
ICANN81 | AGM – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Work Session
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 – 10:30 to 12:00 TRT

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the ISPCP membership session. My name is Nathalie Peregrine. I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, as well as the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During the session, questions or comments will be only read out loud if submitted within the Q&A pod. If you'd like to speak during this session, raise your hand in Zoom, and when called upon unmute in the Zoom room. Onsite participants, please leave your audio muted as you can use the table mics. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. And I'll now hand the floor to Philippe Fouquart. Philippe, please go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Hi everyone. This is Philippe speaking. Welcome to our ISPCP constituency meeting at ICANN81. You should have received the agenda last week. I think we circulated it. We slightly changed the usual order that we have to accommodate some of the items including the two important issues that we'll be reviewing first, the report on DNS Resolvers and the updates on the revision of ICP-2 that we will receive from our ASO colleagues.

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.

So with this, and maybe before we start, any addition to the agenda that you'd like to see. Feel free to, well, raise that during the AOB anyway. It's pretty hollow, I have to say, for an agenda, but we'll try and accommodate any additions you might have. Okay. Seeing no hand, let's start with our usual updates to statements of interest. Anil.

ANIL JAIN:

Thank you, Philippe. Anil for the record. I just want to inform the community that- Sorry for the interruption. Anil for the record I just want to inform the community that I have updated my SOI because I changed my company, and the new company is also ISP and CPs just for the information of everybody. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Anil. There's some feedback. Is it just me, or-- No, it's gone. Okay. Thank you. Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yeah, I've set up a subsidiary to my law firm providing compliance related services from the DSA and NIS and stuff like that. So it's just been entered into the commercial register, so it's very fresh from the oven, but that's a new thing that I will reflect in my SOI.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Okay, thank you. And that does not change your ISPCP membership nonetheless. Thanks very much. Any other updates? Okay. All right. Let's go to number 2, then, Report on DNS Resolvers. Thank you,

Farzaneh, for being with us. The URL is on the agenda. We would recirculate this on the list anyway. Okay, great. Brilliant. Farzaneh, the floor is yours.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you so much. Hi, everybody. My name is Farzaneh Badii from Digital Medusa. So this research project is about DNS resolvers and consolidation. The title is a little bit controversial to just catch your attention. We are not presuming anything. And so the project is funded by Digital Infrastructure Insights, which is a coalition of foundations that give grants to research institutes and organizations to undertake research on internet infrastructure.

So one of the reasons that we started this project was we heard a lot about how consolidation is happening in the NS resolvers, how it's not happening in the NS resolvers, and we wanted to see whether there is centralization, and if there is centralization, why there is centralization, and if we find out that there is a trend towards centralization, how can we decentralize the DNS resolvers?

And so we all know what DNS Resolvers are, you know better than me, so I'm not going to go over that. So what we did was that we looked at APNIC lab data, and APNIC lab monitors the DNS Resolvers usage, and also whether they are being operated by the network operator and the ISP inside the country, or whether it's a public resolver such as Google and CloudFlare. And when we looked at it, and this the data analysis is done in collaboration by .ie, the Irish ccTLD and Sebastien Castro. So

we looked at the data and we see that since 2022, the use of public resolvers in most regions have halved even.

So there have been like speculations and talks about public DNS resolvers are being used because for example, there's this assumption that ISPs do not provide their own DNS resolvers or maybe it's too expensive or too complex to provide your own DNS resolvers, but this is not what we see in the data. It looks like that network operators provide their own DNS resolvers. But this is a preliminary draft, and also our source of data, we talk about the weaknesses of the sources of data as well. But as you can see, there is this change in usage of regional and globally of the DNS resolvers between 2022 and 2024 which has halved like in almost all regions.

So then we looked at whether there's any correlation between internet freedom and the usage of public DNS resolvers so that when the user faces censorship and DNS blocking, do they use public DNS resolvers more? So we looked at several regions and we looked at internet freedom index, which is provided by Freedom House and Press Freedoms, and there was some correlation between a high percentage of internet users in regions with low freedoms including Central Asia and Middle East and middle and West Africa, they use public DNS resolvers.

So as you can see, there's like this correlations, in Western Africa, we need to analyze the data a little bit more to understand whether there are-- so what are the trends? But the research brought us to a

hypothesis that we need to check. Our preliminary analysis shows a sharp decline in the use of public resolvers.

And our hypothesis is that there is an increase in regulatory pressures and contents moderation requirements by governments. While such requests might not directly order to block access to domain names at the DNS resolver level, ISPs might find it easier and less costly to follow these court orders and government orders through the DNS resolvers. So this is why there might be a trend towards providing local DNS resolvers. But as I said, this is just a preliminary research, it's a draft, and we are looking at other sources of data in order to look at the public resolver usage.

And we also provided a global blocking tracker that is mentioned in the report. We are working on that, we are monitoring which public resolvers gets what court order or government order to block access to domain names and for what reasons. It could be copyright, it could be also like other issues such as like disinformation and misinformation. And also we want to consider the correlation between the size of the ISPs and public DNS resolver adoption in order to see whether it's maybe smaller ISPs start-- they don't provide their own DNS resolver because it's too expensive, but this is just a hypothesis that we will see. Sorry, how much time do I have? Can I just go on?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

I think we said around 15 minutes.

FARZANEH BADII: 15 minutes. Great.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: So you've got another-- so I think 10 minutes.

FARZANEH BADII: I have around?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Another seven minutes.

FARZANEH BADII: Seven minutes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Including questions.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay, including questions. So the that's the link to the report. And if you have any questions or if you have any comments on the method-- yeah, please, Christian. I'm moderating.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I appreciate it. First of all, I wanted to thank you for your work on this. I think that it's very important. My own organization, the Internet Infrastructure Coalition, does a good deal of work in talking to

legislators and regulators about DNS resolver blocking, and what they're always looking for is data. And so having some context to provide to them aids us in our ability to have these communications.

So, first of all, thank you for that. I wanted to note that OCTO has taken an interest in this, and they've assigned Alain Durand to do some gathering of information, and I'll put a couple of links in the chat. One of them is some information that they've gathered. I think it's less thorough than what it is you've done here, and it doesn't have conclusions.

So you see there's still a lot of additive value that you have with the project that you're doing that's well above and beyond the work that they're doing. But I figured that people would also want to reference that. I'm also gonna throw into the chat some work that my organization is doing to try and deal with these DNS resolver blocking issues that could use context like this for people to review.

And the last thing I'm gonna put in the chat is an article from 2014 where Turkish protestors were spray painting "8.8.8.8" and "8.8.4.4." on the walls. And so that's a key example where in this area people are leveraging information about how they can access these public resolvers to give a real-world examples of the kinds of things that you're bringing illustrations to. So most of this is just thanks in context. The only question is how does your work compare to the work being done by OCTO?

FARZANEH BADI:

Farzaneh Badii speaking. So OCTO does a very technical job. We do policy analysis and we do regulatory analysis as well. The source of the data that they use is the same as we use, but this is a problem in this field of DNS resolvers because we have APNIC lab data, and also, we have Atlas, but Atlas data might have some, so we need to like, clean up and look at it. So we work on more like how we also like follow regulatory issues, like how people in around the world, their access to domain names is being facilitated by DNS resolvers and how regulatory frameworks can affect the adoption of and providing public DNS resolvers.

For example, you have Quad9 that is a not-for-profit and is a not-for-profit, but then it gets sued in Germany in order to like block a domain name, and that would be costly. So this would also affect providing multiple DNS resolvers that are not necessarily commercial or are smaller, which is very important for this research and for my future mission, which is about like providing as many DNS resolvers as possible but also trusted public resolvers.

Like we should have many more public DNS resolvers like Quad9. But at the moment, the regulatory framework and the policies that we see, they all kind of point us towards a more centralized and consolidated public resolvers because that's the point of control.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON:

Thanks. Christian Dawson, just for the record to very quickly respond. Thanks, that addressed my question perfectly, and I think that the work

that you're doing is very important and relevant to what it's we're doing. So thanks again.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, please, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks so much. That's most interesting and important. So that's awesome, and we're looking forward to taking a look at the full study. Do you also assess how blocking orders are being implemented, whether they are implemented for certain geographic reach or for global application?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, we look at like the impact, the reason that the blocking orders has happened, what the details of the order is. And so far, the court order or the government order, they do not provide a detail that you should block at the DNS resolver level. So that has not happened yet. But ISPs usually just block at the DNS resolver level. And then we also like look at what are the difficulties of blocking and what are the hurdles to just block proportionately and within the geography that the jurisdiction applies and how it affects global access.

THOMAS RICKERT: This is so fun. Do you also take a look at whether it's independent resolvers such as Quad9, or whether it's resolvers operated by access providers? I mean, they can then limit the block to their own customers,

while for Quad9, it's not possible to discern even the location of the request. So that's one part.

The other part would be whether you also take a look at who's asking for the block because I guess that's quite interesting that we're trying to break a system that is very resilient and stable for the benefit of whom. Is it gambling where the governments have an interest in protecting their citizens? Or is it which I would call altruistic motives if you can call it that, but opposed to egoistic motives by individual trademark owners or service providers.

FARZANEH BADII:

Yes. So for your first question, that's very important and we should look into it. But the second one, the global tracker considers who is asking, is it government order, is it court order, and what issues are at stake? Or is it a law? Like, for example, in Czech Republic, there's a gambling law that, in Australia as well. So the global tracker tries to capture all this, like who is asking to block, for what reason, in what country?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Yes, I do. Well, a couple of comments just to pick up anecdotally on when you say ISPs might find it easy or less costly, I think we all recognize that technically it's a pain to do this. It's all manual, it's PDF court rulings in terms of collecting the domain names.

It's just that we are good law-abiding people. We fall under certain jurisdictions, we have to abide by the law, and we do, but even if we might not agree with the principle of blocking domain names.

Anecdotally, with my operator hat, it's even lower on our networks, it's around a few percent. Certainly, leaving aside the DOH part where we do not necessarily have a clear view, although with the well-known IP addresses, we can have, still, some estimates of that. But that's still, at this point, at least we're talking a few percent on our networks.

And a question, I don't know if it's controversial, but do you think at some point where the public resolvers flourished, there was a question about the business model of those, and given that some of them, not, certainly not all of them, but some of them were not quite transparent in terms of how they would manage or use the user's data that they collect and that there might be in the background monetization of that data, do you think that there may be some recognition that that monetization can be difficult if some of them go bust or something?

I'm thinking aloud, and maybe I'm just off track, but I was just wondering whether that might be a reason why some of them went away and conversely, some users would then turn to the ISP resolvers. Maybe that's something to pursue.

FARZANEH BADII:

Yes, during our interviews, it seems like this is not a very profitable business and providing DNS resolvers. And throughout, if it's not the core mission of the organization, it is not really profitable. But in the beginning the ones that provided it, they didn't have transparent policy and privacy policy and blocking policy.

But now, we are working on best practices on their privacy policy, it should be public, and also they should have transparency reports. So we are trying-- it's not a part of this research, but it was a part of this task force on DNS resolvers best practices that talks about the technical issues on how to operate DNS resolvers, but also like some policy issues, like be transparent, have privacy policy and stuff. Yeah.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

How you manage user data. Okay, thank you. Thanks very much, Farzaneh. We're looking forward to the update. We'll recirculate the pointer. Oh, I'm sorry, Anil, you had question? Sure, yeah. Very quickly if you would, yeah, sure.

ANIL JAIN:

Africa RIR is disturbed for the last two, three years, and right now also, there is no conceal of the Africa RIR, which I think ICANN Org is trying to dissolve it. This may be one of the reasons. Second, in addition to the bulk public resolver, like Google and CloudFare, there are several local levels of resolvers, which has come out at the country level, at the local level. So have you taken that traffic on those resolver also as a public resolver when you are taking this study or not? Thank you.

FARZANEH BADI:

That's something that we need to look into, but thank you so much. This is why we are presenting the research. Thank you. Oh, yeah. So DNS for EU.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Well, for example is one example, although that one's public, well, public, free to use, I mean, but yeah, maybe that's something to look into.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah. Thank you so much.

ANIL JAIN: In India, we have started something public resolver, and we are pursuing people for the cybersecurity reasons to come on that resolver rather than on the public resolver. So I'm just giving information to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Farzaneh. Going back to our agenda, I think we we're on time. What I would suggest is to take item four before our discussion on council issues and benefit from the presence of both Kevin and Esteban. Thanks for being here. Thank you. And we'll have an update on ICP-2.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: So I'm not Herve Clement. Don't pretend to. So I'm Kevin Blumberg. We're both ASO AC members, and I think it's helpful to give a very brief overview of who the ASO AC is because it helps explain the work that we're doing and the role and the scope, which is very important in this process. So the ASO AC is part of the ASO, we're one half of it. It is divided between the ASO AC, which is the volunteers, and the NRO EC, I

love the names all different. The NRO EC is the RIR executives. So you've got the executive council, and you've got the ASO AC, which is the policy.

We are volunteers, there are allowed up to 15 of us, three from each region. Two are appointed, sorry, two are elected, one is appointed. Right now there is nobody from AFRNIC because just based on them not being able to hold elections. There isn't any ASO AC members they termed out in 2023 at the end of 2023, so right now there's no seats. They're there, they're available for them, but right now, that's not the case. In October of 2023, we were tasked by the executive council with two items. One of them was to review an implementation documentation related to ICP-2. ICP-2 in its simplest form, is a document that was written in 2001. It is there to help advise on the creation and formation of new regional internet registries RIRs.

And so one thing that came out of AFRINIC, and this has nothing to do with the AFRINIC scenario, what's going on there. But one thing that came out of it was we realized that this document hadn't been revised since 2001. And many of the documents from back then could use a solid polishing, even terms internet service provider, things like that.

The concepts, the meanings have all changed, and it was worth improving that document. So in October of 2023, we were asked to review ICP-2 and to make a recommendation on new text towards ICP-2 that would then be given to the executive council on ICANN to work out the details, because again, we're not worried about the legal frameworks, we're not worried about we the bylaws or anything like

that. We're just there to write a good, clean, new document. And we were given two years to do that.

So again, this was not about any specific issue going on right now. This was more about a long-term review of ICP-2 for today and for the future. Right now, and we'll go through the phase we're in the ICP-2 questionnaire phase of our first trench, which is the principles. As I'm sure everybody in this room is aware, handing somebody a 50-page document and asking them to comment on a 50-page document goes down many rabbit holes very quickly.

And so our decision was to distill it to the core principles or what we believed what the ASO AC believed was the core principles that were both currently in ICP-2 and should be added to ICP-2, or while they may have been implicit in ICP-2 today, make them explicit in ICP-2 today with more explanation. So we have sent this out both through the ICANN public comment process as well as through the individual RIRs. So you can comment in both places, they're the same principles, same questionnaire, but we wanted to get the dispersion out as much as possible to the communities to ask for, not just do you support or not support a principle.

In some cases, the principles are, do you support your bread buttered up or down? Either way it works. It was the comments that are important to us. So yes, we want to see the support, and at a minimum, that would be very helpful for us. It would take five to 10 minutes to do, I agree, I disagree with the principles, but feedback is especially important to us. So if you do have a moment, the RIR system is very

important, I think, to everybody, not just in this room, but within ICANN and et cetera.

And we want to get as much input that we can so that we can write the right document, because the next phase is going to be providing a draft to the community. And then all of those words are going to be-- every question about every word is gonna be there, and we understand that, but we felt we'd be on a much better footing doing the principles first, then moving on to the draft. This process is going to take 9 to 12 more months. We will close out this public consultation on December the sixth.

There was a request from ALAC for a small extension, which was approved. So this is going to December the sixth, that's not ending. So that's some good news. You've got a little bit of time after. And the more constituents that can put in something as simple as you're doing great work, that is just as helpful because it's showing that people are at least looking. And for us, that visibility is very important. So we would love, obviously some more robust feedback, but even something as simple as thank you, yes, this is good, please continue, is very helpful to us within the ASO AC.

The document is gonna take a while. It's gonna be a big document, and we expect it's gonna be a lot of requests from different stakeholders towards it. We need to be focused, which is very important. We have a very specific mandate. We're not looking to end world hunger, there's all sorts of special interests that are looking to add more to what is a very, very narrowly focused document. So that's our main objective.

Keep it narrow, keep it to what it is there meant to be, and update it and hopefully update it a little bit more than every 20 plus years. So, Esteban, did you want to add to that?

ESTEBAN LESCOANO: Oh, just to invite you, your companies and the associations you represent to participate in the public consultation that is open until the 6th of December as Kevin mentioned. For us, it's very important to have the input of the community about those principles.

KEVIN BLUMBERG: And lastly, we've done this, and I've got to be very careful about the word global because a lot of people understand, we have a global policy development process within. This is not global policy development, but that's only IANA to the RIRs. But we are trying to be as global as possible in terms of the outreach and consistent. So again, we've done it both with all five of the RIRs, we've done it with ICANN to get as much reach out. Each of the RIRs as an example, we have gone to and done presentations on in the case of-- there was an AIS summit in Africa, we had two ASO AC members who went and presented there.

There was a dedicated webinar that AFRINIC set up which is great. And Herve and myself did an update for the community and answered questions for the community. And if you have questions, by all means, I'm happy to talk about anything related to the process and what's going on. Because we are in the questionnaire phase, which principle I

think is the best, or a question related to the principle, I don't think is appropriate because we want your natural inputs.

But any questions you may have about the process, about how we're doing things or any recommendations, we had a meeting with a GAC working session related to Africa on Sunday, and any input that you can give in terms of how we can do better outreach, we're open to that. And if there is any suggestions for outreach or for anything in that regard, we're very open to that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Kevin. Thanks, Esteban. Any question? So mostly on the process as I understand it, rather than substance. Yes, Malcolm.

MALCOLM HUTTY:

Thank you, and thank you for the presentation, and yes, I would like to echo that do not underestimate the significance of this, everyone. This is one of the big ones, actually. This is one of the core fundamentals. If you're not gonna speak to any of the substance, my question is when will we be able to engage with somebody to ask them about the thinking behind the substance so that we can actually reflect in a meaningful fashion before putting in our first thoughts on uninformed thoughts in reaction. But actually to us, why are you saying this? What was the thinking behind this?

-
- KEVIN BLUMBERG: So we will be producing a report of distilling all of the questions, the comments, et cetera, post questionnaire closure.
- MALCOLM HUTTY: Is there gonna be an opportunity before we get to put up our feedback in, to actually ask you for an explanation?
- KEVIN BLUMBERG: I don't believe--
- ESTEBAN LESCANO: The idea is to reproduce this document that is a document that in some way reproduce the current principles of the ICP-2. This document is for consultation, the consultation is a public one. So in the case of ICANN, you can see the response in the webpage. And we will provide a report about the feedback we receive. And finally is, we are planning to have a final round just with the complete document in order to receive a new feedback from the community. But that's all.
- KEVIN BLUMBERG: Okay. So, might be helpful. One of the things that we have seen at this ICANN is we need an FAQ, we need to do a better job of explaining some of the fundamentals, no question. The problem is that individually as ASO AC members, it's very difficult for us to comment because of the number of different stakeholders involved in this process.

So I could very easily say X, and a constituency group within ICANN could say, well, actually, based on the bylaws, it's Y, and then the RIRS could say, no, it's Z, no, it's this. There's a lot of back and forth that goes on, even with the most, what would seem simple request about something. And that is why we're looking at the feedback from the community, because we expect that they will have their own interpretations and their own limitations and restrictions. It makes it more difficult, I absolutely understand that.

Unfortunately, we can't within any reasonable timeline. And part of this is we would like to do this in under two years. I believe the last one similar to this was the ccNSO that added it in some things, and that was a 10-year process. So we're trying to fast track some of this work, which is also difficult because of that. I think the draft will help inform, and there will be a lot more discretion once the draft comes out. But we're trying to also be as clean as possible with the principles to not insert our own bias into this process.

MALCOLM HUTTY:

To be honest, no, I have some concerns about that process in that case. Honestly, if we don't have time, I will yield.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Yeah, I think we've got just a couple of minutes. But what I would suggest is then maybe-- I have the same sort of questions and I'll skim through the proposed draft. Certainly, I think, well, first I suggest that the constituency spend some time on this at the very least. But I can

see an output along the lines of, yes, we support the principle, but I'm gonna pick up on one of them.

For example, when you say that the corporate governance of an RIR should comply with good common practice within the jurisdiction, well then if one RIR, just thinking aloud, follows international financial reporting standards, and then another one uses other standards, is that a problem? I suspect that we may have questions as comments. We might have questions rather than substantial inputs, but maybe that's fine.

MALCOLM HUTTY:

I mean, even identifying commonalities throughout the region. I mean, thinking of the RIPE NCC here, you're talking about best practices in the European Union, best practices in Russia, best practice in the Middle East. They're all within the RIPE NCC service area. Those best practices are likely to be directly different to each other.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

Those questions are actually awesome and definitely want them. I do have an answer to that, partially to help. The point of this document is not to actually point to what the specifics of the each individual RIR is, just that they are done. There is going to have to be coordination between the RIRS to what is acceptable internally because there's a lot of commonality between them.

But regionally, each RIR will need to stand up as an example, their own processes and audits at what is acceptable in their region. And that will

need to get buy-in both from the communities and if some of the other principles are adopted and it is third parties that are auditing as an example, those would need to be then acceptable to the auditors as well.

So there's a number of principles that we've put in there, but ultimately, we, with this document are not going to heavily prescribe, we're not gonna heavily prescribe technology, which is another request that's come in because technology changes. And so within the wording itself, they will absolutely be an expansion of the wording to support what you're sort of talking about, but ultimately ask these questions because that is absolutely valid.

Our limitation, and this is the hard part, is going to be to do it well enough that it's explained and everybody is comfortable with it. But at the same time, to give the latitude to both the ICANN and the RIRs who are really the key parties in this. The communities are key, but ultimately from a contractual point of view, those are the two parties that really are involved in this.

MALCOLM HUTTY:

Well, that actually is really one of the key things that is I think, being consulted on here because the RIRs are bottom-up communities, and this is reestablishing them as subordinate bodies to a central authority that the NRO, which was previously essentially the club of the chief executives of the RIRs is now becoming a super vein in authority that can derecognize. And certainly, the first principle that any proposal to

recognize or derecognize must originate from the NRO EC. That is not a back bottom-up process, that is a top-down process.

I would like to hear an explanation for why that approach was taken, whether the other was considered, what were the problems seen with a bottom-up approach, what possibilities for implementing a bottom-up approach were considered and how that was done. All those sorts of things before I come in and say, actually, you know what? I don't like the sound of this change. I want to hear the explanation for it, I want to hear the justification maybe be persuaded.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Sorry we have limited time for this, but I think what we'll do is that as we said, we'll put this as questions, and at the very least they will illustrate that those principle, if anything, can be read as, for example, on the turning of upside down the sort of bottom-up process is it could be read as this, and maybe that's bad. It's just four pages, people should be comfortable with the amount of effort that's gonna be put into this. We've got four weeks, so that's reasonable. So I'll suggest that in addition to, well, Mark and myself, please come up to the list and express your interest on this and we'll put together a small team to develop something.

KEVIN BLUMBERG:

Just to add, and this is maybe a little disingenuous, there are hundreds of hours of open discussions related to these issues. That specific principle was discussed a number of different ways, and ultimately

that's what we presented to the community. If there's feedback as to why you're unhappy with that or why potentially you're unhappy with it, please include it. Because ultimately, the ethos of what we're looking to do is improve the document, not take away from the document. And while it may read to you like that in terms of the principle, the final text or the draft text that comes out to the community may have a better explanation as to some of the safeguards that go into it.

From my recollection, there are issues where one community could impact another community in a completely bottom up. So there's a balance of individuality, there's a balance of everything else that was put into that, but that is a valid concern and it is absolutely worth bringing in through this questionnaire.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Kevin. Thanks, Esteban. I think we can stop here and we'll discuss that in the small team and try and come up with-- thank you for turning up and giving us the background. Time check, we will probably run five minutes over time. So we'll go back to item three now. The important item after that is that we need probably five minutes for the pilot holistic review update. The rest of it could be taken to the list. So there's no rush really. So going back to point 3 now, I'll turn to our councilors. Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Sorry. Osvaldo for the record. The consent agenda for the council was modified. The Motion to Adopt the Revised Charter for The Permanent

Standing Committee on Continuous Improvements was moved over to a discussion on about in the council.

The Motion to Defer the Rights Protection Mechanisms Phase 2 for an Additional Six Months, I think we talked about that on the last meeting because it was postponed due to the policy status report. Now it has reached an agreement and the idea is to defer it until the phase one implementation review teams finish their implementation of phase one recommendations. So it would be for an additional six months till next year, first quarter of next year.

Then The Motion To Adopt The Revised Charge Of The Standing Committee On Continuous Improvements, the reason it was taken out of the consent agenda was because on the proposed members of the standing committee, there were two NomCom appointed councilors instead of three. The non-voting NomCom appointed councilor was not included in the group, and the NomCom appointed councilor, non-voting, it said that it was discrimination between the NomCom appointed and they should be treated all equally. As it is, the standing committee membership is very big. So I would propose either to maintain the two or to take out the two NCAs and leave non, because in the charter of this committee, it says that each member should consult its constituencies and the NCA have nobody to consult to, so I don't know. It will be discussion in the council.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Osvaldo. Yeah, there was some discussion on the list, I think on the council list, on this. Well, speaking personally, I don't necessarily

have a view. I would just note that as a committee, it reports to council, so all councilors will have a say anyway. It does not take decisions on its own. I'm not sure I understand the rationale for having NomCom appointees. But then maybe that's just me not understanding. Any views on this? Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

We have agreed that Osvaldo would start and I would chime in on these smaller teams. So I happen to be part of the CCOICI, just so you are on top of the acronym game. This charter that we're discussing here also includes a name change. So we are renaming the CCOICI to SCCI. So that's going to be the same thing because the CCOICI was a pilot and we're now transforming, or if council agrees, we're transforming the pilot into a permanent institution inside the GNSO. And I agree that there is some hiccup around the composition.

I think it's important to note that in the charter, we have two places where we talk about composition. So the SCCI itself has members, and that would be one member for the CSG, but the registries, registrars, and CSG, they also have one member only. So we would need to see how we get along with that. So I think it's not ideal for us, but it's a matter of fairness that we don't try to reflect our special situation and try to get our will. That's my humble opinion. This is why I have not opposed when this was discussed in the team. I mean, you can see it differently, but since even the registries and registrars only get one person each, that's maybe a sacrifice that we need to accept.

But the SCCI also has an overflow mechanism because what we saw in the CCOICI is that basically we had the entire council on that team, and it doesn't really make sense to have the same workload in an effort to reduce the workload for council, but then aggregate the same number of people. And that's why we wanted to be very conservative in terms of participation in the SCCI. But we can all read, we can all talk, so if there's something going wrong or off track in the SCCI, I think we should chime in through the council level and through our CSG representative.

The other layer, I promise to talk about two layers of membership is the task force layer. So we have this overflow mechanism if there's too much for the SCCI to be done, then task force can be appointed. And those task forces can be stuffed with more people. So if there are any topics that are of particular interest for our group, it's not unlikely that these will be delegated to a task force. And I think that particular matters that weren't a special type of expertise where that might be above the pay grade of the SCCI members, task force might get installed.

So we would need to keep an eye on what the SCCI has on its table and then proceed to send delegates to the task force if we feel the need to be more active in that regard. Then the council is basically the controlling committee tasking the SCCI with work. And we have a decision mechanism included in the charter, and that's what we already know, like for consensus, and this different levels of agreement inside the group as we know it from PDP work.

So in all, I would suggest that we do not oppose against the acceptance of this charter. And again, this is not on substance, but it's basically a mechanism to allow for continuous improvements in our community, and on substance, there will be separate discussions and separate decisions to be taken.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Thomas. This is Philippe here. Any other views, anyone that would consider that we should oppose? Okay. Seeing no hand, I'm looking at the Zoom room. Okay. So we'll support it. I will just time check. It's 25 minutes past. I'll note that there are a couple of other motions which could just mention them. At least I note that the direct critics is up for a vote as well.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

There are two motions for both. One is to accept the final report on the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on Internationalized Domain Names EPDP IDNs Phase 2 report. Phase one report was accepted by the council and sent to the board. And phase one was on top level domains. Phase 2 is on second level domains. The report has gone out for public comments.

The comment had been included in the final report, and now it's just waiting for approval by the council. I don't see any particular issue with this. It has 14 recommendations and six, would you say indications, recommendations for the IRT, not recommendation itself. And then the item five is initiation of a policy development process for Latin script

critics, this has been discussed a lot, is just that in Latin languages, sometimes an accent might change the word, might have another meaning.

But some of them, they have no different meaning with having or not the accent. And there is in particular the case of the Quebec domain that wants to have the accent. So they want to have the both of them. And the idea is to initiate a PDP to see when Latin diacritics be considered words with Latin diacritics may consider the same word or not. And so this is to initiate the PDP. It has very much been requested.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks. And I think we can support this. And there will be--

MAEMURA AKINORI:

I'm curious about the success rate of this voting. Is it likely to be passed or still going to the discussion?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

The question is it likely to pass? I understand that we're at a stage where well, there's some consensus that it should move forward. That's my understanding, yeah.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

I think it has to go ahead. I don't see much obstacles.

MAEMURA AKINORI: Okay. Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Akinori. Yes, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: So we had agreed that Oswaldo would talk about the general agenda for the upcoming meeting and I would talk a little bit about the small teams. So I've given you a little bit of information on the SSCI. The other team that I'm on is the RDRS standing committee. I think for the sake of saving some time because I could just report on the progress. There are no decisions to be made, and there will be a report on the RDRS during the GNSO council meeting.

But there's one thing that I want to note, and that is that we inside the CSG, we have this composition of being together with the IPC and BC, and we had the CSG meeting or meeting with including the CSG on Friday. And there was a meeting between the CSG and the Board. And the way I operate inside the RDRS is that I'm keen on making this a success. The RDRS is a pilot at the moment. There are stakeholders that would love it to be more open in terms of disclosure, and this is where it becomes a little bit challenging because the RDRS is a mechanism to relay requests to the appropriate registrar for checking the disclosure.

There is no guarantee under local applicable laws that disclosure will be made. And yet, Steve Del Bianco and Steve Crocker talk to the Board and say, well, this is all a futile exercise if we don't get a high degree of

certainty for disclosures. And that's just irreconcilable. Either we want something that is compliant with applicable laws, and then we can't guarantee disclosures, but we can just help make the system better, more consistent, and all that.

And so I have difficulties inside the CSG, because I don't want to create the constant impression to the outside world that we're in disagreement on certain points. But just so you know that I'm advocating for this to be compliant, but yet that we're fully supporting it, but that we can't really help with broadening the scope for disclosures.

The other thing that I think we should discuss more, maybe not now, but at one of the upcoming meetings is that during the discussions on Friday, the BC IPC pushed for more work on accuracy, they pushed for more work on fighting against DNS abuse. And they want to reopen the discussion on the definition of DNS abuse and also work on CSEM and these things. And we've cautioned against talking about CSEM because CSEM is better dealt with by law enforcement in collaboration, particularly with hosting companies.

THOMAS RICKERT:

And most US law enforcement, to give a concrete example, to my knowledge as president many years back, was they never take downsides, they always keep them up a sting operation. And if we went in at the ICANN level, dealing number one with content, which we shouldn't, and number two, working on policy to suspend domain names that have to do with CSEM, which would likely be the result we

might be interfering with the local strategies against CSEM, freeing victims because sometimes, or often this is evidence of ongoing abuse and also interfering with law enforcement investigations. So I found it unfortunate that we discussed this, we said we don't want it.

Then there was a meeting between the CSG and the contracted parties where Mason again brought up CSEM, and there was huge pushback from the contracted parties, and then when we discussed this with the Board, CSEM was still on the slides and being discussed with Tripti chiming in and all that. And I think we need to find a way, given all the different views that we hold in this stakeholder group, that if we agree something in preparation for meeting with third parties, that we can rely on the result of the discussions being reflected in the presentations that are being made.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Thomas. We've got three minutes. I think we'll take that to the next meeting. I don't want to elaborate on the meeting we had with the Board. I think we should take the soundtrack as well into account, and I think the sound, well, in my view, the soundtrack was ambiguous in that respect. And I've got my own reading of the CPH CSG meeting. Thanks, Thomas. Thanks, Osvaldo.

What I'd like to do with the two minutes that we've got left, let's just note that the webinar series calendar is on the website. We had a session on Saturday, thanks to ICANN Org and staff for supporting it. It's been really useful and quite successful. Yes, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: We've got till 12, not few minutes left.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Oh, I'm sorry.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: It's an hour and a half meeting.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Ah, okay, good. I thought we had just an hour. That's brilliant. I love that. Thank you, Nathalie. So in that case, well, it doesn't change anything on the GNSO webinar series unless you would have to add something else on-- I think the membership is aware of this. Again, the calendar is on the website. The few of us who would not be aware, please have a look, please shout on the list. So then, we can take the next item and spend more time on this. It's item five. It's a pilot holistic review.

Given the topic, I saw Tony, oh you are online, and since you were appointed on the cross community group, I put your name first. Apologies for this. I hope you don't mind. And maybe we could start with a brief outlook of where we are, Anil, feel free to chime in, and we'll have a discussion. Tony, can you hear us?

TONY HOLMES: Yes. Good morning to our colleagues in Istanbul. Can you hear me okay?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, we can hear you. Thanks, Tony.

TONY HOLMES: Okay, thank you. I've been struggling a little with the sound during this meeting, so I won't even attempt to put my camera on, that would just eat up the bandwidth. So please excuse me for that. So the holistic review has had its kickoff meetings.

We've had a few meetings now. And as for all new initiatives, this is really focused on organizational issues, the work plan, terms of reference, the deliverables, and the time plan itself. A lot of the focus is on the effectiveness of the CIP, the Continuous Improvement Program for SOs, ACs, and NomCom. And it's been noted that this requires a high-level overview of the relationship between the ATRT3 REX and the CIP itself, and then of course, the holistic review. So the deliverables are defined in the terms of reference for the holistic review.

I would urge everyone to have a look at those terms of reference. There are 12 deliverables in total, and one of the things, one of the early tasks we've done is to group those into various buckets to be progressed. So this work is gonna go ahead quite quickly now, certainly in the new year.

The draft report is scheduled for mid to late May, and then there will be a comment period. And the final report to the Board is due in December, 2025. So we've really got six months to do all of the initial work, and then the further months of the year to put that into a form after the public comments and get the final report to the Board.

Now, one of the things I will say here is, there is a need to manage expectations as to what really is going to be the outcome of the holistic review. In the past, the ISPCP have discussed the need for a holistic review many times including we've had discussions with other constituencies, and particularly those within the CSG. It's already clear that the holistic review won't deliver what the ISPCP has discussed in the past. That is where we've looked at it almost from a blank page approach without assuming the structures created. And these were created more than 20 years ago, are still the best approach.

This holistic review is more a review of the effectiveness of the existing structures and how that relates to other organizational reviews and the CIP, and to fix problems that we identify within that, it doesn't look at alternative structures. And that really came about due to the outcome of the ATRT3 and the Board resolution that kicked off the holistic review. So I know that there was several attempts to broaden that out, particularly in ATRT3.

And I know that Osvaldo tried quite hard along with others. He may wish to comment on that. But what will come out of this, I think, is that the issues related to one of the problematic areas that we've struggled with and discussed at length in the past, and that is the CSG structure.

That's probably gonna have to wait until the next GNSO review before that's discussed in any detail. So the focus is really on the effectiveness, making the current organization a lot slicker, making sure the interactions between the various constituent parts improve and trying to look where the weakness is.

And if you look through the deliverables that are listed in the terms of reference, that really is where the focus is. So, as I say, it's early days, we are just getting underway. We've still got the bulk of the real work to do. And obviously as that progresses, then I'll keep the constituency up to date during our meetings so that everyone is aware of where we are. So I hope that's a good background, Philippe. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Tony. This is Philippe here. Thanks for the update. It's certainly a bit frustrating for those who would've hoped that at least some thinking about the structural relevance of the organization were given some thinking, but that would have to wait, I guess. Any questions or comments. Anil, you wanted this to be on the agenda? Anything you would like to add on these updates or comments?

ANIL JAIN:

I think Tony has covered everything. I was just looking and listing this very carefully. So the entire structure has been decided, the deliverables, how we have to approach this particular thing in five buckets, and timeframe is very challenging. By June, we have to

complete this and then we'll go in the process. So I think it is a very interesting thing.

And one thing, what is in their mind is that whatever is happening as an organization review may be replaced. So they will directly go to CIP and then CIP will send their inputs to holistic review. That is how it is designed. Now, depending on the discussions, things may slightly change. Thank you. Nothing more.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks. Thanks, Anil. Yeah, I find the timeframe quite telling of the ambition that we can put into this in terms of the structural elements. And there's just no way that in six months a review of the structure can be undertaken. And I can hear some frustration not only within the CSG, but also in other SO/ACs. So we should see, but I guess that if anything, there's some improvements on the efficiency of our procedures, then that's time well spent. But then that does not spare us from a broader reflection on the relevance of our organization as a whole. Any other comment? Osvaldo.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Just a small comment, something that worried me in ATRT3, and then when we were defining the terms of reference for the pilot holistic review is the ATRT3 recommended that the holistic review substitutes the organizational reviews. So we have to be careful because we have been waiting for the GNSO review for many years, it's been delayed, and

if this goes ahead as the ATRT3 recommended, we won't have a GNSO review in the near future or in the far future. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: True. Thank you. And I do remember that the rationale for deferring the GNSO review was precisely that the holistic review could take a broader outlook on the whole ICANN structure.

TONY HOLMES: Just to come in there.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, Tony.

TONY HOLMES: Yes. So I also remember those discussions, and it's quite disappointing that if you look down the actual deliverables that have been specified, there's very little opportunity to undertake anything that would be really meaningful in terms of structure.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Tony. And yet another reason for not being optimistic in that regard, I guess. So I suppose thanks Tony and Osvaldo for the update. We'll come back to this at our next call, I guess, and have regular updates, maybe not in December, but maybe January. Anyway, that's something that we should definitely monitor moving forward.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Next item, we've talked about it already, that's the DNS webinar series. I'm not sure there's need to come back to it. Let's go to item seven. It's a while ago, and I think it might have been within the leadership only, not on the list. We talked about the new ITUT call for inputs on the WSIS+20 review.

There's a questionnaire that's distributed with a deadline end of January. You would remember that earlier this year, we responded to an ITU questionnaire. And well, several of us would think that it would be a good opportunity for us to chime in again on this. We could convene a small team to make sure that we draft a response by the deadline, we still have some time. More on the substance, Christian, would you like to give us a bit of background?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I'm happy to frame that out a little bit, but I don't know that we need to go deep into the work that is necessary in order to complete it, other than to say that we have, like, as you said, we have until January to produce content in this survey. A lot of the questions you have determined even in the conversations that we've had simply on the leadership list, are similar to the ones that we answered in the first cycle. And Philippe has actually produced a document transporting

much of the language of what we've already done into as many of the questions as possible that are in the existing survey.

So, should you wish to join us in a small group to put together a set of answers that we can provide to the WSIS+20 review survey, we are not starting with a blank sheet of paper. We are starting with a, in a place where I would suppose that around 70% of the content that we wish to submit is already in place in the framing document that you've presented in which we can make available to the wider group. I think that this work is important for us to do.

We have an important voice I believe that will be listened to by those that are driving this process at the WSIS+20 review within the ITU. And we have very important things to say. Next year is going to be a key time in ensuring the security and stability of the ongoing multi-stakeholder model. And the work that we do in order to make our voices heard could really help ensure positive outcomes in WSIS+20.

So I would say Philippe and I are already signed up to engage in this process. We've got a starting point where approximately 70 to 75% of the work that is necessary to take us to a submission in January is already done. We can let you into that document and help us get the last 25% of the way in preparation for a January submission. What I proposed is that we get together with a small group and try to come up with a draft that we could present to the group at the latest by early January, so that the wider group had a little bit of time to review things before we submit.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Christian. This is Philippe. And the background document you can find on the website, it's public. You'll find it under the policy statements page. Anyone interested? Oh, right. Previous. Let's just close on this one if we could. So again, those interested, please indicate so on the list. Yes, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tony has indicated in the chat that he's interested.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. Thank you. So we'll add Tony to the list. Thank you, Tony. And Susan. Thanks. Anyone else? Okay, with a view to coming up with something and providing an update in January on this.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Yes, this is Christian for the record. I will take the document that we have produced, I will let Tony and Susan in, and the four of us and whoever else reaches out to us, we can do that iterative work and prepare it for wider submission.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay, excellent. Thanks, Christian. Item closed. Thank you. So back to you on the GNSO webinar series.

YAZID AKANHO:

Yes, thank you. So this is Yazid speaking for the recording, representing the ICANN Technical Engagement Team. First of all, thank you really for setting up the training that we had on Saturday. It was quite interesting. We sent a report, I mean, a survey, a questionnaire yesterday. So far, we got three feedback. We do hope that by the end of ICANN meeting, we will get more feedback and we'll definitely report to you about the insights that the participants have shared.

After the training, we got five requests in term of participation to the challenge, this is also quite interesting. So they are currently getting the challenge. We got some questions that my colleague [01:19:10 - inaudible] and myself have responded to. So this is the latest updates that we wanted to share with you. Thank you again. Back to you.

SUSAN MOHR:

Hi, this is Susan Mohr for the record. Yazid, thank you for joining us today, and thank you for your great work and helping us getting organized and also for your presentation. I thought it was well presented. We ended up with I would say between 10 and 15 participants, which I think was really a positive outcome given that there was competing with several other events that were happening at the same time.

Our next webinar is on December 2nd, and I'll be reaching out to you, Lars and I will be reaching out to you to make sure that we've got our speakers coordinated. And hopefully, I think we're very hopeful that we'll have a similar response to our first webinar. So I think we're

excited for the partnership and excited for the webinar series to start. So thank you.

LARS STEFFEN:

Thank you, Susan. This is Lars for the record. Couldn't agree more. So thank you very much and thank you to the entire team that made it possible also, who are working in the background to put up the webinars online, providing the registration links and things like that. So for those who are interested, if you go to the ISPCP website, on the right-hand side of the website, you find a small widget where you have the calendar where you just click on the respective webinar, and then you can sign up directly for the upcoming webinars. Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Lars and the team for the session on Saturday, it was really interesting as well as not only the hands-on session, I would say, but also the question-answer part which was enlightening, I would say. Thank you.

Moving on then, so I'll just mention the item eight, the project management portfolio for those of you who would like to have a broad outlook of the various policy work items under council. As usual, a reference point to have an inkling of the amount of work that this also is taking on. And as a side note, I found the session yesterday to congratulate the ARTs very-- it's more than useful. I think it was not only

very pleasant, but we sometimes miss the opportunity of celebrating our successes, and I think that was a good thing.

Moving on. Next is the-- I don't think we need to spend time on the public comment page because we talked about ICP-2 already. So we are now on the AOB. One thing I'd like to mention is that idea of trying to plan our constituency calls or at least have some dates for the year rather than meeting of a meeting. Susan, would you like to say something about that?

SUSAN MOHR:

Thanks, Philippe. This is Susan. Yeah, Philippe and I just discussed putting together a full year calendar so that we could look out for the year, know our membership meetings are taking place, the crop funding deadlines as they come up for the ICANN meetings, the dates of the meetings, when our ISPCP meetings are, we would include our webinar series, the election that comes up in the fall, but just something that we can look out and have a good idea of what's coming and see if we can't get that published either publicly on our website or on the membership page. So I'll work with Brenda and put that together, and once we have it, we'll share it, and hopefully that'll help all of us kind of stay on track for the year.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Susan. So it's now five minutes to the hour. We are done with the agenda, but rather than adjourning now, I suggest we go back to our discussion. And my apologies, I cut off because I thought we would

have to adjourn at half past, but I think we can use the five minutes for that discussion. I'll take the point about the reference to CSEM. Speaking personally, I found that the focus that was put during the discussion at the joint CPH CSG session, I don't know if this soft means something in English, but it does in French, overblowing one part of the argument to discard the whole thing.

I don't think if you, well, as far as the discussion is concerned, I did not interpret it as criticism or an implication that nothing was being done on this. I heard it as something that would unquestionably be something to combat. And I think the way it was presented with the Board was along the same lines. I don't think there was an intent to point at the contracted parties as complacent in that respect. That was just my perception of the discussion. Maybe the reference could have been taken out.

I think the intent was essentially, well, it's to have the same slide deck between the two. But indeed, we could have- and on the procedural part, yes, certainly, I think there's a case for saying that the slides that will be presented should be formally approved by the CSG if they are indeed presented as the CSG at the CSG meeting with the Board. But that's all I can share about the way I personally received that for what it's worth. Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

So I've been in these discussions for 25 years now, and the BC IPC have a particular agenda, which aims at, in the long run, broadening up ICANN to content related issues and making registries and registrars

take down websites, and that being enforced by ICANN Compliance, that's the long-term goal. This is why they want to talk about more contract amendments in addition to the one that we've recently had where we're still waiting for first evidence on the efficiency. We knew that this would be a delayed take off of the results, but still, they're pushing already now for the next contract amendment and for a PDP and for rediscussing the DNS abuse definition.

And I think this is a red herring because everyone agrees that we want to fight CSEM, and this topic takes up so much energy in the room that it, I think it's just unfortunate that we're discussing this with the registrars and the registries. And I agree that the reaction was a little bit high handed, but that's exactly what happens all the time, and also with the Board, and I mean, this was one aspect where BC IPC went off script.

I mean, Lori was rambling on and on and on about her personal grievances with the reconsideration process, and I think that's just not appropriate. I don't want to be represented that way as a CSG. I mean, Lori is going to be gone in a moment, and I think that with John McElwaine, it's going to be a different season, but maybe we can also use the opportunity of change of leadership to discuss a little bit about the way we work together and the way we present and the topics that we're going to discuss.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Thomas. Fair point. And yes, Malcolm.

MALCOLM HUTTY: I wasn't there for this meeting, but I've experienced that kind of behavior in other fora on this topic. I think we should be giving Thomas our strongest support on this. CSEM's always a difficult and emotional subject, but seeing your comment earlier about the experiences and learnings from InHope, deals very effectively with any optical senses that might prove unfortunate in challenging the more emotional attacks. I think we're in very good hands. Let's back Thomas all the way on this. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Malcolm. Santanu.

SANTANU ACHARYA: Thank you, Philippe, and good day to all. Philippe, I just want your permission to bring one point that Continuous Improvement Group have asked to all the SO and ACs, whether one line from the principle of ICANN can be eliminated or so. If we agree, then I can put it on the chat. I was supposed to send this to all the members, but today I think we have some little time and we can discuss. And if it's required, we may discuss elaborately more on this, but as of now, what is there that most of the groups, most of the SO and ACs have agreed to that, and if you have said that, we'll go with the majority decisions. So in case if you agree, I can put it on the chat, what are the discussion they're asking? So I put it in the chat.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes. What would be even better, I think rather than-- thank you Santanu for the comment. This is Philippe here for the record. Would you please share this with the list so that if there's clarification to be made, people can ask questions? That would be easier.

SANTANU ACHARYA: Sure, sure.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Great.

SANTANU ACHARYA: Definitely. Yeah.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Santanu. I guess back to the-- yeah, Christian.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Back to the topic that we were just in, I simply wanted to take a moment to go on the record supporting Malcolm's comments there, giving full support to Thomas's perspective in this area. I also feel as though because this is such a heated topic that is happening within the Commercial Stakeholders Group, and we are going to be a different voice within this constituency, it's very important to frame this in the kind of way that Thomas thoughtfully brought up to us. And we're

gonna end up being an appointed voice in this area. So I wanted to give him my full support on the record.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Christian. Any on the comment? Yeah, Susan.

SUSAN MOHR: I will shut that off. Thank you. This is Susan Mohr for the record. I appreciate the comments as well, and I think I would recommend that if-- it seems to me that the work around the RDRS is going to proceed with the Board, irrespective of how that may be presented and how the IPC and the BC discuss it and push it forward, as you pointed out, that that is going to move forward.

And so if we have an alternative view, or a view, on how it should proceed, then perhaps we should bring that up in the next call so that we can constructively come up with recommendations and thoughts for what our counter view is to their positions. So that would be my suggestion.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Susan. Yes, RDRS, think we can put that on our December call and discuss this further. Okay. Thank you. It's now four minutes past the hour, I think we can adjourn the meeting. Not yet. Okay. Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT:

I'm sorry, there's one topic that I need to bring up on the registration data policy. So what you should expect at the public GNSO Council meeting tomorrow is that I'm going to give a quick update to the entire audience on the IRT as GNSO Council, the liaison to the IRT of the Registration Data Policy. There has been a drafting error in the Registration Data Policy that already went through public comment, unfortunately.

The issue that we have is that the mechanism according to which the registration data policy is designed, spells out which data elements need to be processed. And that suggests to the outside world that everything that's not mentioned does not have to be processed. But there are things in the existing specification to the registrar accreditation agreement whereby certain data elements inevitably need to be escrowed. So it's silent on those elements, but we want those elements to be escrowed in order to have the security and stability preserved.

But then there's the billing contact, which is not mentioned in the policy, which suggests that the billing contact also needs to be processed. However, the RAA specification says that the billing contact needs to be collected. And so we have one instance in which the data policy is silent and we want the data to be processed. And we have another element, the billing contact, where policy is silent, but we don't want that to be mandatorily be processed.

So we're now looking for ways, because I think it's uncontroversial that there should not be any binding requirement to collect the billing

contact that the data may be collected. And we're looking for ways that are procedurally sound either by an advisory to the registration data policy saying that it needs to be read in that way and that this was a drafting glitch, or maybe we can even find consensus in the GNSO to say, okay, we're going to fix these three words in the policy itself without needing an advisory. And my suggestion to us is that ICANN indicate to Council that our group is okay with whatever way is appropriate to do this so that we can fix this issue. Thank you so much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Thomas. Quickly, any? John, I think we can move on with this. Okay. Thanks, Thomas. Looking forward to the council meeting as usual. Nathalie, I think we can thank everyone, and close the meeting now. Thank you. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

Thank you all. This meeting is adjourned. MTS, please stop the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]