
ICANN81 | Prep Week – ICANN Board Engagement with Community Work Session
Monday, October 28, 2024 – 6:00 to 7:00 PM TRT

FRANCO CARRASCO:

Hello and welcome everybody to the ICANN board engagement with the community work session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Interpretation for this session today will include six languages, which are English, Spanish, Chinese, French, Russian, and Portuguese. You may click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. All participants in this session, I kindly ask to state their name for the record and to speak at a reasonable pace. If you wish to speak or ask a question during the session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. Org staff will monitor the queue and you will be prompted to unmute yourself when the host calls on you. Having said all this, I now hand the floor over to the ICANN board chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Frank. Welcome, everyone, and thank you for joining us online today. It is a privilege to open this new community board engagement session ahead of ICANN 81, our annual general meeting in Istanbul. As you know, this session is an opportunity to reinforce our cooperation and work together on topics that are very important to ICANN and for our future. For the next 60 minutes, there will be two breakout room discussions hosted by board members and the

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.

discussion in each room will focus on a different topic. We will spend 45 minutes in these breakout rooms. In room one, led by Becky Burr and Chris Buckridge, you will explore what a future new gTLD program might look like if applications were submitted continuously, similar to ICANN's approach for other programs like registrar accreditation. Our key questions to consider include what advantages, if any, are there to maintaining the round-based system? What challenges would arise from a continuously open new gTLD program? Are there alternative models that could address the identified issues? And given current priorities, what is a realistic timeline for developing policies on this issue that would allow for this different approach?

In room two, Maarten Botterman and Wes Hardaker will lead another important discussion to try to understand the community's perceptions of RDRS after nearly a year of operations, particularly whether the community agrees that the service could be a suitable permanent solution for access to registration data. This feedback will help guide the board's next steps in discussions with the GNSO Council regarding the future of the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendations for a system for standardized access and disclosure. So we very much look forward to hearing your input and perspectives on these topics. After the 45-minute breakout room sessions, we will all come back together to listen to a summary of the different rooms presented by the board shepherds. So I will now ask our support team to explain the logistics of the breakout rooms. Franco, I return the floor to you.

FRANCO CARRASCO:

Thank you, Tripti. For everybody, to select a breakout room, please click the breakout room button in your meeting control below. This button will be visible once the meeting host opens the breakout rooms, which will happen in a couple of seconds. If you do not see the button, please click on the More button. Choose from the list of the two rooms provided. Hover over the desired room, click Join and Confirm. Click Rink Room to return to the main session. You may repeat this as necessary. If you need help, you may click on the Ask for Help button in the meeting controls and then click Invite Host to notify the host. The breakout rooms will not be recorded, live-captured, interpreted, or transcribed. Instead, we will have work staff monitoring each breakout room and taking notes. You will be able to move freely in and out of the breakout rooms if you wish to change topics, or you can spend a full 40 minutes in each room. After 40 minutes, we'll all return to the main room where the board host from each breakout room will debrief the audience on their respective breakout room discussions. The summary discussions will be transcribed and interpreted. Please join now the breakout rooms as we're going to start. Thank you.

Tripti, the breakout rooms are closed, so everybody is now back in the main room.

TRIPTI SINHA:

All right. Thank you, Franco. Welcome back, everyone. So I hope you enjoyed the engagement together. I tried to go back and forth between the rooms a few times and noticed that you were certainly engaging. So we're going to spend the next few minutes listening to a recap of what happened in each breakout room. So I'm going to turn it over to Becky

and Chris. Could you please share with us your summary of the discussion in Room 1 and the topic being the future new DTLD program and what it might look like? Over to you, Becky.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Tripti. We did have a very lively conversation talking about the advantages and some of the issues that need to be resolved before we can move to a continuous round, a continuous processing operation. I think a number of questions were raised regarding applicant support and how much time would be needed and how much learning is needed until we get into that point. I think the consensus of the room was that it's important to start talking about all of these issues and making sure that we're understanding the issues that would go into that, probably premature, certainly premature at this point, to make a decision at this point, but that being proactive, thinking about this, discussing these issues now is the way to proceed.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Becky. Any other further comments on this from anyone else? All right. Hearing none, let's move on to Wes and Maarten. Could you please share with us a summary of the input you received with regard to the RDS, which has now been in operation for close to a year? Over to you, Wes.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, thank you very much, Tripti. So we heard many comments from various different perspectives. We'll dive into them. But one of the

things that we heard was that something like it is needed, and more importantly, its existence is still better than what we had before, but it is still a voluntary system, and that makes it challenging to measure metrics with a voluntary system, and it's unclear if we continue this toward the future that a larger policy would be needed to make it mandatory was one of the comments that we heard. And, you know, unfortunately, the RDS doesn't resolve the legal questions about whether or not data can be released and handled, that that is still, you know, subject to the data providers in the first place. And one improvement to that would be there seem to be strong thoughts about the need for authentication to be able to make sure that requesters are able to request the data and can be properly identified as a member of an organization that is in need of such data, and it should be released to them. Maarten, do you have anything you want to add?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Very quickly, one little addition. This is really a time of the pilot where we do try to get it right and better. As Wes said, overwhelmingly, such service is necessary. It's just how do we get it as good as possible? And for that reason, just encouragement to make sure that your voice is heard and that your experiences, if you have any, are shared as well, because this is the time to optimize it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wes and Maarten. And I'm looking at the clock. We still have 10 minutes, and we're actually, believe it or not, ahead of schedule. I thought the summaries would take a little bit longer. So this is such a

rare opportunity to interact in this manner with the community. So is there anything that anyone would like to say before we adjourn? Please put up your hand if you'd like to share something. Yes, Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

I think just at a very high level, I would like to say I am very impressed with the board, thinking through how they can do major process improvements to the new gTLD program. It's entrepreneurial thinking. It's proactive thinking. It's not reactive. It doesn't even matter really where we end up on the decision. It's just the fact that the idea is being introduced. Y'all are looking at these businesses processes as a business. And it's not always been the case. And we have a, I just think we have a good strong board that's really got their thinking caps on. And I just wanted to say thank you. It's impressive. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you very much, Paul. We really appreciate it. And indeed, this is a hardworking board. Thank you. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Yes, hi. And again, thank you. We really appreciate being involved in these discussions. Just a couple of high-level observations. I would ask that the board think really hard about the effect of the elimination of contention sets entirely on funding for applicant support and grant programs, because this is a long-term question. It's not whether we currently have X millions of dollars in auction proceeds to fund these programs. It's about our reputation globally and what our long-term

plan is for a grant program that we just started recently and the ASP program which did not do well in 2012. So if we could get long-term thinking into how the elimination of contention sets might affect those programs, that would be great. Then with respect to RDRS, although I wasn't in that breakout room, I'm a member of the IPC. I've heard a lot of discussion about what would be called a failure rate with respect to RDRS in terms of the number of inquiries that are not yielding information for legitimate interest. And so that is something that I think, I'm sure this was talked about in that session, that the improvement in the rate of responses that are effective for the legitimate interests should definitely be a goal. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you very much, Anne, for that input. Wes Maarten, I'm assuming you've taken down that input. Thank you. I see heads nodding. Others, we've still got another seven minutes and I'd like to use this time to hear your input. Don't be shy. There are 200 of you. Surely there are opinions. I can't believe this. No hands are going up. All right, so maybe we are exhausted and done for the day. So once again, thank you very much. Oh, Sébastien. All right, go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I would like to thank the board for the opportunity to share about this topic. And I'm pretty sure there are many other topics that could be put on the agenda, not only those that are linked to what is being done with GNSO. I think that we need to, with all the stakeholders, and I am afraid that the way things are starting is the GNSO and the board and the other

entities are added. I think we have to hear everyone. I think it did work in the past. I think that we have a great interpretation tool. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Sébastien, I missed a few seconds of your input because it took me a few seconds to get my interpretation in place, but thank you very much for your input. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Tripti. I just wanted to say on behalf of the At-Large Committee in ALAC is regardless of where we fall on either side of the conversation, I would like to thank the board for initiating this community engagement sessions. I think they're very valuable and I certainly hope that the board will continue this practice into the future. Thank you very much.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Justine. We did do this as a pilot at the last meeting and it is proving to be very informative and valuable. So at this time, for certain, we look to continue this. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Hi, yeah. Just one other comment. This has been talked about, this silo breakage that has happened first in the pilot and this time is something that had been talked about forever. And I'm really glad to see it happening for the opportunity to people to, in a non-siloed manner, actually talk to each other on a specific topic. I think these topical things

are good. Perhaps they should even happen more often than the once in a blue moon that is the periodic meetings. But since they are a hybrid function that is easy to set up when there is one of these topics, you don't have to wait for the next meeting. You can just call a powwow. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Avri. I would like to point out that once in a blue moon and periodic meetings are contradictions in terms, but anyway, we will continue for certain. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm actually going to, I think, follow on to what Avri said. I found certainly the RDRS session that I was in very useful. It strikes me, however, that it would be more useful if we can continue this dialogue, that the board does not go back into its silo and continue deliberations without the opportunity for feedback and input from the community and vice versa. I think some of these problems are solvable, but it really needs to be a cooperative venture, not just an occasional talk and then disappearing back into the silos. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Alan. I don't believe we intend to disappear into our silos. The whole intention here was to actually engage this kind of active conversation. So, but we, it's good to know that you like this and we will definitely continue. That is our intention. Jonathan Zuck, I'm gonna give you the last word. We have about two and a half minutes left.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Tripti. Jonathan Zuck here. I guess the one observation I would make, and I think these are great sessions and we should find ways to continue the conversation, is that having drifted back and forth between the two, because we had people assigned for each conversation, I feel like in both cases, the thing being discussed suffered from a lack of definition of goals kind of, or metrics. Every time I bring up metrics, it makes everybody's eyes roll. But I mean, it was interesting in both instances, not knowing what we wanted is part of what made it difficult to measure success. So in the case of the RDS, RDRS discussion, the reality was that the requester community, for lack of a better term, wanted more efficient, more predictable access to restricted data. That's what they wanted out of RDS. And that wasn't necessarily the question, right? And that wasn't even necessarily something solvable by ICANN, but I think there was an assumption there that if this was standardized, that it would lead to greater efficiency and hopefully predictability of those requests. But given that that wasn't a sort of a stated goal of RDRS or measured in that way, it became a conversation of talking past each other a little bit. And then in the context of rounds and versus continuous applications in the other session, it's similar as well, because people are kind of spitballing things that might be the result of different aspects of each of those solutions without saying, well, here's our five things we want to accomplish by making this decision. In other words, here's what we want most out of this program. And so therefore, which would be the better solution given these five objectives or something like that? So I don't know, in both cases, it felt,

that was my observation, that the absence of concrete goals convoluted the conversation.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Jonathan. Basically, if I understand you correctly, you're saying let's state the goals upfront and measure against progress, right? Against those goals.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, good input. Thank you very much. This brings us to the end of our 60 minutes session. Again, on behalf of the board, thank you very much. This is extremely important to us and thank you for the kind words about the board. We appreciate that as well. It's always nice to hear that. And we will now see you in Istanbul. Have safe travels to everyone. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]