
ICANN78 | AGM – Europe Space
Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 4:30 to 5:30 HAM

CHRIS MONDINI:

Hello, good afternoon, everybody. It's wonderful to see so many faces in such a diverse group here for our Europe space. My name is Chris Mondini. I'm based in Brussels, and I look after the European region for ICANN. And in a moment, I will introduce a few of my team, and we will record the session. Thank you. Before I begin, I do want to extend a special thanks to Sébastien Bachollet. After each of the ICANN meetings, he and his EURALO chair capacity convenes a readout session for our region.

And the thing that we remarked upon in those readout sessions is that they are very diverse in terms of stakeholder group and category, and we are both very passionate about breaking down silos and barriers between the different groups, stakeholder categories within ICANN. And I see that there are many different ones represented here today. But let me just ask my colleagues who serve the European region, if they're willing to stand up and be acknowledged, and also introduced. Thank you.

So we have here Nora Mari, who's with the government engagement team, [inaudible – 01:15], who is also with stakeholder engagement, Andrea Beccalli. We have [inaudible – 01:22] from the Global Domains Accounts Service. We have Gisella, who I think a lot of you will know from At-Large support. We have Luna, who represents the comms function here in Europe. We have Adam Peake, who also is serving

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.

stakeholder engagement. I'm just looking to see who else have I missed. Oh, look, and Maeve, Maeve is with government engagement based in the Brussels office. I may be guilty. Hi. Oh, I've forgotten. Jennifer and Ameneh, comms and OCTO, yes, OCTO projects.

So anyway, these are the very dedicated ICANN org professionals that are supporting the work of European stakeholders every day in every way. In addition to the objective of breaking down between silos and functions, we really wanted to be welcoming to newcomers. So a little bit like I did in the opening session, I'm wondering if there's anybody here attending their first ICANN meeting. Would you raise your hand or stand? I'm delighted that you're here. Keep them up. Keep them up. This same exercise, could everybody find a person maybe that they haven't met yet, everyone with your hand raised. Look around the room. Pick somebody. I'll pick you.

And after the session, please just make a point to say hello, because again, making these connections is about sustainability, the future of ICANN, the future of the model. So I see a number of different categories, as I said, around the room, and I'm curious to know. Raise your hand, please. For example, if you're representing a ccTLD or an organization related to ccTLDs. Here's one. Two. How about anybody who -- We have seven people online. Terrific. And then how about people who are representing another registry or registrar, commercial interests or in that space, the commercial domain name space? See, we have few. Do we have any GAC members? We have a GAC member. We have a couple of GAC members.

And how about At-Large the user community? Nicely represented as well. And so really, this is just again to kind of emphasize that we are a diverse group, that we come from diverse backgrounds, and to spend time to look at some of these issues and items from a European perspective is really valuable time well spent. We endeavored to make a bottom-up agenda. So we sent out some after the initial inspiration and getting the group together, we sent out some surveys. And we surfaced, as you'll see on the next slide, to very big topics. We had the idea to do really an open mic facilitated discussion. And the reason I have this handheld mic is because even if you're seated around the edge, we will come to you to make sure that you can make your voice heard.

But the idea, the concept is really to have an initial kind of fire starter set of comments from a couple of stakeholders from our region, and then for everybody to have a chance to share their opinion on the topic. So we may not have an opportunity for a lot of debates because each of these topics could be a full day. But I want to get as many voices from as many diverse interests as possible, contributing just to say your opinion, your point of view, your interest in reaction to what our fire starters say in terms of the issues. So I'm going to pause for any questions about the agenda. And I'm going to look online to see if there are any hands or questions because I'm about to turn it over to my very esteemed colleague, Adam Peake. Thank you very much, Adam, for setting up the session.

ADAM PEAKE:

Thank you very much. And thank you very much for coming. It's really nice. We're trying a Europe space meeting again. Some of you old hands will remember we've done them in the past, but we think particularly with these issues, it's time to have another discussion at a non-siloed European region participation chat. One thing that's not really on the agenda are two things. One is any other business. And I think a logical topic for that is do we want to continue these meetings as a regular feature of the ICANN's session, in which case we'll have to struggle again with trying to get a non-conflicting time slot on the agenda. Always going to be a difficulty in apologies in particular to the ccNSO. There is a major conflict with the ccNSO event, but these are unavoidable.

So would we want to continue? And the other is a request that we have a group photograph at the end. So let's see how we go with that. But let's get started with a fire starter. I think we've probably got 15, 20 minutes. And the two topics you see there, Polina Malaja from CENTR has very kindly offered to give us a quick overview and introduction to European regulatory and policy issues. So I think with that, Polina, over to you, and then we will take questions, comments and observations. Thank you.

POLINA MALAJA:

Thank you, Adam. And thank you, Chris. And thank you for this opportunity to address all of you today. So as I was already introduced by Adam, I'll give a quick update and let's say maybe a summary of existing European policy and legislative landscape that is relevant for TLDs. And as already identified, I'm Polina and I work for CENTR, which

is the association of and by European country called Top Level Domain Registries. So we are actively engaged in policy discussions on the European level that impact DNS and specifically, of course, TLDs and ccTLDs in our case, to be more precise. And from our perspective, we see a couple of trends that have emerged in the last few years from the European legislative and policy landscape.

So I would probably try to group them a little bit by topics because I think they do have some commonalities and I think it will be maybe easier to group them and then to hear from you if you follow any other initiatives, if there's anything else that you would like to raise today, you'll be very happy to hear from everybody. So the first area that I wanted to introduce and very briefly outline is all the policy and legislative initiatives that are relevant for access to domain name registration data and of course, all the affiliated topics, including registration data accuracy. So the access topics, of course, are relevant for the purposes of tackling cyber-crime, but they're actually also much broader.

So first and foremost, I want to highlight that we have a finalized electronic evidence regulation in the European Union that has been recently been finalized. And it considers domain name registration data to be subscriber data that needs to be available for cross border access by law enforcement authorities. And of course, for the purposes of ICANN community discussions, it's also probably worth noting that Commission is also equipped with coming up and developing a decentralized IT system to handle data access requests that is, of course, relevant for the SSAD and other access and disclosure discussions with the ICANN community.

Second point on access and accuracy is, of course, I'm sure you all heard about the NIS2 directive that also significantly impacts domain name registration processes. It requires a collection of certain data sets and may have and most likely will have an impact on registry registrar relationship, especially when it comes to ensuring accuracy of domain name registration data. It's currently in the process of national transposition. And so there's also a topic that needs close follow up and to be closely in line with what is also being discussed within the ICANN. And another interesting access relevant legislation proposal for legislation that I wanted to highlight today is the recent proposal for reforming European insolvency law.

And it also actually includes a point about cross border access to data held by so-called internet domain registers. So that can be considered national asset registers. And these are in scope for potential data access procedures. And it's not clear whether it only includes ccTLDs at this point, or it might be also include gTLDs established in the EU, for example. It's a proposal that is being discussed within the policy makers within the EU. And the second area that I wanted to highlight that we see also a trend that coming from the European legislative policy making machine is policy and legislative initiatives that target DNS level action and responsibility for illegal content. That also includes, of course, consumer protection area.

So you've probably also heard all about the recently, maybe not so recently, but in any case, one of the latest legislation in that area, the Digital Services Act, that extends the concept of internet intermediary to domain name actors, like registries and registrars, and includes certain obligations for all intermediaries that need to be responsible for

taking action with regards to illegal content. And another DNS level action relevant legislation, and there's a proposal for two legislative instruments in the area of intellectual property rights enforcement, and specifically for geographical indications protection. So you've probably also definitely heard already this week about it. The proposals include domain names explicitly in scope, and also assume certain responsibilities for domain name registries to contribute to the more effective geographical indication enforcement online.

So first of all, GIs are supposed to be recognized within the alternative dispute resolution in place across ccTLDs and might in future be extended to also other TLDs. And also the proposals include calls for establishing domain name information and alert system. That of course is interesting proposal considering that it also interferes with domain name registration process and prioritizes certain rights holders, like geographical indication rights holders over other legitimate users of domain names. So that's important to keep in mind. There are two proposals. One legislation is already finalized. It applies to ccTLDs, but the other is still within the legislative negotiations.

And another part that I wanted to highlight in the area of DNS level action, there's also another recent proposal for financial data access. And it's interesting because it also includes certain enforcement powers for competent authorities investigating and dealing with financial data breaches. And there's also an interesting enforcement power that includes potential orders to registries and registrars to delete domain names. So it's another competent authority with the powers to take action at DNS level. And I know I'm already speaking for quite some time, but I also wanted to maybe to highlight very quickly

that so these are the proposals that are already out there, but we're also approaching the end of the current EU legislative term and the EU elections for next year and a new set of policymakers, a new set of priorities.

And of course, judging from the last years, we do not think that there will be lesser attention towards a domain namespace at the legislative level. But at the same time, I think it's important to also highlight that there's also no better time for increasing and remembering that we need to still consider and raise the awareness of the importance of existing foundational internet infrastructure, including the domain name system and considering also all the other developments outside of the EU as well, like [inaudible – 15:57] Digital Compact, and the WSIS+20 process, but as well as, of course, the European Commission's and the EU future plans for the future of the internet. So there's of course already a strategic document on such notion as Web 4.0 and virtual worlds.

So the needs to raise awareness and maintaining the foundational pieces of internet's building blocks and some of the principles that also allowed the internet to scale and to grow and to become a critical infrastructure that has been also recognized already by many governments around the world. There are a set of principles like technical interoperability, open standards, decentralization, respect for human rights, and of course, the multi-stakeholder model for the internet governance are still extremely relevant. And as a technical community, I believe we need to increase our efforts to make sure that these foundational pieces are also being taken into account, but also safeguarded as we go forward, as we discuss emerging technologies, as

the policymakers are looking into the future and coming up with strategic documents.

I think as a technical community, we all have responsibility to raise awareness of these important building blocks and to contribute to the fact-based policymaking. With that, I would like to finish my short intervention. Happy to take any questions.

ADAM PEAKE:

Brilliant. And obviously, there's not very much going on, so it's astonishing. Thank you very much. And I'm very pleased to say there will be a Zoom recording and I will be listening again. There is a tremendous amount of work to do, but I think the acknowledgement about critical infrastructure that we have a role to not only continue, but to explain into these processes is one of the messages we can collectively take. I'm sure we all have different opinions about different parts of the regulations, but collectively we're talking about mechanisms that we all support in the multi-stakeholder model, the collectiveness of what we do.

But yes, please, a response. I think we'll try and keep it to about 10 or 15 minutes of response. Anybody at the table, anybody at the room, put your hand up or I'll have to start volunteering and then people don't love me anymore. So what would we do? Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Thank you. I echo your comments and appreciation for what was said. I just wanted to raise the question of standardization as a critical part

of the stability and integration of the networks and particularly the internet, whereas in practice a great part of the growth of the internet in the last two or three years has been dominated by a few US companies, some of whom I believe are quite prepared to instigate standardization procedures outside the orbit of IETF or European standardization. I wondered if anybody has any comments or experience of the sensitivity or otherwise of European interests in this area and how to maintain a balance between public standardization, IETF and the recent interventions of basically the social media.

ADAM PEAKE:

Any comments and follow-up on this? I'm sorry, I'm not seeing hands. Anybody want to continue or -- Oh, please. We had another comment. Another comment. Let's carry one.

WERNER STAUB:

It might be related. Werner Staub from CORE Association. I heard the word decentralized IP, that maybe meant decentralized ID. I'm not sure what it was. Was it ID?

POLINA MALAJA:

It was decentralized IT system.

WERNER STAUB:

Oh, decentralized IT system.

POLINA MALAJA: IT system.

WERNER STAUB: Then I'll drop my question, but let's say it would have been good to hear about decentralized ID in this context, which is a standardization effort that would actually be worth being considered here.

ADAM PEAKE: I'm not sure we need to add to the legislative agenda right now after what Paulina said, but is there anyone else who would like to have a comment before we start suggesting that? Michele, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Adam. First off, Polina, as ever, always provides excellent updates, and I think they really are appreciated by those of us who have day jobs and can't possibly follow all of this. And I love the fact that you're able to explain most of this in language that those of us who don't have law degrees can follow and understand. It's very much appreciated. And I'm just going to pick up on one point that Christopher raised, and for once we might actually agree on something.

It does happen about once a decade, but let's not get too used to it. And it's just the amount of legislative activity coming from the EU really worries me. you've heard me say this before, so this is more for the benefit of people who didn't have the pleasure of hearing me say it previously, but I do really worry that we will end up with a super safe internet in Europe. It's going to be like an air-gapped computer because there'll be nobody on it if we're not careful. Thanks.

NORA MARI:

Yes, it's Nora Mari from the government engagement team. I just want to say a few words regarding it and comment on standards. So yes, for example, from the European Union perspective, the European Union, the Commission is interested to have a greater presence and leading voice in standard setting organizations going forward because technological standards are, of course, strategically geopolitically these days. When it comes to internet standards, as ICANN org, there is a diminutive vision of an existing regulation on how the EU sets their own standards. So, as ICANN org, we have commented to that stress in the importance of developing internet standards in the context of the IETF and that guarantees that the internet is global and interoperable. So, yes.

ADAM PEAKE:

Thanks, Nora. We have a question online and this goes to some of our engagement work for both CENTR and the other organizations and ICANN. So, it's John McCormack and his question is, has ICANN and CENTR considered an education program for EU politicians on internet issues given that many of them will be replaced in the next EU elections? So is it time for an education campaign for politicians incoming and other? I don't know if that's a question for CENTR and back to Nora and for Chris as well, but others in the room may want to comment on what we should be doing and I see Bastien as well from RIPE NCC, so you may have an issue with how are you engaging with European political level and should we be doing more?

NORA MARI:

Yes, thank you for this question, tricky question, but yes, of course, the ongoing, I wouldn't say educational work because I think we're in an interesting we're in an interesting development where I think everybody knows or think that they know what is the internet and how to use it, so I don't think a lot of people, including policymakers, would feel maybe appreciative if we call it educational efforts, but in any case, yes, raising public awareness, but also bringing it a little bit maybe a more high level than just explaining how it's still very important to explain how technology works because there's still a lot of misconceptions, but at the same time, I think it's also important to link it with the public policy objectives that are being pursued and how multi-stakeholder model and also these foundational principles of free and open internet can help to solve or to bring this public policy objectives forward.

I think we probably need to focus more on that while, of course, at the same time still helping out with tricky technical questions, but I think the public awareness work needs to be maybe refocused a little bit more to a more high level and to also acknowledge these public policy objectives and concerns from the policymakers and to focus on how we can help collectively and as technical community specifically as well. So I hope this answers and, of course, happy to hear any suggestions how we can go forward, as Adam said.

ADAM PEAKE:

And I see Wolfgang at the end, who's been one of the great educators on there.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Wolfgang Kleinwaechter for the record. Probably it would be a good idea that after the election to the European Parliament, Centre together with ICANN and the European Internet Foundation could organize a two-day weekend seminar for new members of the Parliament just to make an offer, so because the last Parliament was trying to be the norm-maker, not the norm-taker, but I'm afraid that the next Parliament will even have to be more on the agenda and to avoid that they become a norm-confuser. It would be good to clarify this in the very first weeks when they have taken their seat as members of the Parliament.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Adam. Michele for the record. I think it's not an easy one. Some of the trade associations like I2C have had some success in doing capacity-building type work in the US in the past. Trying to replicate that in Brussels might be something worth exploring. CTA does a fantastic job of doing it, but CTA also has a very lucrative trade show that helps to pay for it all, but what they've done is they've set up an innovation house in the neighborhood of the hill and they bring various politicians and other policymakers there and show them all the shiny stuff so that they get to play with the new tech and interact with it so they can kind of understand it.

The problem I'm seeing with a lot of stuff coming down from the EU is, while it might be well-intended, it really ignores operational and business realities. I am really worried that some of these things, while they might fix a tiny problem, will create a much bigger one. Polina and I have had these conversations before and it's just, it's not healthy.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Sorry, I'm just stealing Adam's microphone. My name's Marie and I'm based in Brussels, not with ICANN, with another trade association. If you're going to do this, can I just throw out a couple of suggestions? The elections are in June and what normally happens when the MEPs changeover is, if they come to Brussels in June, the new ones, they tend to spend a month going around going, they don't know where their officers are, they haven't got their staff yet, they don't have their access badges, all the practical stuff, so the work actually starts after the summer break, but you need to get your date in quick because they fill up really, really fast. My personal impression is a weekend, good luck, unless you're doing what Michele suggests and has a shiny come and play with the buttons.

However, within the European Parliament complex itself, there are loads of meeting rooms, so get a sponsoring MEP, whichever one you get on with the best, get them to sponsor you. I would suggest getting one of the ones that come back so they know the system better because you need to be sponsored to get into the Parliament's place. They've got lots of restaurants, they've got lots of bars, they've got foyers where you can have an exhibition, but you do need to be sponsored by an MEP, but the most important thing to do is look at the calendar that in Strasbourg, for lots of historical reasons, which we're not going to go into here, but in Strasbourg Week, as it's known, ain't no one in Brussels, and also if you look at the calendar, it's always published online, there's also Committee Week.

Now, the good thing about Committee Week is they are in Brussels, and you've got more chance of getting them. If it's Plenary Week, you've got less chance of getting them. If it's Constituency Week, you haven't got to hope because they're back home, and this is not a trade secret, but never do anything on a Friday because they all leave on Thursdays.

ADAM PEAKE:

Thank you, it's very nice to have something that's practical as we can, something to consider. To the point of people not being overly sure what the internet is, I'm probably much less sure what the DNS is these days, but many of us who were in Kyoto for the IGF a couple of weeks ago were finding that the term multi-stakeholder was absolutely everywhere, and whether it meant anything or the same thing to anybody was really unsure. So language is important, so explaining what things are, understanding what the internet is, what the DNS is, and even what a multi-stakeholder approach is, and then allowing legislation to perhaps go forward is a thought, but with that, I think we can turn over to the next topic if you don't mind, and we can hear from Nigel, Nigel Hickson from the UK government about ICANN's policy priorities. No fighting, please, thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you very much, Adam, and I'm going to be pretty brief given the audience we've got here, or given the participants here that are much more knowledgeable than I am. So first of all, Adam is the consummate salesman, isn't he? I don't know if you've ever worked with him. I'm sure he said to me, I'm just organizing a small informal meeting of a few European friends, and I said, oh I'll come along to that. And then I said,

well, will there be coffee or beer? And he said, well, I'm not sure, but I'll make sure there's cakes.

So thanks, Adam. I like it. But no, seriously, it's great to be in this sort of setting because I recall these meetings some years ago, and obviously there's reasons why we haven't all got together, but it's enormously useful to be able to have these sort of frank discussions, and greatly enjoyed the briefing from CENTR, and we'll read more. I've always said that you do an incredible job, and your work is just so much appreciated. And I'm sure it certainly is in the UK government. You might say, well, UK, Europe? I won't repeat that joke, but no. For us outside of the European bubble, to an extent, in terms of the European Union, it's just so important to understand, and it's not just the UK, I'm sure, it's many other governments as well.

So onto the policy development work, and as I say many people around the room are deeply involved in the policy development processes, so I'm not going to obviously go over them. All I'm going to do is try and flag a few of the discussions that we're having in the GAC and overall in the policy development processes, to try and reflect on a few that I think mean quite a lot to GAC members, and particularly to European GAC members as we've been hearing this week. But there's other European GAC members in the room, so please interrupt me if you think I'm getting it totally wrong.

So first of all, SubPro. Very interesting we talk about SubPro, and obviously in this room, most of us, although I note there's a few newcomers, so it's great to see people. I'm sure we had a drink last night. But it's really good to see people, and the language that we use

is deeply odd in ICANN, of course. SubPro, subsequent procedure, the next round, or whatever. I suppose we couldn't call it the new round, because we'd already had one. But it's interesting for governments, I think, the next round, and we are a bit, I think, always in two minds about this, because we have to think of the sort of public policy implications of new generic top-level domains. And on the one hand, many of us think of competition law, we think of opportunity, we think of innovation, we think of choice.

And that leads us to an assumption that having more names must be good to a large extent. Certainly just having one or two names doesn't seem to fit the bill. So why not have new names? On the other hand, of course we recognize the challenges involved, and the implications there are for abuse, et cetera, et cetera. So there is this, I think, dichotomy to an extent on new names, but I think for many of us, the balance comes down to the potential advantage of having new names. And many people come to our offices in London, well, actually not many, because they don't like to come and see us, but no, some people come and see us, and they say, UK, get rid of this SubPro, vote against it in the gang. We don't want any more names. And some people do it for really honest reasons, and I think some people do it for rather dishonest reasons.

But essentially, I think certainly the UK comes down to the fact that there is this opportunity, especially with international domain names, with names in different scripts, names in different languages, names from different regions, hopefully, from the global south, and that makes a difference. So that might be on SubPro, but what about the individual issues? And I'm just going to flag three that I think excite the gang to an

extent, as much as one can. First of all, on contention sets, auctions, we had an excellent session with the ALAC this morning on this, but this has been something that we've been discussing for some time. Essentially, we don't want private auctions. That's it. We don't want private auctions.

We don't want a situation where gaming can take place, where people will, and the briefing we're getting from many people is that those that would have gained last time in the first round actually didn't because they missed out, because they didn't realize there was the opportunities to do it. So they'll be doing it this time. So we don't want that. But you might say, well, if you don't want that, what's the alternative? So that is something that I think still has to be resolved, but we've made it very clear to the board that we don't mind ICANN auctions. We don't mind sealed bid auctions, perhaps, where the money goes to charity or goes to somewhere else, but we don't want private auctions.

Secondly, application support. We want applications from the global south. I think most GAC members have given consideration to this, and others will have views, of course, but we want, as governments, to be able to stand up, well, probably it won't be me, but to stand up in the UN in 2025 when we have, when we're discussing the WHOIS+20, and we have countries that will say, and we know that some countries will say can we change this whole nature of internet governance? Can we do something different? Can we this isn't working for us. It's not working for some of the G77 countries, and we want to be able to say look at the last application round. There were so many hundreds of applications from the global south.

People are really using these names in innovative ways, et cetera, et cetera, but, of course 2026, or we're beyond 2025, but at least if we have a process in place by then for applicant support, we'll be able to point to what the multi-stakeholder model is doing in that area. So those are, I think, two of the aspects in the SubPro, and no doubt there's as many others. Let me, I'll be very brief with the next two. Let me just go on to the whole issue of data accuracy and WHOIS, et cetera. This is incredibly complex. We just came out from a GAC session on this, and I know the community are working tremendously hard to put these measures in place, and it is very complicated.

But I just wanted to flag something, because during this discussion we had earlier on, we had a couple of comments from ICANN org which were absolutely dead on the button that said that some of the comments that I made and some of the comments that perhaps other GAC members made confused phase one and phase two. Well, that's terrible, isn't it? Fancy confusing two phases of the EB, TB, B, whatever. That's terrible. Both on exactly the same issue, both on law enforcement access to data. But because they were in different policy development processes, then for some reason you couldn't link them together. You couldn't do the common sense thing. This was impossible. This was outside of the process.

And this is something that we have to get beyond because this is something that, A new GAC members don't understand, but the community out there doesn't understand either. We're talking about RDRS. We're talking about urgent requests. We're talking about being able to do something about urgent requests in one part of the house. And that, when we do something about urgent requests, it must go to

the other part of the house as well. So we can't have this just because it's being developed in one policy development process, it can't be applicable somewhere else. It's just totally unacceptable, I don't.

And thirdly, something that is really positive that work is going on. And this is a really difficult area of work and some GAC members are involved. And I know the communities, other, the GNSO and ALAC and others are involved a lot more. And this is the work on IDNs. This is the work on IDN variants that's work going through the policy development process. And I just wanted to stress the importance of this work because of what I said in terms of applications in different scripts and in different dialects, et cetera.

And I just really wanted to say that as governments, we sit on this group, we try and contribute what we can, but the bulk of the contributions are made from people from the GNSO and ALAC that have steeped themselves into this knowledge that do it, not because they have commercial interests in the game or anything, but do it because they really feel passionately that these are important aspects. So I want to commend the community for this work. Thank you.

ADAM PEAKE:

Thank you. So Nigel, you've mentioned the At-Large, you mentioned other GAC members. So are there other comments on these sometimes contentious issues, I think? Auctions, what's the future? Applicant support, what does it mean? And how do we get it right, as you say, because it's important into other processes as well. And also data accuracy, which another is a week-long meeting, I think, possibly. And then thank you for the positive work. We do appreciate the work that's

going on in IDNs and variants and so on. And you see from the CEO goals, the importance of inclusion and where we're going in ICANN as a global organization that is expanding the global inclusive internet. And I see, Sébastien, you have your flag up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. Fortunately for you, there is no interpretation, and then we'll not switch in French. I think that what Nigel says are very important topics. I would like to add one point, it's that we can do a lot of things for application support, but if it's a basic price, it's more important and eventually much more important than the previous round, we will be also in trouble from my point of view.

Because there will be plenty of organization willing to have a new extension and they will not be able because they will not be supported because whatever we do, it will be a tricky process, unfortunately. We're an organization where everything's need to be, but can it be game? If it's game, let's add something in top of that and so on and so forth. And at the end, it's too complicated. Therefore, I think we need also to talk about the price requested for each application. Thank you.

ADAM PEAKE: Betty, please, if you'd like to take the first. Chris spoke on the last one, so I'm demoting him to next.

BETTY FAUSTA: Thank you. Betty Fausta for the records. Two questions. The first one is about urgent request. Normally, you as a PDP team of review can

have a standard answer for all the request. Do you think we have to maybe to have a special decision about this in Europe? That's first. And the second question is about as a UK government, do you think as ICANN policy priorities can impact some overseas territories of UK?

NIGEL HICKSON: Do you want to take another question?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, no, absolutely no.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, well no thank you. And I think the issue of urgent requests I'm no law enforcement expert and never have been, but the many years ago, I worked setting up the Internet Watch Foundation in the UK when I was doing other civil servants duties. And I was involved in the early days of UK policy on child protection issues and on sort of pornography issues and various things when the internet really first emerged. And so I suppose I've always had a certain sort of sensitivity for the real work that law enforcement authorities do to get at certain types of data.

So I'll come to the point. So I think that urgent requests is very important. And when I was ranting on about confusing phase one and phase two or phase A and phase B it seems we missed a real opportunity in this RDRS pilot not to recognize the importance of urgent requests. And I'm sure that won't be the view of other GAC members necessarily, but it's something I feel fairly strongly. I think there's a great deal of difference between some time some of the requests that are made for

registrant data and others requests come in many different natures. So that was the point on that. And does it reflect how does it reflect into UK policy? Well I think it does.

We're just enacting powers in the UK to enable, if you like, the government to regulate UK-related domains. So this is .UK, obviously a country code, and .London .Wales, et cetera. Now, these powers are not day-to-day powers, they only come in if a registry does not comply with certain types of provisions. And so if a registry completely ignores law enforcement requests, then that will be a ground for the government to say, well, hold on a minute. This isn't right. Thanks.

ADAM PEAKE:

Thank you, Nigel. And then, Elena, do you want to respond now, or is that?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Christopher Wilkinson again, just a couple of glosses on Nigel's excellent introduction. On IDNs in general, I hear from the GAC members that this should be a priority in the next gTLD round. But what I see in the SubPro report, especially if you delete this, I think they have my personal dissent on the topic. What I see is a recommendation for another generation of significantly large numbers of vanilla, new top level domains, most of which, in terms of the money involved, will be in English. So I really think that there's a dichotomy there. Bearing in mind that we've got far more than two TLDs, we've got hundreds as a result of the previous round, many of which are still not used properly.

So I don't think there's a real need for lots more top level domains, unless they're policy focused. And in this case, the IDN case is pretty strong for reasons which have been enunciated already. Regarding application support, the buzzword is holistic. I think Sébastien subtly avoided the word holistic, which needs definition, and I'm not going to define it now. But the fact is that the established policy is just to give the application a rebate on the ICANN fees.

Now, from the point of view of financial management of new investments, and I think setting up a new top-level domain is basically an investment project, it's quite obvious that little incentive of a discount on the fees is totally inadequate.

And before this policy is put to bed, it has to, and by holistic for the sake of argument, I would say it has to be available in multilingual, it has to cover the real startup costs of a new top-level domain, and has to be available for a sufficient time for a new top-level domain to become permanently viable on the basis of new registrations. I think on auctions we've heard what the situation is, and the current discussion on WHOIS and urgent request looks extremely complicated, so I'll pass on that. I've just listened to a couple of hours of that topic. But just a few glosses on Nigel's points, thank you.

ADAM PEAKE:

Thanks, Christopher. Nick, Nick Wenban-Smith from Nominet.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Thanks, Adam. Yes, it's Nick Wenban-Smith from Nominet. For the record, I'm the general counsel. Just in relation to the access of data, we, as the UK registry, I feel I should point out that there is already very good access systems, and we've not ever received a single complaint from any UK law enforcement agency. I was going to say just on sort of governmental engagement, there's obviously an election in the United Kingdom probably next year, well definitely by January 2025. And I do sort of sympathize, I know Elena and I, because obviously we work together very closely, have this ongoing re-education, this sort of the groundhog day of a new set of elected politicians and leaders and that thing.

But I just wanted to make a sort of a small personal vote of thanks really to Nigel, because despite all of the chaos of ministerial changes, there's been one constant individual who has put a lot of care and thought and does actually know a lot about the DNS and put a lot of passion. And when on occasion, perhaps we may come over things from a different perspective. It's always extremely cordial and is an exemplar of government engagement from my perspective. So I just wanted to put that also on the record and say thank you.

CHRIS MONDINI:

Thank you, Nick. Just quickly, because I wanted to let everybody here know in the European space that we've been joined by our vice president for governmental engagement for the European region, Elena Plexida. If you don't know her already, you should. And yes, so thank you for coming.

ADAM PEAKE:

Thank you. And so Nick, what you're really saying is that I do have to give the cake and beer that I promised Nigel and thanks for everything you do. You are the constant in all this changing political world. We want to go on and just talk about some upcoming European events and then resources and contacts. I think we should also think a little bit about how we want to use this space. Would you like another continuation of it? How can we design the agenda? Should it be 90 minutes? It should be owned by you rather than by staff, which is why I've tried to moderate this session in a rather light way, because I want to keep out of the way. And so we have events coming up. Chris, do you want to take this one?

CHRIS MONDINI:

I'm really delighted with the participation, obviously, and we know that a lot of people are attending more than one session at the same time and coming in halfway through and not finding a seat. So I'm really grateful for the time that you've dedicated to this and your attention to the issues and really grateful that indeed it was for, especially for our fire starter volunteers who really jumped in to give a few words to get the conversation going and also delighted by the diversity of people we had in this room and the comments, in fact.

On the engagement team, I want people to know that we really well into the future plan, a lot of events, some of them are live events, some of them are webinar events. These are just a selection. So you can see on the calendar ahead and on the ICANN calendar online, even if a webinar is aimed at a particular, say, sub-region within Europe, it's open to everybody.

So we have active sort of sub-regional groups. And I put this offer out to a lot of groups that if you can gather an audience, if you can get 20 people on a Zoom and you're interested in one of these topics we discussed where maybe ICANN has produced a paper or we have a technical expert or one of our government engagement colleagues can talk to you about an issue, we will endeavor to get you that person for your audience. We do this very well with stakeholder groups and really the outreach is what all of us are doing together. So here's a list of events and topics and webinars.

And just on the last slide, I think I have, I referred to publications. In every presentation I give, I make sure that people know that there are these links that have a whole collection of papers. Again, some in exactly these topics, either from the public policy perspective from our government engagement team or from the technical perspective from our OCTO office of the CTO. So they were quite easy to find. Our newsletters you can sign up for on the homepage of icann.org if you're not there yet. We of course have excellent digital learning platforms. So if you are bringing along a colleague or a new employee or you're trying to help somebody get familiar with ICANN, please check out the curriculum online. And mailing lists, a lot of people like mailing lists, especially people in the German speaking, Baltics and Nordics and Central Europe.

And so Gabi Citek, who may be with us online, but helped prepare a lot of this session, wanted me to be sure to say thank you for your activity on these mailing lists and let that you can join them by contacting her or sending a message to those addresses. Adam will be following up to find out what we do for a future Europe space. We welcome the

feedback and advice. And I'm going to ask Sébastien if you'd like to close this out.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, why not? But I wanted just to add in your program that ICANN 78 without organized by EURALO with the support of Chris and Adam. In English, Spanish, French and Russian will be held the 7th of November from six to eight UTC. That's been 7 to 9 p.m, central European time as we will go into winter. If someone would like to have a slot of three minutes to present what they take from the ICANN meeting, just come to me and I will try to accommodate you in the program. And I just wanted to say thank you both to Chris and to Adam and for your participation all here. But I think it's a good restart of the European space. I hope that we will be able to do that in other meeting. Thank you very much again.

ADAM PEAKE: Just to close here. So I will contact everybody, but of course I don't know who everybody is. I am adam.peak@icann.org. So if you haven't received email about this Europe space activity, please drop me an email and we'll add you and make sure you're continuing. And we have a request from comms. We'd love to have a group picture of you all. And then I'll do that facial recognition thing and find you anyway. So it'll all be good. But thank you very much for joining us. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]