
ICANN77 | Prep Week – GNSO Policy Update
Tuesday, May 30 2023 – 18:00 to 19:00 DCA

SEBASTIAN DUCOS:

Good evening, good afternoon, good morning to everybody. This is Sebastian Ducos. I am the GNSO chair. And today we are going to run you through the GNSO policy update webinar, which I'm going to run with a number of my colleagues and friends who are going to walk you through the different work groups and tasks that the GNSO council is working on with the rest of the community.

So first I have little notes given to me to make sure that I don't forget anything tonight. If you are like me and this is, you've already been for the last six hours, six hours today actually on a Zoom call, you don't forget things. I'd like the opportunity to welcome everybody, of course. I want to remind everybody also that as we all take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process, we are all to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. And somebody might post it in the chat if anybody needs a refresher on that. So this webinar is designed to run through all the work that the GNSO is working on and the preparation for ICANN77. For those that will attend the meeting either in presence or remotely.

We'll run through our activities and I will repeat this a bit further, but essentially, we're here to answer questions. So you can post your questions in the chat and we'll endeavor to answer them. Today we're

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.

going to hear from our leaders in the different PDPs and EPDPs, so the policy development process and expedited policy development processes. We're also, and I'll go quickly through the details of what those are. And also through other work, for example, the GNSO guidance process that is running. We also have small groups, discussions with other parts of the community on Closed Generics and et cetera. So, sorry, I wasn't looking at the slides. So again, the policy development work that we're working on, we have two main bodies of work there, the transfer policy review, which is headed by Roger Carney, who's going to go through this after me.

The international domain names, the IDN EPDP, which is headed by Donna Austin, who will also, I believe, present. I don't see her right now on camera, but I'm sure she's there. And then we'll talk also about the GGP, the GNSO guidance process on applicant support, which is led by Mike Silber, who will be presented a bit later.

And then we have three bodies of work. One on the small team working on the aftermath or the results of the EPDP phase two, which will be presented by John McElwain towards the end of this presentation, at this hour. He will also present on the closed generic specific discussion, discussion that we have with other bodies within the community. And John is our liaison for it. And then again, about the SubPro small team, the two small teams working on the results of the ODP process that we had last year. But John will go into more details.

Next slide, please. So you would have been familiar with this slide if you followed our previous activity reports. We've been using this for a year and a half, something like that. This is the long path of the policy

development process, from initiation, from the first identification or scoping of a problem, all the way to the implementation and having the policy done. So the two main parts, I think there was a previous slide before. Thank you very much. The two main parts of policy development that we are going to be talking about today that are running, the transfer policy review and the IDN EPDP. You will see are in the initial report phases on the -- sorry, I don't want to get this precise.

So on the IDN, there's currently a public comment period that is on the phase one, the initial report phase one. The period closes on 19 June. So this is just after ICANN. If you plan to submit comments, this is a good time to do it. And we will, obviously the team will then review all those. For the transfer policy review, Roger will go into all those details too. But there will be also initial reports and public comments and et cetera.

Next slide, please. Sorry, I'm having trouble finding slides and notes at the same time. The joy is on a single screen. So we will talk about also the two small teams that I mentioned above. So those are much further in the development process. The policy has been developed. All the public comments, the final reports, all that was delivered. It was presented to the council that voted them in. And then as was done for the first time for those two, the board requested an operational design assessment. It went through an operational design phase. A work that was done by staff over a period of six to nine months for both of them. Delivering an enormous report basically on trying to evaluate the consequences, particularly the financial and risk assessments for ICANN on the policy recommendations.

And in the case of the PDP phase two, as John will present it a bit later, the board came back to council asking us to sort of review the recommendation or help them assess how that could be done in a way that was more palatable, I want to say. The initial report that ODA was offering a solution in over \$100 million and it was assessed that maybe there was a way to do this in a more stepped away in order not to spend all that money all at once and discover that we may not have the product that we wanted in the end.

In the case of SubPro, and there will be quite a bit of discussion, all the work basically that we're doing and presenting tonight, almost all of it is somehow linked to SubPro. In the case of SubPro, the board actually voted most of the recommendations that came out of the policy work last year. And we are starting implementation, I see the dot far into the implementation area, it should be straight on the left, we've just started that, we had our third call today. And we will discuss the fact that some of the recommendations were not voted in the last ICANN and we're trying to find solutions right now for them to be able to go through in the very near future.

With this, next slide please. So as I said at the top, we're here to answer your questions. I'll leave it to the different speakers to decide if they'd rather take the questions as they come or deal with them at the end, both is possible. We will ask all the speakers, me included, to show up again at the very end for a Q&A. If you have questions, the easiest is to put them in the chat, include a question between brackets so that somebody monitoring the chat can pick them up easily. But again, we'll have a Q&A and we'll try to have an open mic at the end of this hour to

answer your questions. And with this, I believe I am to pass the mic to my good friend, the Vice Chair, Greg, who will be conducting the second part of this evening.

GREG DIBIASE:

Great. Thanks, Seb. So the transfer policy PDP has been going for a little while now. Without further ado, Roger, can you tell us a bit about what your group has been working on since your last update before ICANN76?

ROGER CARNEY:

You bet. Thanks, Greg. The team has been working on dispute mechanisms. So we've been reviewing the TEAC, the Transfer Emergency Action Contact, and the TDRP, the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy. And the team is reviewing those to see if there's any updates to them. The goal is to have all that wrapped up and look at recommendations in two weeks when we're at ICANN77. So we're hoping to transition from our dispute mechanisms into recommendations and then move on. So I think the team has made really good progress since 76.

GREG DIBIASE:

Great to hear. Are there any new or recurring challenges that have emerged since your last update to the community?

ROGER CARNEY:

Yeah, and I think you kind of hit on it maybe accidentally, Greg, where you started. This has been going for a little while now. So we are two years into this PDP now. And I think we're starting to see what we generally see in the process, some waning of some participation. And it's something that we're actively working on and communicating is to make sure that people that don't have the time anymore or need to get someone else assigned to get someone in there just to keep it fresh and make sure that we're making progress.

And honestly, I think that's the only hurdle we've really hit is just that. And I don't think it's slowing us down. It's just come the end of this, we don't want people to wake up and say, oh, I forgot we weren't paying attention to that. So we're just trying to make sure everybody's actively engaged as we go through. So I would say yes the only big thing.

GREG DIBIASE:

Great. And two years, it's not so long and ICANN land, I think you're doing great. Can you tell us a little bit about what the working group will be discussing more specifically during ICANN77?

ROGER CARNEY:

Absolutely. The team has completed its review of all the charter questions for the dispute mechanisms. And staff is currently feverishly working on getting all the discussions and recommendations put into an initial draft so that ICANN77, we can start walking through specific recommendations and answers to all the charter questions. So that'll be our main goal at 77.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. And lastly, is there anything else you would like to update us on?

ROGER CARNEY: I think nothing big. Again, we're going to continue the outreach to make sure everybody's participating. And again, anyone that's listening, please just knock on your representative's door and say hi and see if they need help or anything. But other than that, no, I think the team's in a good spot and we're working forward.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Well, we look forward to hearing more at ICANN77.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Craig.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you. So next we have international domain names, EPDP. And has Donna joined us? Do I see Donna on the screen?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I'm here, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Oh, hi, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi.

GREG DIBIASE: So, first question. Can you tell us a bit about what your working group has been working on since the working group's last update at ICANN76?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Greg. So at ICANN76, we were finalizing discussions on charter questions from phase one of our work. And at the end of April, we delivered our, or I don't know what the right word is, but our initial final report was posted for public comment and that public comment has, we've just extended it. So it was initially open for the standard 40-day period and I think we've extended it for another two weeks. So that public comment period will close soon after ICANN77, I think is the plan. In addition to that, we as you know as a Councilor, the board requested of the Council some timeline and project plan for some of the work that may be on the same path as SubPro.

So we have recently provided an update to Council on what we think will be the timeline for our phase two work. So we split our work into two. Phase one was to deal with the introduction of variant IDNs at the top level and phase two is dealing with second level domain. So IDNs at the second level already exist as to IDNs at the top level, but the manner in which variants are managed is something that we're working through now and will continue to work through at ICANN77.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Is there anything the Council or community could do to assist the work of this group?

DONNA AUSTIN: We're really looking forward to the public comments to see the extent to which we have to do substantive rework of any of our -- the consideration of some of the charter questions we had. We have four sessions at ICANN77, one on each day, and they will be primarily to look at the charter questions on the second level, so phase two of our work. But we are available as a resource. So if there are different groups that want to better understand some of the recommendations from phase one, the leadership team, or at least myself and some of the staff would be available to come and speak to any of the groups at ICANN77 if they thought that would help with their preparation of input to the public comments.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. That sounds really helpful. Can you tell us maybe a little more specifically what the working group will be discussing during its sessions on ICANN77? I think you touched on that earlier.

DONNA AUSTIN: Just a little bit. So the charter questions on the second level, as I said second level domains exist, IDNs exist already. Some of the questions are around the harmonization of IDN tables. So each registry operator

has their own IDN table. So there are a number of IDN tables that exist most of them are probably similar, but not the same. So there's a discussion about the harmonization of tables. We'll probably get into the same entity principle at the second level. So if you register an IDN at the second level, if we adopt the same -- does the registrar can't need to be the same if someone wants to register a variant of that IDN at the second level?

And then if we decide that that's the case, what's the best mechanism to do that? So within our charter questions, there's a question of whetherROID is, and Roger, you like to help me out. I can't remember whatROID stands for. But basically, what's the mechanism to make that happen? So that's a flavor. Some of the other, because we've got four days, we haven't actually set out a work plan yet. We're going to do that next week. But one of the other things that we will probably deal with is what's the impact on the lifecycle on if we adopt the same entity principle at the second level.

GREG DIBIASE:

Well, sounds like you have your work, you and your team have your work cut out for you. Is there anything else you'd like to share with this group?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Just similar to what Roger's experiencing with his PDP, the participation is waning. We're also two years in. And I know there was probably a little bit of concern when we delivered our timeline to the

council last week that it could take us through to 2025 to complete our work. We are, I can tell you that the leadership team is very keen to wrap it up sometime next year. But if the participation is important. So if we can, I know we have reached out to community leaders to confirm the membership of our PDP going into the phase two work. So which is great, it would be good to have that confirmed. But we also need the people to show up.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Well, great. Thanks. Thanks for those answers. And we look forward to engaging further on this work at ICANN77. Thank you, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's great.

GREG DIBIASE: Next up, the GGP on applicant support. I see Mike there. So Mike, I'll start, can you provide a progress update on the work of this group?

MIKE SILBER: Sure, Greg. Greetings all. So we're in the very fortunate position of not having the same timelines that everybody else is describing. It doesn't mean we're not having some of the same problems. But we started at the end of last year. And we're tracking to our timeline that we are running pretty close to our deadline. So we're hoping at ICANN77, we will wrap up any remaining issues. At the moment, we're on task six,

which is the final task. We need to then review the recommendations. And we're doing a serving job in terms of getting them written up. And then they'll be published for public comment, which means we should get it all done and dusted shortly after ICANN77, out for public comment, digest the comments, and we'll be ready for ICANN78, hopefully.

GREG DIBIASE:

Wonderful. So this is a GGP or GNSO guidance process that differs slightly from a traditional GNSO PDP or policy development process. For those who are unfamiliar, can you provide a little background on what's the difference? What's the nature of the GGP?

MIKE SILBER:

Sure, Greg. I think the critical difference is we're talking about a discrete item, which Council has passed on to the GGP for specific guidance or recommendations. And so it's been one of the interesting experiences corralling the participants that the expectation from Council is quite narrow. The temptation is to try and broaden it and we need to keep focused and narrow. And I think that with a little bit more experience, I think it could be a very useful process, because I think Council will get a little more experienced in terms of setting the tasks and setting the expectations and the participants will get a little bit more disciplined in terms of their participation. But on the whole, I think it's been very positive.

Certainly great appreciation for staff. I was a little disappointed. I was expecting participants would be a little more forthcoming on the mailing list, would take a little more responsibility for actually drafting proposals. But instead, we're relying very significantly on staff to prepare proposals. And then we're getting some great comments. We're getting a lot of good feedback outside of meetings as well as in meetings. But the participants are not really driving the content. And I think these are just learnings that we need to adjust from in terms of how we take the process going forward. And in particular, that we shouldn't shy away from staff actually putting straw man proposals before the GGP going forward.

I think staff were a little hesitant initially to do that, because there was a concern that they didn't want to drive the process. And so we stalled a little bit for a couple of weeks when we were discussing, but we weren't actually making progress on actual documentation until we started putting straw man proposals in front of the group.

GREG DIBIASE:

I think that touches upon my next question is just what are some of the challenges facing the group? Kind of besides what you just outlined generally, are there any other challenges or maybe opportunities going forward from your perspective?

MIKE SILBER:

Greg, as I indicated, I think this is a good process. I think the fact that we can get work wrapped up and public comments out within six

months shows that this is something that can work. What we just need to do is keep working on refining the tasks assigned by council so that council are actually getting good little deliverables out of it, and then just keeping participants focused in terms of what's in scope and out of scope. And I think we'll get better and we'll find good results coming out of the GGP going forward.

GREG DIBIASE:

Great. So what is the GGP planning to discuss at ICANN77?

MIKE SILBER:

So we're really wrapping up, task six should be done in the coming week. And it means that at ICANN77, we'll close off anything on task six, as well as doing a review of the full set of recommendations, hopefully to adopt those either at 77 or shortly thereafter, so that they can be published for comment.

GREG DIBIASE:

Great, close to the finish line. Is there anything else that we didn't cover that you'd like to share?

MIKE SILBER:

Not that I can think of, I don't know, Steve or Julie, if I've missed anything, but again, just appreciation to our staff as well as our council liaison for the sterling work that's been done to get us to this place.

GREG DIBIASE: Well, we really appreciate the update, Mike, and we look forward to hearing more at ICANN77. Great. And now I think I'm turning it over to my fellow vice chair, Mr. John McElwain.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I'm going to be covering several of the non PDP work that's going on at the GNSO council level, and the first being the work being done by the EPDP phase two small team. And for those who don't know, to not use too many acronyms, the phase two report of the expedited policy development process, that's the EPDP part, that was looking at the temporary specification for gTLD registration data, developed this phase two final report.

As part of the GNSO council's approval of these recommendations, the GNSO council agreed to request a consultation with the ICANN board, with the goal being to discuss the financial sustainability of this model and some of the concerns that were expressed in the various minority statements. These issues were primarily concerning whether further cost benefit analysis needed to be conducted before the ICANN board considered all of these recommendations prior to adoption.

During ICANN70, the board directed ICANN to initiate what's called an operational design phase or an ODP to look into the costs and the scope of work needed to implement these recommendations. After the publication of the ODA, the GNSO council formed a small team consisting of council members as well as EPDP team members to assist the council with its review of the ODA's findings. The small team provided input on the proposed next steps for the consultation process

between the board and the council, particularly regarding the cost benefit analysis of the ASAD recommendations. After publication of the ODA, the council's small team proposed next steps for the consultation process relating to these.

Following the board's direction to ICANN.org to proceed with implementing the WHOIS Disclosure system, now this is being referred to as the Registration Data Request Service or RDRS. The council re-enlisted the small team to consult with ICANN org on the implementation of the RDRS. So the council tasked the small team with considering topics identified in the addendum that the small team did not consider gating factors, but what would be of interest to have further discussions with ICANN org during the implementation phase and to consider if or how some of these aspects would be considered to be added in the current implementation of the RDRS or a future version of it.

We're also tasked to look at a success criteria for this registration data system, which should include an analysis of the relevant usage data of the system and how to best promote and secure comprehensive use of the system both by potential requesters as well as ICANN accredited registrars. Most recently, the small team submitted its proposed success criteria to the council and the council discussed this at its May meeting as a part of an update as to the work of that small team.

We can move on to the next slide. Closed Generics, that's the group that I'm actually serving on as part of council leadership. So, Closed Generics is one of those topics that fell within the subsequent procedures, PDPs, charter, but that working group was unable to come

to an agreement on and come up with recommendations on this topic. The ICANN board sent a letter and invited participants to send a letter to the GNSO council with this concept of an invitation to participants from the GNSO, from the GAC and from the ALAC to work together through a facilitated dialogue to help develop a framework for the treatment of closed generic top-level domains. This group has been meeting twice a week now for an hour and a half each time working on putting together an agreed upon framework.

Should the facilitated dialogue result in an agreed upon framework, then there will be further work done to develop the appropriate GNSO policy process to implement that framework -- to develop process and then implement that framework. The facilitated dialogue participants hope to deliver a draft framework if agreed to by the end of May, so very soon. The GSO, GAC, ALAC and the broader community will then have an opportunity to review and provide input on the draft framework before it is finalized by dialogue participants. As anticipated by the board resolution from ICANN76, the GNSO council provide a draft project plan and timeline for any subsequent GNSO policy work on this topic by June 15th, noting that such work would be contingent upon agreement on the final framework.

So we're going to take that framework as in a working version and the GNSO council is going to build out a timeline based upon what we're seeing to date just to be prepared for future work. The group is going to be meeting twice during ICANN77, first on Monday, June the 12th from 9 a.m. to 10:15 eastern time and second on Tuesday, June 13th

from 10:45 to 12:15 eastern time. These sessions are going to be open to observers.

Next slide. The next work stream we have going on is a subsequent procedure small team. During its informal session at ICANN76 and the subsequent council meeting, the council discussed and agreed to task a small team of interested counselors to review and suggest to the full council how the underlying concerns that cause pending status by the board could be best addressed. Interested counselors were asked to volunteer for a small team by the middle of March of 2023. Since ICANN76, the council small team has met several times and completed an initial run through of the issues chart with board members input on why the board placed specific recommendations into a pending status.

The council discussed the main output of that effort, the proposed path forward for each pending recommendation during an extraordinary meeting that we held on May the 4th. During that meeting, the council agreed to further task the small team with taking interim steps, such as the provision of clarifying information and developing speaking points in order to support the council's dialogue with the ICANN board, which took place on May 22.

During the May 22 meeting, the council presented the small team's output to the board. The small team has continued to meet to try and to assess where the landing spot is for each recommendation or set of recommendations, meaning in many cases, a landing spot could be a path to address the board's reasons for placing the recommendation in the pending status. Having an understanding of such a landing spot is important to being able to develop the work plan and timeline to

resolve the recommendations as requested in the ICANN board's resolution.

I would move on to the next slide. Before I go to the Q&A, I wanted to provide an update on the DNS abuse small team. In February of 2022, the GNSO council formed a small team of interested council members to consider what policy efforts, if any, the GNSO council should consider undertaking the support the efforts already underway in the different parts of the community to tackle DNS abuse. In October 2022, the DNS abuse team transmitted its report to the GNSO council.

Recommendation number two from the report recommended that the GNSO council request the register stakeholder group to further the role that bulk registration play in the DNS abuse, as well as measures that registrars may have already put in place to address this vector. Based on the feedback received, The GNSO Council will consider whether further action on bulk registrations is deemed necessary.

The DNS abuse small team received input from the following groups. Contractual Compliance, ICANN org, DNS Abuse Institute, gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group, and the Registrar Stakeholders Group. For the bulk registrations, the feedback roughly fell into three buckets. Complaints from single or multiple registrations are handled uniformly without clarity on what might constitute bulk registrations warranting targeted reactions. The lack of clear definition did not elicit a clear response. Other Know Your Customer tools are deemed more efficient in detecting potential abuse. It should warrant more attention, that is, rather than focusing on bulk registrations, which lack consistent

definition, it may be better to focus on things that combat DNS abuse more broadly.

At this stage, a small team noted that potential issues around bulk registrations do not warrant policy development. With that, I think we can move into the Q&A portion of the webinar. If you'd like to ask a question, you're welcome to add it to the chat, but please ensure to include question in capital letters to denote that the question is to be read aloud. We will read these questions aloud. Participants may also ask questions verbally by raising their hand, and we will call on you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, John. This is Caitlin Tubergen from ICANN org speaking. We did receive a question via the Q&A pod from Susan Payne, which I will read aloud. Given the drop-off in participation Roger and Donna have mentioned, should council be thinking about allowing for greater numbers of participants if using a representative model PDP to better allow for wastage and or reconsidering the widespread use of the representative model?

JOHN MCELWAINE:

This is John McElwain for the record. Susan, those are great points. I will see if anybody else on leadership Roger, I see you have your hand up. So over to you on this.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, John. This is Roger. And I'll just say something that we're doing and looking at in our group is, and actually we're going to do some outreach at 77, is just to see and reach out to see if any of the stakeholder groups want to do a refresh and see if there's any other questions that we can answer. So we're going to do a refresh and just swap people out as the process continues and give them that opportunity to do that in the future here. Again, just something that our working group is looking at doing. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Roger. Donna, I see you have your hand up. So over to you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, John. So I think the challenge is that we have a hybrid representative model, which means that we have participation from dedicated members from different SDs and Cs, but we also have open representation. So anyone could join if they wanted to. I do know that the time zone causes a little bit of a challenge to participation. That's not always the case, I suppose, but I think the length of time it takes to get through a PDP is also a challenge for participation. So we've been going on for two years and so has Roger. So people's level of interest wanes over time, but they may have picked up another job or doing something different. So it's a little bit of a struggle.

Now, similar to Roger, we've done a reach out for phase two to just confirm the participants that we have, particularly given that we have members that represent different groups. But one thing I will say is that

I have personally reached out to one of the SDs and Cs to say that we don't have attendance. But that hasn't changed anything to my knowledge. And I know that staff has also reached out to a number of the other groups where we lost a participant, but we didn't get a replacement.

So I don't know. To the extent that we can get where it is a membership representation from an SD or C, to the extent that the leaders of those groups can help us out. If we've basically gone to them and say, hey, look, we don't your guys aren't showing up. If they can help us out, try to overcome that problem, that would be helpful.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you to the panel for responding to that question. We received a new question in the chat pod from Nigel Hickson. And the question is, can you update on accuracy small group, please?

JOHN MCELWAINE:

I'll run the queue. So Greg, over to you.

GREG DIBIASE:

So that working group, it's a working group, not a small team. It is currently paused pending a couple of deliverables, which was the DPA between contracted parties and ICANN, which negotiations are still underway. And then some clarifying information that ICANN had requested from regulatory authorities. And we also had a chair had to resign. So when that work does start up, we'll have to find a new chair

as well. But that is under discussion either at the next meeting or the meeting after kind of a status check in.

And sorry, it's been corrected. It's not a working group, it's a scoping team at this stage. So it's the team before the working group scoping if there is an issue that's suited for policy development. So whether to or how best to proceed is going to be taken up in either this next GNSO meeting or the meeting after that.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

I'm John McElwain for the record, not seeing any other questions, but if folks have it, please feel free to type it into the meeting chat or to the Q&A box. Well, doesn't look like there's any other questions. So I think this concludes. Seb, do you want to send us off?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

There's a last-minute hand from Jonathan Zuck. So let's hear him and then maybe we'll close this up. Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry, wait a second there. This is on John's summary of the DNS abuse, the small team and the issue of so-called bulk registrations. Given the recommendations of the small team, is that something that, and we haven't formed any kind of consensus position on this in the At-Large community.

So I'm just asking the question, is there another point of entry to pursue this issue since I think it came from us if we organized around having

the GNSO revisit this issue of bulk registrations and definitions and such, is there a path for that to happen or given the recommendations from the small team? I'm wondering if we wanted to continue to pursue that despite the recommendation, is there a path to do so?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So Jonathan, this is Sebastian. Maybe I can answer this, not so much as the chair, but as one of the participants in that small team. So indeed, we discussed the matter of bulk registration at length. And I do believe indeed that it came, or some of the questions about it came from your side of the community. The discussions that we're having in the small team were actually quite interesting and there was a lot of fact finding and an interesting topic discussed, but we felt that none of it was leading us to particular policy work.

And given the amount of work, policy work that is already on the council's table, we are looking into maybe a way of having these discussions outside of the council's work within the community, maybe facilitated by the GNSO in some way or form, but not directly because there's no lead in directly to policy at this stage or from our analysis.

There's a number of things that can happen around it, but I think that the biggest problem that we had with bulk registration is whilst there was a feeling from different people from different participants, including on the register on the council's party side, that there was, there could be problems with bulk registration because there was no definition around it. When is it bulk? When does it start to registration? Three, five, 2000?

Because there was no definition in either in terms of is it one individual? Is it a pattern? Is it all these things need to sort of be better defined? We were finding ourselves in a position, we were sending registrars and registries on wild goose chase, trying to figure out what was the problem before we had identified what we're looking for. So again, I'd invite that work to happen within the community.

I don't believe that it's directly the GNSO work to invent more policy work for itself. We have enough on our table right now, but let's chat, let's talk in DC and see if there's a way to have these sort of discussions in another instance. But that is not directly under council right now, again, because there wasn't enough ground to go and pursue policy work and start. We just talked about the accuracy, started scoping team or started anything. There was just really too little on this topic.

So again, I'd love to have the discussion. Mark Datysgeld, who was leading that small team, I know is very, very keen on continuing these discussions, but maybe not within council at this stage until we have something that is more policy like. And I hope that answers the question.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks a lot.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Cool. With this and seeing no further questions, thank you, Marika, for sharing the elements on the DNS abuse. But if there are no further questions and I don't see any other, and given the fact that we've all had

a long day of prep calls and everything, I'd love to give an extra eight minutes back to all your lives, mine included. And it is 1am here in Europe, so well time to close this day. Thank you very much to all the participants, all the speakers for your speaking tonight.

But also for all the work that you do when you're not on presentation mode and you're actually doing the working group and all that. It's an enormous amount of work. We all know it. And thank you for everybody who joined us and participated tonight. Thank you. Have a good rest of your day and see you all soon, hopefully in DC.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much, everyone, for joining. That does conclude today's webinar. Sawyer, if you could please stop the recording. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]