
ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils
Tuesday, October 20, 2020 – 12:30 to 14:00 CEST

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Hello and welcome to the joint meeting between the ccNSO and the GNSO Councils on Tuesday, 20 October 2020. My name is Joke Braeken, and I'm the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

Instructions for the GNSO and ccNSO councilors, please use the chat box to ask questions or raise your hand. Please remember to set your chat to "send to all attendees and panelists" if you intend your chats to be read by all. You can do this in the dropdown menu at the bottom of the chat pod.

Questions or comments by observers who are attendees in the Zoom room will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Staff will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the session chair.

Some further instructions to observers, if you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, you will be given permission to unmute your microphone. Kindly unmute your microphone at this time to speak.

With that, I'll hand the floor over to Katrina and Keith. Thank you.

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.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Joke. Keith, this is your room.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Katrina. And thank you, Joke, for the introduction. I hope everybody can hear me okay. Thank you very much and welcome, everyone, to the joint GNSO Council-ccNSO Council session at ICANN 69. These are very important conversations that we have between the two councils on a regular basis at our ICANN meetings.

In this particular case, the annual global meeting is also the time where we have some turnover in terms of councilors, in terms of leadership. Just as we were getting ready to kick off here, Katrina, I thought I'd mention that the GNSO Council will be having quite a bit of turnover this meeting. We actually will have eight new councilors coming in and also two of the three members of the leadership team, myself and Rafik, are both termed out. So we will be cycling off of the GNSO Council and there will be a new leadership team coming in.

I'll note that Philippe Fouquart from the ISP constituency is the sole candidate for the GNSO chair position that will be confirmed following our council meeting tomorrow, actually. And then we have Pam Little from the Registrar Stakeholder Group continuing as the vice chair from our Contracted Parties House, and Tatiana Tropina will be taking the Non-Contracted Parties House vice chair position.

I just wanted to note that for you and for our colleagues in the ccNSO that you will be seeing some new faces here in the GNSO Council, but

I'm highly confident that the new leadership team and the new council will be excellent partners for you as we continue our work together in the domain name space at ICANN.

With that, maybe I'll hand it back to you for any opening remarks. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Keith. Thank you very much for sharing this information with us. We know Philippe very well. He's GNSO liaison to the ccNSO Council, and it's really great to see him now moving into this position so congratulations, Philippe.

Actually, I wanted to save to my closing remarks, but since you started with these changes on the GNSO Council I will say it here. Something that I learned around half a year ago maybe some of you do not know. Keith actually used to be a ccNSO councilor too. He was on ccNSO Council and then he served as GNSO liaison to the ccNSO Council, and he became the chair of the GNSO Council. Now Philippe who was a liaison also moves to [ccNSO Council]. And actually when I come to think of it, Maureen who is now the chair of ALAC also used to be ALAC's liaison to the ccNSO Council. So by the looks of it, ccNSO Council is working really hard in preparing future leaders of other communities. So next time you choose a liaison to the ccNSO Council, choose wisely. I'm sure you will.

So really great and, Keith, thank you very much for the time we had the opportunity to work together. I really always appreciate your calm

approach and pragmatic thinking, really very valuable. And, well, all I can say is thank you very much and I hope you will enjoy your time off, relax a little bit, and then think about other important things you want to accomplish.

With that, thank you very much again. Here you see agenda in front of you. The first agenda item is about ccNSO PDP 4. May I ask Bart to walk us through the current status of our PDP 4 which is selection/deselection of IDN ccTLD strings. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Katrina. I assume you can hear me. It's going to be very brief. The PDP just kicked off its first set of meetings. They had three meetings before the ICANN 69 and will continue on 3 November.

I think the most important part for you on the GNSO side is that the discussions around variant management and policy development around variant management will be conducted by a sub working group to which the GNSO will be specifically invited to ensure that, as requested by the Board, both the GNSO and the ccNSO at least coordinate their policy development efforts. Whether this will mean they are similar, one hopes they will be, but you never know. But at least the GNSO and the ccNSO have ample opportunity to discuss a common approach.

So that's where we are. Probably around by November the schedule of the different subgroups, when they will start, will be known and I will share this through my colleagues on the GNSO side with the GNSO

Council as well as with the ccNSO Council, of course. That's all I have to say. Back to you, Katrina and Keith.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Bart. Keith, now back to you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Katrina, and thank you, Bart. Yes, I can give an update on the GNSO Council's progress on the IDN track. We have actually divided the work facing the GNSO and the GNSO community into two tracks. One is an operational track where we've given an indication from the council that we support ICANN Org engaging with registries and contracted parties in the gTLD space to continue engagement on the operational track and the operational guidelines. But at the same time, we are preparing tomorrow to initiate a call for volunteers for a charter drafting team for the policy work that we anticipate initiating for the IDN policy work.

Just a bit of context and background. We had called for a scoping team to pull together some recommendations for the council's consideration toward the end of last year. And then that scoping effort was delivered to the council in January and February of this year. So the GNSO Council has been well informed by the experts in this matter and are now preparing to initiate some policy work related to the topic.

So on our consent agenda tomorrow the GNSO Council intends to initiate the call for volunteers for the charter drafting. Importantly, the

plan moving forward is that this effort will become an expedited PDP, so an EPDP. And the distinction here in GNSO operating procedures is that it just means that we don't need to request an issues report but that there's still some additional scoping and charter drafting that needs to take place to determine how exactly we will establish the EPDP.

Importantly here for those that have tracked the EPDP on registration data in response to the temporary specification it doesn't necessarily have to look like that and it probably won't. There is a range of opportunities that we have, a range of choices that we have in terms of how we structure the work, how the group will be composed, and essentially laying out the plan for that group. But that is expected to be initiated as far as the charter drafting during our meeting tomorrow.

I'm going to pause and see if any other councilors or ICANN staff, policy colleagues would like to add anything to what I've said. If not, we can move on.

But I think essentially we also at the GNSO Council recognize the need for the GNSO and the ccNSO efforts to be informed and that we would certainly look forward to inviting ccNSO colleagues to contribute to the effort in the GNSO as well to make sure that there's full awareness of the various tracks.

Let me pause there. If anybody would like to add anything, feel free. I'm looking for hands. I don't see any at the moment, so I'll assume I got that right or at least mostly right. Katrina, back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thanks, Keith. We're also open for collaboration and, as you said, completely realize the need for coordination in these areas.

As I also can't see any raised hands, so we move to next agenda item. Sorry, there's a typo there. Talking about financial year 2020 budget and ops plan coordination. Unfortunately, Giovanni who is the chair of our SOPC group cannot join us today. Oh, there is one hand up. Sorry. There is one hand up. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Katrina. And thank you, Keith, for the update. I guess I just want to note I guess with the initiation of the EPDP I guess a question and a comment perhaps. Earlier it was also mentioned that there should be some sort of a linkage in some ways between the ccNSO and GNSO on this work. So I was just wondering what the plan is I guess from both sides at this point in terms of establishing that linkage.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Edmon. I know that there have been discussions at the GNSO Council about establishing a liaison between the groups. I'm certainly interested to hear. I think I heard Bart say that there would be an expectation or a welcoming of GNSO input or contributions to the ccNSO's work. But it's a good question, and I think we probably need to focus on that a little bit. And again, I'm happy to turn to any

colleagues who would like to provide a more detailed answer. But I think the expectation is that we would benefit from having liaison roles so that there would be regular and ongoing engagement and collaboration at least in terms of information sharing if not actual more substantive work. Katrina, anything further from your side?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, just again stress the fact that as soon as our subgroups, our PDP start their work we will send an invitation to our GNSO colleagues who are interested in this work to take a more active part, [observe] and participate in work of those subgroups.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Katrina. Edmon, does that respond to your question? Anything you'd like to follow up on?

EDMON CHUNG: No. Thank you for the clarifications. That's good.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right, very good. Thanks. And again, the GNSO Council needs to conduct the, well, will be asking for volunteers to help contribute to the charter drafting, and that's where I think some of those more detailed questions will be resolved. Katrina, back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Apologies.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, sure.

JOKE BRAEKEN: There is one additional question is the chat from Marie Pattullo which asks, “Do we have any timing regarding IDNs before the next round?”

KEITH DRAZEK: I think that’s probably a question for the GNSO because the next round relates to the next round of gTLDs. Marie, I think these are independent, and I don’t see necessarily one interfering with the other. I think that on our current trajectory for the next round of gTLDs, I think the projection for the next launch of the round would be 2023-2024, something like that. I think there’s an opportunity to get this IDN work concluded prior to that.

If anybody with more expertise would like to weigh in on this question, I see Edmon is noting that the IDN PDP relates to the 2012 round also.

If anybody would like to speak to this, feel free to put your hand up.
Okay, I'm not seeing any additional hands. Katrina, back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Thanks, Keith. Thank you for questions. That's great to have interaction. Going back to moving forward with Agenda Item 3, as I already said, there's a typo. We're talking about Financial Year 2022. Unfortunately, Giovanni who is leading the work of our Strategic and Operational Planning Committee cannot join us today. But SOPC had a meeting last week, and they met with people from Xavier's team. Xavier presented their way forward. [He] presented also a table of a plan when each document is going to be published for public comment. We also know that people from the GNSO side were in that meeting. So it's really great to see that collaboration happening. I don't know if any of my colleagues would like to note anything regarding SOPC and the coming plans. Apparently, next ICANN public comment period will be opened on 17 December. There are also additional budget [inaudible] submission periods from starting from 9 November. There are going to be community webinars in January, and the Board is supposed to adopt the documents in May next year. Anyone would like to add anything? Barry is ready to. Barry?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Apologies. Before we give the floor to Barry, just one additional comment that [Xavier] wanted me to read out regarding the previous agenda item. [Xavier] mentions, “There’s a lot of cross-community interest in IDN like there was for GeoNames. Wonder if IDN chartering might somehow mirror Work Track 5 structure.” That’s it. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you for the question, [Xavier]. It’s an interesting question, and I think it’s a good question. I think Work Track 5 and the GeoNames discussion within subsequent procedures was I think viewed by many who contributed and participated as a success at least procedurally and that it might be a model for looking at the issue more broadly.

I think one question is, how do we make sure that we have the requisite expertise on a topic that’s relatively complex such as IDNs? But I think that’s definitely some of the work that will take place over the coming months related to the chartering effort of that group. I expect input from the broader community on that effort would be welcome, but that will be a topic for the next council that is seated at the end of this meeting.

I see a hand from James. James, did you want to speak to the IDN issue or to the budget and operating plan issue?

JAMES GANNON: The IDN if I can be brief.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sure. Please go right ahead, James. Thank you.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Keith. I just want to call out that the GNSO's normal PDP processes are open to many members to attend, and I think the IDN is one that obviously we will have a lot of cross-community input to. I just don't want to set up the expectation for the next council that some of the special scenarios that we've had, such as the EPDP and the Work Track 5 chartering efforts, need be the normal going forward. The GNSO has traditionally always been open to many members to come in and participate, and I just don't want to set up the wrong expectations for the next council that the exceptions need to be applied in every instance for other community members to participate.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, James, and it's a good point. As you've noted, traditionally GNSO PDP working groups have been open to all, and we've experimented with a couple of things recently. And we're still going through the process as a GNSO Council of assessing how those experiments went. I think that there's going to be some additional effort on that related to EPDP and, of course as noted, Work Track 5. So without predicting or prejudicing any future decisions of the council, I think we fully recognize that where there is broad community interest in topics that the GNSO is conducting policy work

on that it's best to have people contributing to the process rather than watching from the outside. So thanks, James, for that.

Let's see. Are there any other hands or questions on IDNs? Just checking.

JOKE BRAEKEN:

There is an additional comment in the chat from Jiankang Yao. I will read it now, "IDN is important both for ccNSO and GNSO. Is there any coordinated plan for ccNSO and GNSO to do something to help the development and deployment of IDN?" Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much for the question. I think as the ICANN Board noted back I guess almost two years ago now around the Kobe meeting that there's an expectation that the GNSO and the ccNSO need to coordinate and at least be informed of each other's work in this area. I think that exactly what we're talking about today is, how best do we do that with these parallel tracks of ongoing policy work? So I certainly recognize that there needs to be some coordination and possible collaboration and that the topic of IDNs is a very important to the broader community.

Katrina, back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Keith. If I may speak from a personal perspective, I was quite sad that our collaboration in the area of

confusing similarity didn't seem to be working. Our interests are perhaps too different there, but I am really looking forward to collaboration in such areas as variant management, for example.

As of ccNSO and [inaudible] efforts with IDNs, we always supported that. Being one of the most diverse communities in ICANN we fully recognize the need for so many Internet users to be able to register their domain names in their languages. If there are any ideas, we're always open. Our meetings are always open for presentations on these interesting topics. So that's all from me. Budget seems not so important. We can still talk about IDNs. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah, thanks, Katrina. I think Barry was going to provide some input from the GNSO perspective on our standing committee on budget and operations. So, Barry, over to you.

BARRY COBB:

Great. Thank you, Keith. Just briefly from a GNSO perspective, as Keith noted, after tomorrow's council meeting we'll have the change of guard across the council with eight new councilors coming in. So typically right after that is when we refresh the membership or the roster for our standing committee on budget and operations. So that will probably start happening next week or the follow-on week.

In terms of getting the cadence or in preparation for the fiscal year comment, if others aren't aware, there is already or the FY22 cycle has

already started in that the IANA FY22 budget and operating plan is out for public comment.

So the council typically will comment on that, although it's usually not very substantive because of the council's role as manager of the policy development process. But what it does allow for us to do is to get our group refreshed with membership, either confirm or elect a new chair to lead the group.

And then as Katrina noted about the schedule for the FY22 ICANN Org budget will start in mid-December which is good timing because I think that it allows everyone in the community to kind of casually review through all of the materials.

The instance for this particular agenda item is the continued coordination between the SOPC and the SCBO. With the public comment period concluding around 8 February, I think we'll probably want to target the last week of January or literally the first Monday of February to have our joint meetings. That will allow each group enough time to gather their own positions around the budget cycle, have the meeting, and then allow for an additional week or so to course correct comments based on those collaborations.

That's all I have for now. Once we get our new SCBO refreshed, I'll be sure to inform Bart and Kim to pass the message along. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Barry. I also noted that [Xavier] in the chat volunteered to give a very brief summary of the upcoming changes and the process. [Xavier]?

[XAVIER CALVEZ]: Hi. Can you hear me? Thank you. Katrina, you [inaudible] my offer, but that's fine. I'll volunteer as a result, thank you. Just a couple minutes to talk about the FY22 operating plan and budget. Katrina provided feedback on the timing with the public comment in mid-December.

I just wanted to say one word about the fact that we created a new department within the organization which is focused on planning. It's called the planning department. It concentrates all the activities of planning that the organization has been carrying out in the past, but it's also the opportunity to try to evolve our collective planning process.

One of the areas that we want to be able to improve is the collaboration throughout this planning process. As an illustration of that collaboration, one of the thing that all of us are talking about these days is prioritization. This group is going to try to develop with community input a methodology and process for prioritization of our work.

Everyone across the community is talking about the amount of work that there is of different parallel topics that are important to work on, and there's just too much work for everyone at any point of time. So being able to prioritize is something that can make a real difference in

how we manage our work, and our effectiveness is improving across the community if we are successful at prioritizing.

We think that this is going to be a challenging endeavor but a necessary one for our own sake. So this is something to come over the next few weeks and months, and the SCBO on the GNSO side and the SOPC on the ccNSO side are two very important groups focused on planning and operations that we definitely would like to use the help of as we engage with the community to develop this methodology about prioritization.

And of course, we carry out the actual work of prioritizing together which will take compromise. It will take a lot of effort and goodwill from everyone but is obviously going to benefit everyone going forward one way or the other.

I'll stop with that. Thank you, Katrina and Keith, for the opportunity.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, [Xavier]. Any further questions or comments on this? If not, then next agenda item that was also proposed by us, [Board] committee mechanisms. I know that you guys are a little bit ahead of us. You have already approved your document [inaudible] one particular I would like to talk about, and that's about the removal of ICANN Board members [inaudible] the entire Board.

We started working on that recently. We haven't discussed it on the council or with the community yet. The work carried out in ccNSO

guidelines review committee. That's a community group that looks into all the documents that need to be updated or developed.

I don't know how familiar others are with the process we're talking about here. I assume that not everybody knows what we're talking about, so therefore we have a very quick presentation here. I'd like to cover three things.

The first one—the next slide, please—for example, if somebody wants to remove a ccNSO-appointed director to the Board, this [inaudible] looks pretty simple. It's really up to the ccNSO to decide how to move forward. Next slide, please.

If we look at timelines, they are very tight. And we have discussed that many times before. Timelines are tight. But again, that's really up to us to [pull] this through.

The next slide talks about the process, what happens when one of the decisional participants receives a petition requesting removal of a NomCom-appointed director. Here you see we already need to seek support from other decisional participants.

First at the second step, so to speak, if, for example, ccNSO approves the petition moving forward, then we need support from other decisional participants, one. Then we go into next phase and community forum and everything. And then when we start deciding on the removal petition, we need support of at least three decisional participants to [pull] this through. Next one.

As you see here, this is something that we really discussed at great length. Again, timelines. NomCom-appointed director removal petition support period is only seven days, and that's for everyone. So if we learn—I just wanted to inform you that if you ask us today, for example, to decide on the support in seven days, we won't be able to make it. I don't know if other communities who would be a decisional participants would be ready, but this seven-day period clearly shows that we won't be able to move forward with that which means that we need this collaboration and exchange of information earlier in the process. Next slide, please.

If things are really, really bad and we need to recall the entire Board, again, here is where we need support of at least two other decisional participants and support of at least four decisional participants in the last stage. Next slide, please. Timelines here are just the same, seven days' time.

What we discussed, and that's partly a response to Michele's question if I want to remove anyone in particular. No, definitely not. That was one of the things that we discussed. We really hope that we would never, ever need to use these mechanisms. However, if things get really bad, if any appointed directors were really so tragic that we need to even start talking about recalling [then] our Board, it means it's really, really bad. For that, the community needs to have efficient mechanisms and be able to act. Again, hopefully never happens, but if it does, then we need efficient mechanisms.

On a personal note, again, what worries me is the complexity of all those mechanisms that we have now, Annex D. I don't know how many people understand them fully. I'm glad that the GNSO is already done with all the documents. It's a bureaucratic process and, again, tight timelines. You need to understand the entire process which, personally, I feel like it puts barriers for participation from those who are new to ICANN community.

So one message that the guidelines review committee wanted to say here is that we need strong collaboration mechanisms early in the process. Even though everything is public, but you know that normally we probably do not follow too closely. Yes, we have liaisons which is, again, very good. We have those exchanges among SO/AC chairs. We need to think carefully about all those processes because if we really need to use them, they need to be efficient.

Thank you. That's brief intro. I would really be glad to hear, Keith, what you think about this. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Katrina. I'll welcome any of my GNSO colleagues who would like to speak to the issue but, yes, as you noted, the GNSO Council last year, almost a year ago this time at the annual global meeting, did approve the GNSO Council's plan for dealing with this. Work had been done over the course of last year, and I see James has his hand up. James, I'll come to you here momentarily. Heather Forrest was involved helping to shepherd the team in terms of the

guidelines. So, yes, the GNSO has established its procedures and process for handling these.

But I take your point that the timelines are very tight and that whether it's the ccNSO and the ccNSO Council or the GNSO having to work with our stakeholder groups and constituencies that the timelines are very tight and that, to your point, collaboration and coordination will be very important if and when we need multiple decisional participants engaged on a particular issue.

So I take your point that that coordination I'm not sure something that's important if we ever end up in a situation where we have to utilize these systems or these processes. But I think we'll also probably have some advance warning or have some knowledge that there's going to be a challenge perhaps before the formal process is initiated.

But let me see if James would like to add anything to this. If anybody else would like to get in the queue, please do.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks, Keith. Yeah, actually exactly to Keith's last point, not speaking as a councilor but speaking as an ICANN process nerd who was involved in drafting a lot of these, important to note these timelines are strict and there for a reason. The reason is that this formal spill or director removal process is the conclusion of a more informal process that happens before it.

So the assumption is that if the community is going to come together to this level of decision, even prior to the petition being started it will

already have been subject to community conversation and community discussion. Then additionally, we have the petitioning period where the community has to come together and have those conversations. Otherwise, you won't reach the level of decisional participants required to initiate the formal spill process or removal process.

So, yes, this is a tight timeline, very constrained process. However, it's important to remember that this is the end of a long journey in ICANN, if we ever get to this point, where my assumption anyway is there will have been months of discussions and months of debates about how we have got to here.

The reason it's so quick and so condensed is the assumption is in the process that if we've reached this point something is very bad and we have agreed as an entire community essentially this needs to happen now. And really, that's why the end of the process has to be so quick is because we have as a community led up to this point and now we have made the decision, and we need to execute that decision quickly because something is fundamentally wrong that we as a community have to take such a drastic and major decision.

That's why you have the contrast between the more informal pre-petitioning and petitioning period. And then once that petition has reached a number of participants willing to sign onto this, something is very bad and we need to move quickly. So it's just important to remember that contrast.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, James. As the bylaws are worded today, basically any individual can submit the petition. Of course, they have to be reviewed and everything. But one thing I, again on a personal note, would like to note here is that when we talk about those plenaries and ICANN meetings, we very often talk about getting out of silos. Here I see that we're kind of bound to work in silos. I think we need to have those mechanisms of getting out of silos and working closely with other communities. [inaudible] already in the bylaws. Something that would show that we really need this collaboration.

Actually, James, some time ago you raised an issue of maybe we could look into the timelines and all the things that we need to change in the bylaws and make them work for the community. I think that was a very good idea. Thank you. Keith, back to you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Katrina. Just thinking out loud here, I think over the last couple of years, the last year certainly, the GNSO Council has recognized the importance and the value of empowering our liaisons. I'm first thinking specifically about liaisons to policy development processes and working groups, but I think that this could be an opportunity for us to bring some specific focus or some targeted focus to this issue of the role of the decisional participants and the Empowered Community and making sure that we have people, individuals, or a small team on each side engaged on these issues so that if it ever becomes important, necessary, or urgent, that we have

people who are well versed in the process and the procedure and to make sure that we've got those existing lines of communication.

So again, I will defer any decisions on that to the next council once it's seated, but I think that you've raised an important point here related to that engagement and collaboration and open lines of communication that I fully support.

I'll stop there and see if anybody else would like to get in queue. Any other comments or questions on this particular point? I don't see any other hands, so I think that gets us to AOB. Katrina, is there any other business from ccNSO Council perspective?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, there was one but you already covered that in the beginning. I wanted to thank, again, you for chairing the GNSO Council and for bringing both communities, ccNSO and GNSO, closer together. Virtual hugs going your way. Sorry we cannot meet face-to-face, but I hope that one day when we're old maybe we will meet.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Katrina. Thank you for the kind words. It has been a pleasure and an honor, and I've always enjoyed my engagement and our engagement with the ccNSO and the ccNSO colleagues. So thank you for that.

I see Michele has his hand up. Michele, over to you.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. This I suppose is to ccNSO members in general, not to the council specifically. But I suppose this is the only forum for any kind of formal engagement with you. In the DNS abuse session earlier today there was a lot of talk about data and statistics. I suppose the thing is just to plant that seed with ccNSO members to think a little bit about how they can share data on DNS abuse or the lack of it with the broader Internet community.

Because I think the issue we're seeing in the GNSO is that there's a lot of pressure to make changes even though it's not very clear exactly what those changes are meant to be. But the reality is that if you "fix" a problem in the gTLD space, it's just going to move to the ccTLD space. So any data that there is around that would probably be helpful for proper discussions. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Michele. I know that not during ICANN 69 but during ICANN 68 we had this session on DNS abuse. I'm sure there's a recording available. We talked about that. And actually, one of the comments from ccTLDs was that for some reason statistics that are available today provided by different security companies does not reflect the reality, does not correspond to data that are in ccTLDs, does not [inaudible] the data that ccTLDs have.

I see that Peter and Russ are already engaging in discussion. Peter, may I ask you to comment on this? Because you were the one who raised that.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Peter, you've been promoted to panelist. You can simply unmute your microphone if you want to speak.

[PETER]: I can now, thanks, Joke. As some of you probably know, in the context of COVID-related or COVID-themed domains across the period February to April, so early during the pandemic, [inaudible] look into the registration of domains that contained a couple of keywords. We used [crawler] to check whether these domains were actually used, whether they were parked, or whether they only had [inaudible].

The conclusion was that despite all the information that we saw coming, and I might have missed the first part of your intervention, but despite the concerns that were raised in numerous publications we could find the abuse, at least not of the size that was being published.

So that's my question to Michele. This was the first time that we ever looked into the usage of the domain. Not even go ahead content. We didn't decide whether a website selling masks was fraudulent or whether it was a true effort, a commercial effort to help out the community. We didn't go into it that far. But we looked into the usage of the domain. This is the first time that we did that.

So when asking for numbers about domain abuse, are we talking about the numbers that are probably available from APWG or the

number of complaints that CCs get or an interaction with their consumer protection authorities or law enforcement authorities?

One of the initiatives that's currently taking place in [CENTR] and it's partially inspired by efforts by Internet and jurisdiction, that is to come up with a standardized form of [transparency reporting]. [It's still nascent.] A couple of members already have practices in place: .uk, .eu, .dk as well. I believe the Dutch as well. And see whether we can find common ground and use it as a template.

So maybe this could be helpful, but it might not give you information that you're looking for. So hence the question: define abuse so that we can understand what metrics would be helpful. Thanks.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Peter. I think in terms of defining abuse, I think there are a few definitions that have been used in various contexts, and I don't want to go down into the weeds on which definition fits most comfortably. But in terms of data, I think the data that would be probably more interesting is things like the number of complaints that CCs themselves are getting. The number of complaints you're getting from law enforcement, consumer protection, etc.

In other words, the data that you are seeing yourselves as opposed to any lists from third parties that may or may not be vetted, that may or may not be based in reality. Because the thing is that we all know that while some people are producing lists and databases with the best

intentions in the world, unless that data is carefully vetted the percentage of false positives can be very, very high.

I think the reason that I raise this is that people who want to “fix” the issues have an awful habit of coming to ICANN and pushing on things. Whereas, for those of us who know, we know full well that ccTLDs are not bound by these [inaudible] contractual requirements that gTLDs are and it really needs to be a more collaborative thing. So I think it’s just something to think about further and maybe collaborate on either within the remit of ICANN or elsewhere. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay, thank you, Michele. Thank you, Peter. Okay, so I think we’re at a point. Is there any other business? Would anybody else like to raise anything before we move to close the meeting? I don’t see any hands. So, Katrina, maybe I’ll hand it back to you to bring us to a close.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, thank you very much. I’ve really enjoyed the meeting. And I like the way you push everything toward the new council. I’m sure that’s very helpful, and I see that you’re smiling, that you’re enjoying this. I hope you enjoyed your time on GNSO Council and enjoy stepping down and moving forward.

Thank you very much, and I wish great [fun] to everyone and I wish a lot of strength to all incoming GNSO councilors. Actually, in March we also have five new councilors on the council, so it’s great to see new people joining ICANN world and doing great things.

Thank you very much, and see you next time.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]