
ICANN81 | AGM – Joint Session: ICANN Board and ALAC
Monday, November 11, 2024 – 16:30 to 17:30 TRT

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello and welcome, everybody. My name is Franco Carrasco, and I am the participation manager for this session. Welcome to the joint session between the ICANN Board and the At-Large Advisory Committee. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Interpretation today for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic. Please remember to state your name for the record and the language that you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please also speak at a reasonable pace. The discussion today is between the ICANN Board and the ALAC only. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience. Having said that, I will now hand the floor over to the ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Franco. And welcome, everyone. This is our third constituency bilateral meeting, and when Leon and I were coming up the stage, Jonathan Zuck comes up to us and he says, my favorite Board members. And I know, I know, I was gonna put you on the spot for

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.

saying that. And Leon and all his political wisdom says, and you are her favorite electorate. So with that context, I turn it over to Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Tripti. Welcome, everyone. Welcome to everyone in the ALAC and in the At-Large community. Thank you very much for being here. Well, let's kick it off and have a productive meeting. We have two questions from the Board to the ALAC. I think these are important topics or at least I identified as important topics for the ALAC and the At-Large community. And we would like to know your thoughts on this specific topic. So if you have anyone that's been designated to answer the first question and so on and so forth. So do let me know who's gonna take the first question?

FRANCO CARRASCO: I'm prepared.

LEON SANCHEZ: Is that Hadia?

FRANCO CARRASCO: Yeah.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. And so do you want me to read the first question first?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yeah, I mean, I can read it. "In addition to the resources that Org has provided, is there anything else that the ALAC or the At-Large community needs to bring applicants into the next round from underserved communities?"

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Leon. So we would like to highlight two key issues that we find important for encouraging applicants to join the next round of new gTLDs, as well as one suggestion to ensure all successful applicants are supported.

So the first is with regard to awareness and outreach. The limited time available to promote the final version of the ICANN applicant support may result in few, if any applications from underserved communities or applications being submitted late, which would jeopardize their chances of receiving support for the upcoming ground of new gTLDs as funds are only available until they are exhausted. To address this, we suggest, but I would also point that currently outreach engagement and the media group focus on specific countries. And again, since the program operates on a first come, first serve basis, this approach may disadvantage certain regions.

So we suggest addressing this issue to ensure more equitable access. We also suggest more information about the current outreach and

engagement activities, regularly scheduled regional and local specific campaigns, both virtual and in person to raise awareness about the application process. These sessions could address the unique challenges that are specific to each region or community, and offer guidance on budgeting and technical considerations, highlighting all the non-financial support that ICANN is providing and how to make use of it. Second, provide information about the next round of gTLDs and what it entails to operate a gTLD registry.

In addition to establishing a feedback loop or feedback loops for continuous improvement where applicants can share their experiences with the application process, this could be used to better tailor the program as we go along to specific regional needs. The other point that we would like to bring to your attention is related to the financial support provided by the program. So we suggest some kind of long term operational or financial support through introducing mechanisms for continued financial support beyond the initial application phase, especially for applicants from less developed economies such as a phased funding model where financial support is provided at some key milestones.

For example, additional grants could be provided during initial operations setup or for promotional activities post-launch. This could happen through opening up the grant program to support subsequent operational costs for successful applicants. We would also support inclusion and supporting inclusion and recruitment of more local service providers across all areas of pro bono services.

Lastly, because the program operates on a first come, first serve basis, we suggest that if the number of successful applicants exceed the allocated budget, the Board considers increasing the available funds to ensure all qualified applicants are supported. With that, we thank you for the opportunity to provide our feedback.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Hadia, these are great ideas and great suggestions that could also trigger a wider discussion within the community. I think it's worth touching base with other constituencies and other parts of our community to try to bring in them or bring them into the discussion and see how the community could actually enable these suggestions that that you're making.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Hadia. And I just want to note one thing, which is in our conversations with the GAC, we have agreed that we're going to take some pauses and do clear reporting so that we understand where the applications are coming from, make sure we're getting support for underserved regions, but also just as the guidelines suggested, the Board has committed that if it looks like the funding is gonna run out, that there are gonna be more than 45, we will look for additional funding. We can't write a blank check at this point, but we're very much on the same page that we want to support applicants who need support and qualify for it.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Becky. Chris, do you want to add something to that? No? Okay, good. So let's go with the second question. ICANN's new CEO will come on board in December as you have already heard, what do you think his top three priorities should be and why? Please be as concrete as possible.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Leon, for the question. And thank you Board for the question. Again, always pleased to be here to speak to the Board directly. In terms of, I know you asked the top three priorities, but there's just so much to be done, so much challenges that we're facing at the moment. So I'm gonna try to summarize what would potentially be the top three priorities.

Now, in respect, well, of course, I have to give due respect to Sally because I think she's done quite amazing job in the interim. And it begs that we hope that the new CEO, not being directly from the community per se, would be able to bring fresh perspectives to addressing some of the problems and challenges that we are facing at the moment. And we fully acknowledge that some of these challenges are often competing, so we have to find a way to balance this and that, what this person wants and when that person wants.

But in terms of the top three priorities, we think that the new CEO needs to lead a review to ascertain how best to strengthen and secure ICANN's sustainability. And when I say sustainability, I mean operations, financial, as well as governance as a multi-stakeholder model. Now again, we understand that these broad goals often compete with each

other. So I think the best would be to find an acceptable balance, take it as a holistic approach, but through consultations with the community in order to get buy-ins from the community for compromises, really. I think at the end of the day, compromises is what we are looking for in order to make something really happen.

And amongst these, in terms of securing ICANN's future, you'd be looking at things like having to boost income, controlling costs. And in respects of controlling costs, we understand that there's this how we meet discussion that's ongoing, but we would like to urge the Board to take into consideration, and obviously, the new CEO to take into consideration that it's not just about cost as a primary goal, we need to look at meeting strategy in terms of the purpose of it. So it's not just cost as the primary or cutting costs as the primary purpose of the exercise. There needs to be a way to manage the community, the need for the community to keep being engaged as well as cost, obviously.

Also multifaceted sustainability in terms of like climate change, equity, human rights, I don't think I need to delve into that a little more than that. And the showcasing of multi-stakeholder model, I think that's something that's resonating from our At-Large community. In fact, that is very important to us. And we note that there's something new out called the Internet Governance Advocacy Project, so I personally would be very interested to follow what is the progress and what is the purpose of that and how that would pan out.

Second priority would be to play a key oversight, problem solving role in ICANN's upcoming major initiatives, including the next round and the

applicant support, making sure that those two programs stay true to their purposes. Again, balancing the needs of the community as a whole against the interest of applicants. Second one would be pilot holistic review or the group of pilot holistic review, continuous improvement program, as well as the holistic review. I'm not quite sure where that is going, to be honest.

It's a little bit confusing for me, but hopefully that will be cleared up. And I think one of the things that came out through the At-Large deliberations is also the possibility of a ICANN geography region's review in that process, if that's possible. And the last priority would be looking to set and possibly achieving, obviously trying to achieve, agreed standards, timelines for various operational activities, and trying to lead ICANN outside of its bubble a little bit more.

And steps like this could be including creating a dynamic roadmap for more timely, quicker ongoing examinations or developments, impacting the namespace industry, market demand, trust in the DNS, new technologies, either to innovate and or to protect against threats. And in particular, I'm referring to things like Web3, AI. Identifying and adopting concrete efforts for a robust green strategy. How we would do that, I think you would get some input from the green group discussions. Establishing objective measurable targets for any such initiative and striving to stay ahead of the curve.

And lastly, consistently, effectively communicating those action items, the progress outcomes, any lessons learned, and how to build on those

such action if needed. And please include the community in all these things. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Justine. That's quite a list. I hope that Curtis listens to the recording and takes note, but thank you very much. I think these are very sensible topics and that they definitely need to be looked into by the CEO or the incoming CEO. I don't know if there are any reactions or comments from my Board colleagues or we're good. Okay. So now let's go to the questions that the ALAC wants to have the board answer. So who from the ALAC is going to-

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thank you, Leon. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So I'm tasked with asking this question. The At-Large community meets every week in a consolidated policy working group call which is effectively the vehicle that we use to build policy responses to consultations, but not only consultations in the public consultations, but also statements that eventually sometimes end up on the desk of the ICANN Board.

One of the topics that we've constantly had to grapple with, especially when it comes down to issues of DNS abuse, of the use of domain names in a certain way that might actually include the way it's used, which basically means content is this problem that we see with the Board having to adhere to the bylaw that says the Board does not deal with issue or ICANN will not engage in issues and matters relating to content. Yet, when you look at systems like the UDRP review, that relies heavily,

I guess on the review of content, and it's the whole use of domain names. And so we're kind of trying to work out within ourselves how the Board sees this now, because there are two ways to interpret it.

There's a loose way to interpret it, which then allows for the UDRP review to live within ICANN or there is a more strict way of interpreting it. And as soon as something remotely relates to content, you can just shut it down and say, sorry, we're not going to deal with it. So it'd be really, really great to have some clarifications and some understanding of how the board thinks now about this. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Olivier. And for that, I think we have two very talented board members that would like to speak on this. I'll go first to Becky. Becky, please.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks for the question, and I'm sorry to say this requires us to review the picket fence, so bear with me. The 2016 bylaws basically included description of what ICANN's mission is, and they say that ICANN can create policies for which uniform policies are required, and they specifically reference Annex G1 and an Annex G2 in the bylaws.

Annex G1 and Annex G2 in the bylaws are the picket fence. So the picket fence is within ICANN's bylaws. Then the 2016 amendment to the bylaws included a prohibition on regulating content. So in order to know whether content is fair game for ICANN, you have to look at Annex G1 and Annex G2. And Annex G1 is the picket fence for registrars and

Annex G2 is the picket fence for registries, and they differ in one phrase only.

So they both say that within the picket fence is topics, issues, policies that are within the picket fence include registrar policies or registry policies that are necessary to implement consensus policies and resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names as opposed to the use of domain names.

That's what the registry agreement says. The registrar agreement has a little gloss that says, but including where consensus policies take into account the use of domain names. The UDRP requires you to look at how the domain name is being used in order to determine whether you have a good faith basis for it. So the UDRP has been within the picket fence since 1999 and there was a specific call out for looking at the use of domain names in order to make an assessment related to trademarks. Because in order to determine whether you're using it that way, you have to look at the use to see if it's bad faith.

So the explanation for why ICANN can administer the UDRP has nothing to do with the fact that WIPO or some other third party does it. It has to do with the fact that it is that looking at the use of a domain name for purposes of trademark issues is within the picket fence. So that brings us back to the 2016 amendments that says, basically, otherwise I can't regulate content. And I'm sorry for that long and technical explanation, but it has reminded me that maybe we need to have a warmup, a reminder session on the picket fence. I think Sarah has more to say, but.

LEON SANCHEZ: Please, Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Okay. Just to take things up a level, I think maybe we'd like to hear more about what you mean when the question says more detail on where the Board stands when it comes to the issue of not dealing with matters that are related to content. So we are very sensitive to the content issues, so yes, the UDRP is in the picket fence, and so therefore it's clearly inside ICANN bylaws.

But when we talked about the registry commitments, for example, that's a very good example where we were concerned that maybe ICANN couldn't enforce those commitments if they included content. And so it was important to veer away from that. But on the other hand, we do have to deal with the content in that because ICANN has it outside the bylaws, much of the content regulation and the risk to the community in general are coming at from outside. So we do monitor and discuss issues where content is key.

One example that we've been discussing, or I've raised with the Board are recent US efforts to have DNS Resolver Services, ISPs, registrars, registries get involved in blocking a foreign website. So there's all these content risks that come up, and we monitor them, so if that's what you mean by involvement, but we would like to hear more.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So thank you. It's Olivier speaking, so indeed, yes, the latest version of the bylaws are from 2016, and they do introduce this point regarding

content. The UDRP predates this though, so do you see any conflict between the latest version of the bylaws and the UDRP? And secondly, monitoring is one thing, obviously, but do you then mean that ICANN will never, in your view, have any further power than just monitoring and just saying, well, I'm not even sure if you're allowed to say if it's good or if it's bad, but just monitoring things and saying, okay, we'll just let it be. I don't know what the consequences are of that.

BECKY BURR:

So I don't see a conflict between the 2016 bylaws and the examination of the use of content for purposes of the UDRP, because it's specifically called out. The picket fence, those Annex G1 and G2 have been in the registry and registrar agreements since day one. They're sort of the fundamental compact by that enabled commercial operators to say, yes, I'm gonna give you sort of proactive authority to change my obligations without having a one-on-one negotiation with me.

Contracts are generally agreements between parties who sit down at a table, and if you want to change obligations under a contract, you need to amend them. When in 1999 we put this together, we recognized that there would be a need to change these. And so, that is why the concept of consensus policies and the picket fence was created, was to enable the obligations to evolve over time as the internet evolved, but still provide sufficient certainty for registries and registrars to operate businesses. But because this is specifically called out in the picket fence, it's covered.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Becky. Thank you. Sarah, do you want to add something.

SARAH DEUTSCH: From a risk perspective there, if a law or regulation or treaty passes that targets ICANN directly with a content issue, we would need to discuss, what would we do, right? I mean, they do need to comply with law, and if it was a content issue, I think that would be an interesting discussion. So far, we've been avoiding that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Sarah. Thank you, Becky and Olivier, for this. We have a second question from the ALAC to the Board. I don't who's gonna take us through the second question, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it's me. The nature of this question, I guess has to do with the boundary between the bilateral negotiations take place in contracting and the involvement of the community. And it seems as though the level of involvement of the community in contract negotiations, like the how early they're engaged for commentary and what input they have and what visibility they have into those contract negotiations has varied quite a bit over time. And I think that there's just a concern that more and more is being accomplished without community engagement than was previously the case. And so I think we're trying to raise in a general sense a concern over the community's role in those contract negotiations diminishing and wanting to kind of raise a flag about that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Jonathan. Becky, please.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Again, picket fence. Sorry. I actually don't think that the community's involvement has been diminished over time with respect to these, and I'll give you some history on this. I do understand that the community is concerned about that the recent DNS amendments were bilateral negotiations between the contracted parties. There was a sense there that as our discussions about DNS abuse had evolved, there was some low hanging fruit that we could actually capture, agree on, put into the contracts and give the ICANN Compliance more tools with respect to that. So we grabbed that opportunity to do it.

But basically, the community has full authority to change the obligations in the ICANN registrar accreditation agreement and the registry agreement through consensus policy. If a consensus policy is passed and that has the effect of imposing new or changed obligations on contracted parties, you don't have to do anything else, it applies. Other than that, the fundamental rule, and this comes out of the picket fence, is that the regular rules of contracts apply, parties negotiate, the parties to the contract, negotiate.

So in the base agreement for the 2012 round, the original contract was negotiated between ICANN and the contract parties. It was put out for public comment, and then we had a very weird thing, which is at the end, we had a whole round of new changes right at the very end that was anomalous and imposed from above. And I'm not gonna go into a whole wrap about why that happened. But the contracted parties in

ICANN Org negotiated the agreements and then they were put out for comment, and the community's comments were taken into account.

In the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement, a contract that I have way more familiarity with than anybody would ever like to know, that contract negotiation took 18 months. It was preceded by a sort of demand list from law enforcement, which I think the community had a lot of sympathy for as well. And at the end of the negotiations, the contract was put out for public comment. It went back out for public comment after it was changed to reflect that. And there was visibility to the community in terms of webinars and discussions and stuff during that 18-month process.

But again, it was fundamentally a negotiation between the registrars and ICANN. So I don't think we've strayed from that with the exception of these recent DNS amendments, and the notion there with the way we got to get those done was, this isn't the end of the discussion, but there was an opportunity to make some progress and get some improvements and give compliance more tools, and the terms under which we agreed to do that were in this negotiation process.

But we've said from the beginning, that's not the end of it. We wanted to grab those amendments, grab those improvements, and there's always been the concept that there could be these micro PDPs to get additional changes. So we want to preserve the fundamental structure, which is the community has authority with respect to changes through consensus policy, otherwise the negotiations are between ICANN and the contracted parties.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Becky. And we don't mean to seem ignorant about those distinctions. Obviously, we're aware of the picket fence and the distinction between bilateral negotiations. And I think there's a perception about how the commentary from the community is received and dealt with and that that process is transparent and communicated has changed. And then also sort of what falls within and without can blur.

I mean, the most recent issue to come up has to do with breach notices and things like that, and whether that's something that ought to be part of a community discussion more so than a bilateral one is one of the things that came up most recently that sort of brought it back to the surface for us. So we're not unaware of these sort of gross distinctions that you're bringing up, it's more kind of what the utility of the public comment process appears to be, and then also if there are certain topics that while they might not fall into those appendices could stand with more community input because of the broad implications they have around security. I think that's kind of what's brought the issue back to the fore for us.

BECKY BURR:

So I would love to understand a little bit more about the breach notice issue because I'm not quite sure I understand that. I mean, I know you're not meaning to call them gross distinctions because they're not important, and I think the registrar accreditation agreement in 2013 was a very clear example of-- that final contract changed three times based on three different community inputs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We look upon that time fondly.

BECKY BURR: That was because you were not part of those negotiations, I can assure you. So I want to reassure you that from all of my involvement in these negotiations, the community's input has always been sought and has been seriously considered. But I also just want to-- I mean, maybe this is a gross distinction, but the distinction between changes by consensus policy versus bilateral negotiations is really the fundamental deal that contracted parties made with ICANN in order to give up authority to ICANN. And so, when we belabor this issue and work to protect that fundamental deal, we're really working to protect ICANN's legitimacy because if we violate that, we're breaking just the basis of ICANN's legitimacy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think we have any desire to break that. I mean, I think that's what I meant is that I think we understand that fundamental deal. It kind of just has to do with the Board's relationship to the rest of the community and the role that you're playing within that, or the Board or Org and the role playing in that bilateral negotiation, more so than the idea that it shouldn't be bilateral. It's about the effectiveness and utility of that public comment process as a way to influence how one side of that a negotiation is taking place, that's all. I don't think it's about bringing a third party into the negotiation.

BECKY BURR: And just one final thing, I think Sally sort of mentioned this, the IRT is discussing right now, issues that arise because of the SubPro policy. So the SubPro policy is directly feeding into, that's obviously what the IRT is discussing, and they are in the course of that talking about contract changes that arise because of those policies.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Becky. Thank you, Jonathan. So that's the last question we had from the ALAC. And we still have some time, we have 25 minutes to spare, I guess 24. So I don't know if you are interested in maybe touching upon another topic.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Should I take one out of the bag?

LEON SANCHEZ: Absolutely. Yeah, why not?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so here's one. So it's Olivier, here's one, we'll take out of the bag and just put it on the table. So in the last round of new gTLDs, the ALAC was afforded the ability to file community objections through a process by which it had to develop among the community and effectively go out there, review the applications, and if required or if asked by a part of its community to then find the a whole process if you want, with safeguards and so on, to make sure that it reflected the view or the wider view in the At-Large community. So it did file while they had

requests for several objections, and one of them actually was filed through, and at the end it was rejected by the system that the panels because of the point that the At-Large or the ALAC did not have actual standing for filing that community or limited community objection.

The reason being that there was no direct contractual link between the affected community and the ALAC itself. And it's one of these interpretations which then left us a little bit concerned because effectively we have this ability to engage a process which is costly as well, because there is a filing, and the legal costs involved, et cetera. And at the end of the day, it gets thrown out because the ALAC doesn't appear to have standing to even file that. What we're looking for is a solution to this. And so, the question to the Board is, how can we resolve something like this? I wouldn't go as far as to say, well, the Board needs to get the ALAC to have standing to file those objections when it provides the ability for the ALAC to do this. But maybe there's another solution or maybe that is the solution, I don't know. Over to you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Olivier. So we actually discussed this during our workshop this last days, and we had a thorough discussion around the issue. I mean, short answer that might not satisfy, of course, your input at this point is that we would need to go back to the community to shape the policy that would actually enable, if at all, to have the standing. But I know that Becky is also wanting to add something to this. So, Becky.

BECKY BURR:

Sorry, I mean, the bottom line here is that the ALAC has automatic standing for limited public interest objections. The ALAC has standing if it can demonstrate that it meets the requirements in the community objections providing automatic standing in the community context is related to Nexus.

And we think it's reasonable to demonstrate, and we think that there may be circumstances where ALAC could demonstrate that it had Nexus for purposes of standing, but it doesn't automatically. And I think if you went back and looked at the places where the elect did file and was found not to have standing, it would provide a pretty robust explanation. If you don't have Nexus, the question is, we've said you have Nexus for purposes of limited public interest, but for community, it's not so clear. So you need to demonstrate it.

LEON SANCHEZ:

And just to add to what Becky just said, our conclusion during the workshop, if I'm not mistaken, was that we needed more guidance on the ALAC side as to better understand where do you want to get, where you're standing, where do you come from? And I mean, it's definitely not shutting down the discussion, but the other way around it's to engage in a dialogue that could help us better understand this topic, this issue, and try to find a common ground solution. So, but you want to add something to that, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No, thank you, Leon. It's Olivier speaking. So I think that it's a good starting point to actually-- I would like maybe a small group of us to engage with the Board and maybe also with Legal to find out how we can resolve this issue. Because one of the big problems with volunteers is if you're going to bring volunteers into a process and they're going to spend some significant amount of time doing things, and at the end it just crashes because of a technicality or because of something that was unforeseen, it does bring this feeling of soreness and feeling of, well, we've wasted our time doing things and it doesn't help with involving people in the process.

So obtaining clarity so that we don't have this unforeseen event that certainly cuts the grass from under our feet would be really, really helpful. So maybe that's a kind of, as a next step. If we could do that, it would be helpful.

LEON SANCHEZ: Absolutely, Olivier, thank you. And let Becky remarks be a teaser of what we think would be the next step, which is to further engage with the ALAC to flesh out a plan. Yes, Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was just putting words in your mouth. Thanks for bringing out this community Nexus issue. I guess that's what we should work out so there's predictability of the process for us. I think that's Olivier's point.

LEON SANCHEZ: Great. Good. So we still have some time. I don't know if anyone wants to raise any other topics or questions from the ALAC.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'll take the time if we have it. I never want the Board to be bored by us, but there's a study that has the acronym informal that has finally come out, but very, very recently. So I don't expect that you've all read and absorbed it or anything that OCTO commissioned some time ago on the indicators and the things that tend to lead toward malicious registrations of domains, basically. And one of the issues, this has been talked about quite a bit, is volume purchasing, bulk registrations, deep price reductions, et cetera. It felt logical and it sort of has shown itself out statistically in the study. And the study recommends and looked at areas where friction was created in certain instances around these types of registrations.

And so, I guess it's just a heads up. I know we're on the fast train related to the new round, but I think we're going to try to work with the GNSO to look at this issue of bulk registrations in the timeframe of the new round to see if there's something we can do that isn't overly cumbersome, that along the lines suggested by the paper to introduce some friction in the context of these bulk registrations, because it can have a dramatic effect on the attractiveness of particular domains for malicious registration.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Well, thank you. We, the Board also obviously follows the reports from OCTO, and this is one of the important things, and we are aware of that. So thank you for your future contributions in creative ways of thinking about it. But we had also recent discussion during this Board workshop about the risks that are coming from such registrations. And the thing that is seen in wild as I would say, is attacks based on the AI tools that also can use the domain names, create a huge number of domain names in a very short time span, use them to create a huge number of attacks.

Obviously, also the shield is evolving, so many of the AI based and machine learning based tools are also there to protect networks. So this is something that Board is aware of, we are looking into it, and thank you for contribution. Obviously, as you know, security and stability of the internet is very important for us, but it's evolving thing, and the domain names are one of the key vectors that attacks are created. But domain names are our remit.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Danko, and thank you, Jonathan, for your input again. Any last shot?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Maybe another question from the bag. One last one. Okay, alright. No, I'm actually being prompt to ask, so, okay. Olivier again. So the last one is about the, I think, successful workshop that the Board had during the prep week. Which I think if any of you have missed, you should be-- well,

you can't review because it wasn't completely recorded. But the way that it worked was to have an introduction and then we divide into several subgroups. And we were wondering as a group, several people from the At-Large community took part, and we wondered whether the Board already had any feedback regarding what they had heard during that prep week session, whether there's anything you could share with us.

TRIPTI SINHA:

So you said the Board workshop, I think you meant that session where we-- Okay, yeah. So that's the second time we've had that. We had it once before. The first time it was considered pilot. This is closer to a production one. I think it's going to remain because it's been quite popular. I think if we take it away, there will be a mayhem. So I think it's here to stay, and I think what-- yes, be careful what you pilot. And I think the one feedback we got was someone said, I wish I could attend all the set breakout rooms. So the only way we do that is we have separate sessions and a series of them. But I think it's here to stay.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Chris?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE:

Yeah, thanks, Leon. Just wanted to note as so I was moderating one of the breakout rooms where we were talking about the potential to move to a steady stage round rather than the staged rounds of new gTLDs. So I really wanted to say thank you to ALAC for coming to that session with

some really well thought out and considered inputs to that. I think it remains very early days for that discussion, but it's something that is good that we're beginning and it's good-- well, it was great for us as the Board to see ALAC so engaged intellectually with the challenges and possibilities of that discussion. So thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Chris. Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: I led from the Board side on the discussions of how to improve our interactions. So this is one of the outcomes. Also, the Board receives after ICANN meetings, policy outcomes report that is very important to-- it's public obviously, very important to record the conversations in the prep week and also during these sessions. But we need more feedback.

It's complex things. As Tripti said, there are-- drives to have more sessions, but also on the other hand, we have limited 24 hours a day, and if you add too much to the prep week, it'll be again, more burden in the community and everyone and on the Org staff that needs to prepare the ICANN meeting that's coming. So we need more feedback and we will continue to think how to innovate and evolve the interactions to make them better.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you to my colleagues who have provided this feedback, and thank you Olivier for asking the question. And we still have 10 more

minutes to go, and I think we have one last question. Edmon, would you like to pose it? Yeah, this goes both ways.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Edmon has a bag, too?

EDMON CHUNG: Since we have time, and this is one thing on the Board I've been very eager to push forward, which is the ethics policy. So we posted a draft, I think it should be-- hopefully it's welcoming, but would like to get your feedback, even if not now, definitely the public comment period is open. So this is something that I think the ALAC should care about, obviously.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, and well, as Edmon has said, it's not for you to answer right now. Maybe it's something that you want to take back and further deliberate. But yes, Justine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It frankly wouldn't be ethical for me to answer without that deliberation. But we will, for sure.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry, just to add to that. This is Justine. I can safely tell you that within our Operations, Finance, and Budget Working Group, we already have a

number of volunteers that are looking at this policy proposal, and you will definitely get a statement from the ALAC.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. And thank you, Edmon, for raising the question. Good, so I think that's it for today. Thank you everyone for your engagement for this interactive session. I think that in the end, we have grown better in having this dialogue and this conversation more interactive as opposed to staged or sketched, and that makes me really happy and I hope you are happy too. So thanks, everyone. Back to you, Tripti, to close the meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Oh, thank you. This has been a great exchange, and we look forward to our next meeting. And Jonathan, continue to keep us your favorites.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Of course. Thanks for the opportunity. We appreciate it.

FRANCO CARRASCO:

MTS, please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]