothing to do with technology. They're written documents on how you execute a clinical trial. So the same term has multiple uses. So if that closed generic was awarded to a technical community for use in the context of technical protocols, would that be exclusionary to it also being then used in other contexts?
- KATHY KLEIMAN: Of course, you go and get one string. What you're talking about is the beauty and the natural ambiguity of language. So as a trademark owner—and I'm now putting on my trademark hat and strange to say as a trademark professor now. The example I use with my students is milk. For people with dairy cows, milk pasteurizers, milk distributors, milk
-

sellers, milk is a generic term, right? And that's what we're talking about here for a closed generic.

But one can envision that I would want to create a line of children's clothing. Children drink milk and I might want to create a line of children's clothing under the brand name of milk, in which case I would register for it as a trademark in the particular category of goods and services, international class of goods and services in whatever country I'm in or whatever countries I want to sell this for milk. That does not deprive—just because I have a brand name and put a little label on a beautiful girl's smock that says milk, that does not deprive the entire milk industry of using the word milk as a generic.

So I think what we're talking about here is actually embracing the way we handle these words in the real world and some of the regulatory processes. It's a much longer conversation. In fact, multiple classes are taught on exactly this topic. Thanks.

JAMES GANNON:

Yeah. And just very briefly as a quick response, a personal opinion. I think any time a closed generic is awarded to an operator from a distinct community, there has to be something there for them also not to be exclusionary to other contextual uses of that closed generic term. So like it can't be just that they then only accept registrations from a technical protocol community, for example, because otherwise—

KATHY KLEIMAN:

If I were you, I'd submit comments on this to help us understand the nuances of this issue. By the way, this also comes up in open gTLDs and

brand gTLDs, so that you can have a brand that's also—love is an open GTLD. But it's also a trademark in lots of different areas as well. So it could have been a brand.

JAMES GANNON: I would suggest NCSG to submit comments as I cannot.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. I think we'll have to stop this conversation at this point so we can move on to—I think we have about 10 minutes left. Our next agenda item was the SOI Task Force update, and I think Manju mentioned that not much has changed from the last time she gave an update on this. We could keep that for today.

KATHY KLEIMAN: What's the timeline for what's happening?

MANJU CHEN: So this week we were supposed to gather opinions from our stakeholder groups, and then we're having a meeting by the end of this week. So in last session on Thursday—so we're not having a task force now. The task force has [disassembled] because they have delivered their report to the CCOICI. So CCOICI is going to have a meeting in the last session on Thursday. And we will talk about how our stakeholder groups or constituencies react to the ideas that are presented in our last policy call.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Is that an open meeting?

MANJU CHEN: I'm not sure. I don't know. I have to ask and I'll let you know.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Do we have input? Can you summarize our input since it looks like you're looking for our input?

MANJU CHEN: I think—so since last meeting and since the email I sent out to the list, I think people are generally supportive. Like they're not strong opposition and they were not—people are like, "I can't live with this." And I'm actually hoping we can wrap this up by this year because I thought that was a good compromise. I'm hoping other stakeholder groups think the same.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'm so sorry, but my understanding is that this has come down to—and I know you're chair and you're neutral, but that there's some agreement out there that people will not have to actually disclose who they work for. And I understand and circulated something about privacy of clients and that there is a battle on that. In policymaking world, you almost always disclose who your clients are. Maybe that's not true in other world, but you may have more opposition than you think. Some of us may have been working on frameworks and other things, but I'm really concerned that we do not know. And is there anything that at the end of the day will let us know? Has anything changed on that? But right

now you can just say I represent a registry and that's it, right? I mean, my name is Kathy Kleiman, I'm a registry representative—

MANJU CHEN:

So since the burgeoning of ICANN, you are allowed to not disclose when you fill in an SOI. That was what I was trying to say in the beginning. So in my email, I explained this, since ever they have SOI, you are allowed to not disclose. And you just have to put private. That has been what has been practiced the whole history of ICANN. And now it's actually we are adding more requirements when you choose to not disclose. You will have to specify which legal conditions are preventing you from disclosing. And then you'll have to kind of describe in the general sense or more specific sense what company you're not disclosing. But it's like there will be like examples, for example, a big industry, a big company in the entertainment industry or a big company in the, I don't know, whatever, carmaking industry. So that's the now current newly added requirements. And it's much better than in the past. It was just, oh, I'm not disclosing. It's private.

And we have looked through how many people in the history of ICANN when they're using SOI, they are choosing not disclose and then put private for their reasons. So, for example, in RPM, I don't remember exactly how many people are in RPM, maybe a few hundred. Only two people chose to not disclose in their SOI. In SubPro, there are only three. And then a lot of them were like confused in the sense that they choose to not disclose, but then actually they disclosed whoever they're representing.

And also now under current GNSO PDP 3.0, most working groups, not all, but most working groups operate under representation model. That means you're only there when your stakeholder groups or a consistency appoint you to. So you're not representing whoever pays you money. You represent your stakeholder group or a consistency.

So this problem, of course, it's a problem. Like me, I think I don't like it, but it's really very slim chance that whatever people are imagining will happen, will happen. And I think now we're arriving this like the best compromise we can get, which is people are not disclosing. And they're like being like, oh, I'm not disclosing because of this and this legal conditions. And they'll be like, oh, and my company's like this, some company and some industry. And then they will not be allowed to participate in the consensus call when there's a policy decision. So that's the compromise now we are proposing. So, yeah, that's about it. Thank you.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Thank you. That was great. I really appreciate the overview. Great overview. Thank you, Manju. And for all your work and our members of the committee. Just to note that just because my working group, I was co-chair of that one, the Rights Protective Mechanism Working Group. If only two people said private, that was not a term that was well used, well understood. It's not definitive anything. I know you guys looked at it, but I wouldn't take that. There are a lot of people who don't fill in that space at all, who do represent both as attorneys and as consultants, people who we would know, actors we would know.

So going forward, it looks like you're going to create better benchmarks. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Quickly move forward. I think the queue is closed. Sorry. You could give your comment later, but we really need to just quickly look at this so that we can get to the AOB. I don't want us to miss. So we'll move to the next item. I just wanted to quickly make sure some public comment proceedings, which I'm still expecting members to volunteer for.

We did submit the comment on the bylaws amendments of the NomCom review. We submitted a comment already, but we still do not have volunteers to draft a comment on the IDNs EPDP. There is also the amendments to the base gTLD registry agreements to modify DNS abuse contract obligations. And I know that Farzi has an AOB related to that. And so I think we actually do need volunteers to drive a comment on this specific public comment proceeding. So I just wanted to mention those before. I think we have two minutes. All right. 30. James.

JAMES GANNON: So not speaking in a personal capacity, speaking as chairman of the board of PTI. I really encourage NCSG to submit comments on the PTI governance changes. This is the first time we have changed the bylaws of PTI since the IANA transition. This is a small operational change around budget timing, but we want to hear from the community on this. It's the first time we've changed something. We know it's boring, but we still want to hear positive confirmation that we're doing this the right way. So please do submit comments.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, James. Thank you. I'll go to Farzi.

FARZANEH BADII: So basically we are unfortunately going to have the NCUC workshop, the three-hour workshop that we have, tomorrow that conflicts with the CPH outreach for the bilateral amendments, DNS abuse bilateral amendments. But we need to monitor this. And unfortunately, I just wanted to raise the flag that I am not comfortable with the process and bilateral negotiations that are going on. And I think that this will lead to a weaker multi-stakeholder model, especially because the small team at the GNSO Council at some point, one of the representatives during the last meeting, they were kind of like talking about issues like as if it's GNSO Council point of view, which wasn't. So I think that these negotiations and how they are being done unfortunately set a really bad precedent.

But then now about the substance, they recommend to change DNS security threats, the term security threat to DNS abuse, which we should say no. But then also, they think that they are going to add spam, but then a limited spam. They have come up with some kind of phrasing on that, that I have talked to a few technical people and they say that this will expand the scope of DNS abuse if they have that even with that kind of limited definition of spam.

And so we need to look at that and we need to discuss it. We need to discuss it with the board because we are here to do policy and they went and did policy like in bilateral negotiations because of external pressure. The DNS abuse was actually decreasing according to ICANN report. ICANN itself went and did research and DNS abuse was

decreasing. But now we have to do virtue signaling. I don't know. I'm sorry. I'm disappointed.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So that will be in the comment and you're coming to the town hall, aren't you, to bring this up. All right. Thanks. I think we've come to the—
Yes, please.

FARZANEH BADII: We also need to monitor whether they actually take into consideration our comments because we had to insist to have a public comment on this. Is that right? It wasn't their initiative to even ask for comments. I mean, what is this? We are not in a multi-stakeholder environment anymore. And what are you going to do with our comments? I really want to see what they are going to do. They're going to say, oh, thank you. Love you. Bye.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, everyone. I think that brings us to the end of our meeting. We've gone over time, Benjamin. Sorry. But you can continue talking if no one kicks you out of the room. Benjamin.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: So I can continue talking. Okay. Two minutes. Thank you. It's good to know people in high places. DNS abuse. I think we talk about it, but our people are not aware of it. So I think we should, as a matter of urgency, put together sessions to inform our people and to make them aware what it is rather than just a few technical people who understand it and

agitating for it. We should, as a matter of in-house, create awareness. What are the tools out there? I mean, Google has a tool already. There's the one ICANN support it. Let's get our people to see it and see the expanse or how far reaching these issues are.

If it's there, yes, if it's not, then they can argue and support the move towards it or not, rather than just bringing it up on and off. And people are like, okay, what are they talking about? And I think other communities are doing this and that's where they're able to get adequate momentum around it. So we should get our people informed about what DNS abuse is. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Benjamin. I think we really should end now. I've gotten confirmation that we should end now. No, from staff. I'm not the boss. So thanks, everyone, for being here today and those online. Thank you too. See you around.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]