
ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – ccNSO Q&A with ccNSO-related Board Members
Tuesday, October 20, 2020 – 14:30 to 15:30 CEST

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you and welcome to today’s Q&A with ccNSO-related board members. My name is Kimberley Carlson. Along with Claudia Ruiz, we will be your remote participation managers. As a reminder to all, this call is being recorded and recordings will be posted on the ICANN69 website shortly after the call.

If you would like to ask a question or comment during this session, please type those in the chat pod with brackets, as shown on the screen. Additionally, you can verbally ask your questions using the raise-hand icon found at the bottom of the screen. You will then be automatically put in the speaker queue, and we will take the questions in order that your hand was received.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. One more reminder: if not speaking, please remember to mute your phones and microphones. And with that, I would like to hand the floor over to Jordan Carter, our session moderator.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Kimberly. [inaudible]. Good morning, everyone, or good afternoon or evening. It’s my pleasure to, once again, MC this session for us with our ccNSO-related ICANN Board members, a number of whom are [inaudible]. I believe that, today’s call, we’ve got six friendly

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.

faces: Chris, Nigel, Patricio as the incoming. Becky, Lito, and Danko. But I don't think Becky is on the call yet. Has anyone ...?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, we're missing Becky.

JORDAN CARTER: Becky?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll ping her.

JORDAN CARTER: That's going to foil my diversity plan in calling speakers. So, this is usually a pretty informal session. I hope you're all happy with that, as usual. I appealed and begged for any questions that you might want answered in advance, and I got only one. So, this is going to end up being quite a short session if you don't get your question skates on and start to prepare to either raise your hands or ask some questions in the chat.

Now, the questions that you can ask could be much anything, preferably related to ICANN business. They can be a little bit of a statement-question-type approach, sharing a view with board members, since we don't have the opportunity in this meeting to be face-to-face in the corridors and the social events quite as easily as we do in person.

And the other thing I'll just say with any questions that you might wish to ask in the chat pod is that, if your question is for a specific person on the board among our directors here, please say so. I'm going to do what I did last time. I've just written down the names in a somewhat random order. And I will start with Chris, because why not? It's the last time I'll be able to interrogate you like this on behalf of everyone else.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you so much.

JORDAN CARTER: And then, we'll just flow down, and then whoever goes second will go first the next time, so it'll just be a cascade. And it is not my intention to fill the hour with myself talking. It's going to be us listening. So the first question is an interesting one. It's from Peter Van Roste, the GM of CENTR.

I don't know if Peter is on the call but I'm going to get on with asking his question, anyway, which he sent through by e-mail. This is a question about the balance between gTLD and ccTLD policy and ICANN's responsibility to get both of these right. And the context that Peter gave is ICANN's approach to DNS abuse and to the WHOIS policy questions that have been worked through, through the ePDP in the GNSO.

ICANN sets a policy from the consensus policy process on these for gTLDs, and there is an obligation on the corporation to be very careful that its actions, and that consensus policy generally, is clearly and distinctively seen to be heard as not being applicable to ccTLDs.

How do we minimize the confusion that could be allowed to grow as ICANN sets these policies for the whole of the Domain Name System, and how do you as a ccTLD-related board member discharge your duties as ICANN directors that meet your fiduciary responsibilities in sticking to the scope of ICANN and not causing confusion for the market or for governments about ICANN's role in the ccTLD world? So, it's quite a question. I probably should have e-mailed this to you in advance. Sorry about that. But Chris, do you want to take a stab at that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Can I just say "I don't know" and pass it onto someone else? I think we all know that ICANN, in essence, doesn't set policy for ccTLDs. ccTLDs each set their own policy, and I think that confusion is an inbuilt part of that mechanism because, if you have a .uk ccTLD, you will be subject to a different policy regime than if you have a—not picking anyone in particular but at random—.de ccTLD, and some have massive amounts of rich policy, and some have no policy at all.

So, I don't think that there is a ... And equally, in fact—not in the DNS abuse zone, but just generally—gTLDs have a number of different policies. There are gTLDs that have eligibility requirements, and there are gTLDs that don't.

So, I think the confusion is kind of built into the system. And just to be ... ICANN ... The CCs can, by consensus within the ICANN structure, set an agreed global policy, which is applicable to those who choose to abide by it, in essence. It cannot be binding. It can only be advisory.

And the example that I pretty much always use for that is when we did a bit of work on wildcards and we ended up with, in essence, an advisory about wildcards, but it's not binding. And that's about as far as I can go with that, I think, Jordan. I'll happily come back in if somebody else says something I want to comment on.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay. Thanks, Chris. The next one on my list is Nigel. And, Lito, you'll be after Nigel, so I'll give you a heads up. I've popped the question in the chat, now. Nigel, any thoughts on this one? You're on mute, too. Now we can hear you.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Right. I'm not on mute now, I hope. Good. Well, Chris obviously started out saying almost exactly what I would have said, but I want to dive a little bit deeper into a couple of things. Part of the question talks about fiduciary duties as directors.

Chris was the one who actually squared this particular—I see you just perked up, there. Chris was the one who actually squared this circle. Because I think, nine or ten years ago, it was commonly believed that, once you went from the ccNSO community, as an example—or the same thing applies to other communities—to the ICANN Board, you had to give up all loyalty to where you came from, and forget where you came from, and do, essentially, what the secretary and general council told you to at all times, because you had a fiduciary duty to ICANN, the corporation, and you must leave behind all previous ...

That’s actually not right. Chris put it very well when he said, basically, the job of a board member that’s not elected by the NomCom—so, that’s everybody else from GNSO, ALAC, ccNSO, and so on—is not only to be a director with the duties of loyalty, and fidelity, and so on, but also to bring the knowledge, and experience, and perspectives from your community.

It’s quite common, and I’m sure my colleagues will agree with this, that, from time-to-time, it’s necessary to kind of give a bit of background to board members who, perhaps, come in from even outside the DNS community.

So, continually reminding people of what Chris just said about the advisory nature of ccNSO global policy is something that every ccNSO-appointed board member is going to have to do from now for the next 20 or 30 years, because it’s only natural that people outside come to ICANN and think, “ICANN rules the Internet.”

So, if we are not getting, or they are not getting, what they want out of their registrar, or the registry, or the TLD manager concerned, even if they know that ICANN has limited role in certain areas, they will still come and try it on. So, hopefully, that has given a little bit of depth and color. I’m sure I’ll leave some for my other colleagues to fill in. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Nigel. I’ll go to you, Lito, and Danko, you’ll be next. Lito.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Jordan. Hello, everyone. I will just start saying that I get this type of question, or related questions, by friends at home, my country, or other places when I speak about ICANN and the role of the board, the Org, and everybody.

So of course, they use the Internet, but they don't know any much more than that how to use it, how to take advantage of it. And then, I started, like a teacher, telling them about the difference between the domain names, gTLDs, generic and country-code.

I say I happen to manage the top-level domain for El Salvador, I say, but there are some others. "And what about .com, or .biz, or whatever?" "Oh, those are called 'generics.'" And I have to go and explain further that ICANN sets the policy and has a contract, a legal contract, with the gTLD operators.

But with ccTLDs, or country codes, they have other types of agreement. So, every ccTLD, every country code, has to check their own policies. And then, I go on to explain that, even though ICANN oversees the security, stability, and resiliency of identifiers, in the case of the country code, ICANN simply suggests, if you will, or let's everybody know about, things that you have to take into account in concretely, specifically, DNS abuse.

What we see is that we can make use of some examples/experiences that go on in the gTLD world and apply them to us. For instance, DAAR. The DAAR system is, I think, a good example of something that is open to ccTLDs regarding DNS abuse, and this depends on our own policies to use it or not, or some other means to fight or to deal with these types

of things, like DNS abuse, and some other issues. So, that is the way I try to manage our fiduciary duty in being part of the ICANN Board, of ICANN as an ecosystem, and still do what we need to do with our own policies. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Lito. That’s good. Danko, we’ll come to you next.

DANKO JEVTIVIĆ: Thank you. Well, it’s maybe a bit difficult to speak after all these very good answers and to add something to that, but I will try to say a few words about how I view this question that is, I believe, very important.

So, first of all, fiduciary duty is a very well-developed concept, especially in the U.S. But our duty is not to some tyrannical interest of the corporation. Our duty is to the bylaws and to our mission. And this something that I believe all we in this community can agree on. So, it is quite well-defined, and we are testing our decisions against the bylaw mandate and the mission. So, in a way, it’s clear, and I think it very well fits what Chris, and Nigel, and Lito have explained.

Speaking of gTLD versus CC—no way. I think it’s naturally a complex system. First of all, we have one route, and this is IANA, and we, all registries, have joined there. But all registries are top-level domain names. “Top,” in my mind, means that this is the top. So, in a way, all of them have specifics, as has been said. Also, different Gs have different ... Well, they’re governed by ICANN policies but there are different rules for different Gs, in a similar way for CCs.

Also for the G side, it's not the board that is a policy-making body. The board is deciding but the policies are defined by that community. So also, for the CC side, now, we have more Policy Development Processes. But in a way, the situation is complex because CC, as a top-level domain registry, is equivalent not to one G, but equivalent to ICANN in a way that is creating its own policies.

And of course, we all think about how to simplify the message for the ordinary users because, to understand Domain Name Systems, they don't want to do that. They don't want to their own cat videos and other Internet services, which are sometimes more relevant, but often not.

And I believe, in order to simplify that, we have to explain it. For example, we have Peter from CENTR asked the question. So, I will remind ourselves to a great video made by CENTR that explains the role of the registry, and explains the content, and how content can be blocked.

But interesting thing with this video is this video explains only from the CC side, mentioning only country-code registries. But in fact, DNS system functions in the similar way in the G side and the CC side. Only some of the legal subtleties are different.

So, if you want to have simple message, we, all of us, the whole community, I think should communicate into ways that will explain it better. And I ... Okay, I'm coming from the NomCom side, but I've been running the CC and, during that time, I was also thinking about policies that are coming from the G side.

There is some way of some of the ... Not best practices, but industry practices, that every CC should think about, and maybe implementing them, in a way how we ... Most of the CCs implement, for example, EPP. That came from the Verisign. So, in a way, we are all developing together and trying to make the Internet better for the end-users. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Danko. I should have said at the start of my intervention, my introduction, that you don't all have to answer every question. You're allowed to take a pass, and you shouldn't feel bad if you choose to do that. Because if you all answer every question, then we'll only get through three questions. But so far, we have only got two. Patricio. That isn't to tell you you can't talk, either, just to bring it back on the table. Have you got a comment on this one?

PATRICIO POBLETE:

I am so glad you just said that one can pass on a question, but I'm not going to pass on this one. Unlike my colleagues, who have been actual board members—I'm just a board-member-to-be in a couple of days—they have had the experience of how to balance the background that they bring to the ICANN Board that they certainly cannot erase, and they're not expected to erase it, with the duties that we all know that the board members have, which are to, essentially, look for what's good for the whole of the ICANN community.

So, I will not speak to that part. But to the part of how these ICANN policies have anything to do or not with ccTLD policies, personally, in my experience, I haven't found that it is too hard to get people to understand the difference. It does happen from time to time but, once you clear that up, then the confusion does not persist. So, I don't see that as a big issue.

On the other hand, I think that there are two ways to look at what happens here, and both are useful. When ICANN, the ICANN community, develops a global policy for gTLDs, everybody involved in that process tries to make it to be a good policy and [ward] it to final stage, participate in that process.

So, usually, one would expect those to be policies that, even though not applicable, are certainly not binding to ccTLDs. They are, in a way, industry standard. And from time-to-time, in my own experience, that has been very helpful.

When developing our own policies, or when getting people to accept the policy that we have developed, we can refer to what's happening in the world of gTLDs and say that we're doing something that's similar, and it looks reasonable. We don't do it, but many of our colleagues actually, on a voluntary basis, applied some of those policies, like they'll get how many ccTLDs used the UDRP, or variants of it. So, I think that's one useful way of looking at this relation.

The other one, which I think is not mentioned very often, is that we, the ccTLDs, with our own policies, can contribute to the ICANN policy-generation process. I think we bring kind of a biodiversity to this

process. If you want to develop something for ICANN, you could and you should look at what the ccTLDs are doing in each of their own registries. You see such a variety of approaches that you can see what works, what doesn't, what looks better, and draw from that experience to enrich the ICANN Policy Development Process.

We saw some of that in an earlier ICANN where there was ... About exactly DNS abuse, the session where different ccTLDs contributed with their own experiences. You can see a wide range of approaches—some that were very active into getting involved in dealing with these abuses, and others in the other extreme that wouldn't do anything without a court order. So, you see the whole universe of experiences and bring that to the table when looking at what ICANN should do about gTLDs, if anything.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Patricio. I understand that Becky is on the call now, but apparently from a train. I didn't know you had trains in America. Do you want to say anything on this question, Becky? Are you able to join us? [inaudible] seen the question. I'm going to say that's a no for now from Becky. Oh, there we go.

BECKY BARR: Hi, guys. Can you hear me? Hello.

JORDAN CARTER: We can now, yeah.

BECKY BURR: I joined in the middle of this question, so I think I'll wait until the next one. And indeed, I am on a train. It's one of the only trains in America.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Well, welcome, and thanks for joining us. We will carry on. Peter Van Roste is on this meeting and has his hand up to follow up, one presumes. So, can we unmute Peter and invite him to do that?

PETER VAN ROSTE: I think I could do that, myself. Thanks, Jordan, and thanks, everyone, for your contributions, here. I think, first of all, we as a ccTLD community have ... I mean, it's engrained in every discussion that we have that we understand this discussion, and we take it for granted. We don't refer every other census to, "Of course, this is for Cs, and Gs is a different world." We all know this, and this is the way that we discuss things, and we have made significant progress over the years.

That is not the case for the people outside our world. When we're talking to regulators, authorities, other communities that are not part of the ICANN community—the business communities in Brussels, or probably around the world—they don't get that distinction. And I think we should be very careful, especially now, at the time when ICANN is finally stepping up its government relations and policy efforts, which I applaud.

I think it's crucial that, in that process, they find a way to make that distinction without making it an awkward interruption of the conversation. But if I'm looking at the recently published documents, it is absolutely not clear that, when ICANN is writing to the European Data Protection Board, they are not writing on behalf of the 27 EU ccTLDs that that board has also ... Well, it's not overseeing them, but it has a significant impact on the way they work. That distinction is not clear. It's not there. It is not mentioned.

So I think, as a starter, this would be probably a very helpful thing. It would also be helpful for all the ccTLDs, and everybody else, like at the regional organizations that are engaging in those discussions, as a thing to point to, as in, "Of course, ICANN is not setting policies for ccTLDs."

And I think CC-related board members, or board members that understand the CC world very well, I think you can play an exceptionally important role, there. This is not about controversy, or creating a we-versus-them narrative, but to make sure that, to the outside world, this distinction is made clear, because it is going to create trouble. It already has, and it will continue to do so. So thank you so much for taking that up.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Peter, for that follow-on. I don't know if there is anything there that ... It's sort of a request, I guess, from Peter for some clarity on this in the way that ICANN communicates, from the boilerplate that you mentioned in the chat on upward. Does any need to follow that up? It seems pretty straightforward and, in my view, helpful. There seem to be

some vague nods going on there, and people endorsing your points in the chat.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

That was a determined nod, not a vague nod. I apologize if it looked vague. It's a determined nod. Peter makes a very good point and I strongly recommend that my ccTLD board member colleagues take that forward with them after tomorrow.

JORDAN CARTER:

After, but not before. Okay. We have got a couple of comments in the chat that are interesting from—I'm going to say your name wrong, sorry—Javier Rúa-Jovet. Which is sort of along the lines of ... He made an earlier comment about whether things are binding, like taking an IDN PDP future result, given that would be binding.

And then, you made another comment in the chat, I think, that followed that up, around Work Track 5 of the Subsequent Procedures in the gTLD things. And I think the question you're going to is, how would ccNSO not see that result as binding, or at least extremely persuasive, policy?

I mean, I've got opinions on that, but we're not here to hear my opinions. So, I would start ... So, I hope that you board members have been able to read those questions in the chat, and so you have been participating in it. So, I'll carry on with my rotation, starting this time with Nigel. Do you have a response to Javier's point?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Comment to that specific thing about the binding-ness? Well, I think you have to go back to the ICANN 2.0 bylaws, and I know this is kind of boring, and it's kind of tedious, and so on, but the ccNSO is a gathering-together of ccTLD managers who choose to be members of the ccNSO.

And the only policies which are binding are those which are agreed through the ccPDP process and are binding on members, and only while they remain members, and only while they do not issue a statement saying that, if they did have to follow it, it would breach public policy, or religion, or custom, and so on.

This is kind of fundamental to the bargain between ICANN and the CCs. I think you have to realize that, in the last five to ten years, ICANN has become a very comfortable place for CCs to be. It's non-threatening. It's not threatening to take over the world and dictate how we run our CCs.

That was exactly how it was back in the day, and there was an awful lot of distrust and mistrust which ended in quite an interesting couple of years. And where we are today, which is a very comfortable place that we're in, is a result of many years of hard work and goodwill, and it has happened on both sides. I have to pay tribute in particular to the last two or three CEOs, including the current one, who is the best CEO ever. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Nigel. [inaudible]. Lito is next, and then Danko. Lito, do you have any views also?

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you. Yes. As many of you know, or maybe everybody, we have ... So, there are work mechanisms within the board. Two of them are the working groups and caucus groups. I'm fortunate to be part of the board caucus on Subsequent Procedures, and we are revising the PDP about to come out on the Subsequent Procedures.

And one of the topics is IDN. I'm also fortunate to be in the board IDN Universal Acceptance Working Group. So, we look at that issue, I'm referring specifically to the IDN, in both of these groups, of course, with different perspective.

But one of the things that we were concerned about is that the SubPro is accepting, or is stating, some of the IDN-related agreements, or policies, or suggestions from the working groups on IDN. But there will be another IDN policy coming up, so the question is, what will we do when this IDN policy taken up by the genius GNSO primarily will be out in the open?

So I think, as Javier was suggesting, this is something that is strictly not binding for the CCs but, of course, it will be very helpful and very useful, because all the technology, all the agreements, all the root server rules, have been worked by then, and we can voluntarily follow all of this work that has been carried out by the IDN Working Groups.

So, I think we can take, we ccTLDs, I mean, advantage of those. And I will say that is in our benefit as ccTLDs. Of course, different ccTLDs from different parts of the world, and using different sets of characters, will find this very useful. For instance, we, in the Spanish-speaking ccTLDs,

can use the accents and the N with the ... What is the name of that letter N in English? España.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Enya.

LITO EBARRA: Enya. That's in Spanish. In English? Okay. But that letter. For instance, we will be using that and expanding our offer to registrants. So, I think it is not binding but it will be another good thing to look at from the ccTLD's point of view. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Lito. We'll move onto Danko, if you've got anything on this one.

DANKO JEVTIVIĆ: Well, can you remind me what was the question? Because I understand Nigel explained about the role of ccNSO processes.

JORDAN CARTER: So, the question—

DANKO JEVTIVIĆ: I was focused on the chat side. Sorry.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. Well, the question is, in fact, further up in the chat, from Javier, and there's the one that sort of labels a question. It was, I think, if I was summarizing, about how does ccPDP make policy and yet not be binding on ccTLDs? I was trying to collapse it all into a sentence.

DANKO JEVIĆ: Yeah, but I believe it was quite well answered, so I'll skip that one.

JORDAN CARTER: All right. Thanks. That brings us to Patricio. Have you got anything on this one? And then I'll come to Becky.

PATRICIO POBLETE: No, not much. Only that the policy that we developed for gTLDs, as Lito said, would bring with it a number of technologies I think are very useful for everybody, but ccTLDs could take that on a voluntary basis. On the other hand, the policy for IDNs, for ccTLDs, even [inaudible], it is also about IDNs. It has to do with different issues, like how our TLDs with IDN delegated for countries and territories, and how are they retired? What is a triggering event for one of those strings to be retired from the root zone? So, it's about IDN, but it's a different kind of issue.

JORDAN CARTER: Great. Thank you, Patricio. Becky, do you have anything on this one, if you're still with us?

BECKY BURR:

Okay. I hope there is not too much background noise. I think we live with this funny anomaly because, under the bylaws, the only kind of policy that can be made for Gs as policy that is reasonably necessary for stability and security ... And one would think, if something was reasonably necessary for stability and security as the Internet and the DNS, then it would apply to CCs as well.

But I think that the separation of the CCs and the Gs has worked quite well, leaving CCs to local law, and CCs have adopted modified versions of G policies when it makes sense to them individually. So, I think that the two different models coexist quite nicely, and have for a long time, and they [mesh with a failed] “if it isn’t broke, don’t fix it” approach.

JORDAN CARTER:

Cool. Thank you, Becky. And we will come, now, to Chris to wrap this section up, this question, if you’ve got anything to add.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Jordan. I mean, nothing other than to just call out your point, which I think you made. It’s a very important point that you made in the chat about the distinction between the ccNSO making policy on how IANA should deal with ccTLDs and the ccNSO making policy on what individual ccTLDs should do, and I think the distinction between those two things is an important one because the ccNSO can’t really make policy on what individual ccTLDs must do.

It can make policy about what is best practice and it can attempt to bind ccTLDs by peer group pressure, but it can’t force a sovereign

ccTLD, which often may well be run by the government, to act in a particular way. But I think we have covered pretty much everything that needs to be covered on that point. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Chris, and thank you to all the directors. I have a hand up in the speaking list, Barbara, but first I'm going to take one of the questions from Desiree, because she beat you chronologically, Barbara. Sorry about that.

So, there is a question from Desiree Miloshevic. I'm going to ignore her first one about ICANN helping CCs flourish, but I'm going to ask her second one because it's a more general point for directors to think about. "What do you think is the biggest risk going forward for ICANN, or for the good working of the DNS for the Internet?" The biggest risk. I love those kinds of questions. And this time, we're going to be starting with Lito.

LITO IBARRA:

Thanks, Desiree, for the question. I would say, in general, DNS threats are the biggest risk, because they are increasing from time to time. And we include under this category of threats the root server attacks, probably. They will affect everyone here. So, everything that has to do with any attack to DNS servers, being that the root or our own servers, I think is one of the biggest risks.

People are getting more aware. I mean, the bad guys are getting more aware of these vulnerabilities, and we have to be looking after that and

trying to take all the possible measures to avoid and to prevent or mitigate these risks.

So, I see that specifically, as well as some new technologies, but they are in the cooking, I will say. So, we have to be watching the developments of this new technology. But for certain, the risk of attacking or threats to the DNS, I will say, is the biggest one. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. That is not a shocking answer but it is a reassuring one. Danko, we'll move onto you, and then Patricio.

DANKO JEVTIVIĆ: Thanks. Well, I believe that we all thought that we understand the importance of the Internet. But now, with this COVID situation, it's obviously clear to everyone that Internet is critical, and even more important than we Internet professionals thought. So, I believe that this kind of success is creating, actually, risks, and that risk is—I don't know how to call it. Maybe political. I don't have a better word.

And because there will be pressure on content and regulation to contain this importance of the global medium, and this pressure creates pressure on the full system in a way we call ... We called it "fermentation," but now it's more complicated and more refined, because some of the things that are happening are very positive.

But the risk I see is that, actually, the regulation might come without understanding technical consequences of that on the Internet, and the

global Internet that use it. And we, as the community, I believe, have a very important role to take care of our technical Internet governance and to explain what is needed for the Internet to continue to be successful and to continue to be a driving force for our global economy, global society, and our everyday lives. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Danko. Patricio, have you got anything on this one? You're on mute still.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Sorry. I would tend to go with the geopolitics side of it. [inaudible] trade wars, and products being banned, and possible retaliations, if that were to continue, probably, we could see a real risk of fragmentation of the Internet. ICANN's model is "one world, one Internet," and I think we all value that. That's why I see that as one important risk.

JORDAN CARTER: Fabulous. Thank you. Becky, have you got a view on this one?

BECKY BURR: You know, I think ICANN ... The biggest risk is the same one that it has been for years, which is the tendency, the desire, of governments and others, part of the community, in fact, to use ICANN to route around geopolitical realities.

So, the GAC and other governments trying to get confessions, or rules that they can't get in international [free] organizations, and then coming to ICANN to solve that problem.

And another example of that is the notion that ICANN could be used in some way to route around the European General Data Protection Regulations, where we saw the limits of that, that ICANN can make policy on it but individual registries and registrars have to comply with European law.

And if people start saying, as we saw in some way, that when they don't get what they want out of a Policy Development Process, that's a failure of the multi-stakeholder model. When the multi-stakeholder model runs into sovereign governmental legislation, there is only so much the multi-stakeholder model can do.

I think that's a threat of expectations that we need to be clear about, that ICANN is not a place ... The purpose of ICANN is not to route around those kinds of things. Yeah. But I think that that has been the biggest threat to ICANN since the beginning of time.

JORDAN CARTER:

The beginning of time sounds like a very long time ago, sometimes. Speaking of the beginning of time, Chris, do you have an answer to this one?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Charming. [inaudible] Thank you, Jordan. Yeah, no. Succeeding! Nothing to add other than one thing, which is that I think that everything that has been said is true, and I'm detecting, also, there is the start of talk about ICANN maybe expanding its mission, and I wonder if that isn't also a bit of a threat in certain circumstances, and something that we should be very careful about.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Chris. Nigel, how about you? You're the last call on this one.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Well, as the last one, I've got a little bit of a counter-point, here. I would pay tribute to Lito as the chair of the board Risk Committee, which I have had the privilege to serve with him on, and I have learned quite a bit from this.

Risk is the probability of something happening multiplied by the consequences. And I'm just going to say the biggest risks on that measure are the standard little irritations that we have grown used to over the past decade or longer—things like spam, and phishing, and so on. Because there is lots of it and, although the consequences are low level, they build up and, actually, come to real costs.

The most shocking risks, however, are the black swan events. Some people say that COVID-19 has been a black swan event. I kind of disagree with that because it was all mapped out quite comprehensively by a very smart guy called Bill Gates in a TED talk in about 2015.

And if you don't believe me, go look it up. But the most shocking thing is the thing that we don't know what's coming around the corner, and we must try and have a very agile and very strong organization, and that's the community as well as Org and the Board, to be able to deal with the next black swan that comes around the corner.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Nigel. We're going to take a little detour now and we're going to hand this over to Katrina, because I think she has got something to say to Chris. Katrina, over to you.

[KATRINA SATAKI:]

Thank you. Thank you very much, and thanks a lot to everyone, and thanks for ... Sorry for cutting off this very interesting discussion, but we had it prearranged, a little bit. So, Chris, this is your last meeting with the ccNSO in your capacity as the director on the board.

I know that you are already receiving some postcards, and I'll talk about them a little bit later, but now you have a great present from the ccNSO and, well, I hope you can unwrap it and share it—not share it, show it—to everyone. You will not be able to share it, unfortunately. And while you're showing it to everyone—

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Can you hear me?

[KATRINA SATAKI:]

Yes, we can.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Hang on a minute. Okay. So, it is a bottle of 2009 from ... Gosh. I can't tell from here. Spain. Sorry, my apologies. From Spain. And a bottle of 2011 [inaudible] from the ... And what can I say?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

“I am immensely grateful.”

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I'm immensely grateful, and I will enjoy [inaudible].

[KATRINA SATAKI:]

I have something to share with the—

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Hang on.

[KATRINA SATAKI:]

Yeah, okay.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

One sec.

[KATRINA SATAKI:]

Sure, sure.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Carry on.

[KATRINA SATAKI:] Okay. Thank you very much. So, I will. I will. And probably everybody knows Chris, but still the question is, who is he, and who is he for us? The easiest way is to ask it to Google, because Google knows everything, and if you Google keywords, “Chris Disspain, ICANN, from Latvia,” you’ll get this picture and a very interesting set of summaries on top, starting with Martin Boyle and ending with Keith Davidson, and another extreme ...

But the most interesting, perhaps, are the ccNSO and domain names. So, if we dig deeper into the Internet, and social media, and everything, of course, we want to know how this adorable child managed to grow and become the man we all know and love.

And I think it might have something to do with Chris’s taste in music. He loves Revolver and yet, also, An Innocent Man. Even if he managed to shoot somebody, he somehow got away with it and never got caught. So yes, revolvers are there, always ready to be used, but still an innocent man.

And he is also very well known for his ability to find the right words and summarize the most complex events and really put them in a really simple context for everyone to understand. Not only he speaks, he also writes down, and I hope that one day he will write his memoirs and,

there, we will all learn about all the great things he did and learned while being on the ICANN Board.

And I'm sure that, all the knowledge he acquired, he will be able to put in use, and I'm sure, again, that we will see a lot of new achievements from Chris. Thank you very, very much from everyone. On behalf of the ccNSO, thanks a lot for all your advice, your guidance, and your years of service to the ccNSO and the entire ICANN community.

Postcards from around the world, I know they have started pouring in and they will continue for at least a month or two because the world has grown big again and it takes some time for a postcard to arrive from one place to another.

Sorry we cannot hug you and thank you in-person. I hope that opportunity will still ... Is ahead of us. And with that, again, thanks a lot. If anyone wants to add anything, I will be happy to give it back to Jordan to manage the queue.

JORDAN CARTER: Wow. Okay.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I just—

JORDAN CARTER: Yes, I think we'll start with you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: [inaudible] just say thank you very much, everybody. I have started wonderful postcards. They're very [special]. So, also very special, thank you. But the most special thing is all of you, and friendship, and that's the most important thing.

So, thank you all very much. I really do appreciate it. I want to say a very special thank you to Bart, and to Kim, and to Joke, who make this whole thing run, it seems, amazingly well, and have done for a very long time, and Gabby, when she was there, and all the others who help. It's extraordinary, the effort that they put in to help all of us do what we do, so thank you to them, as well. And thanks very much.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Chris. And I don't know if people would like to get up on the soapbox and say a few words for Chris, or whether it might be a bit awkward? Lots of lovely comments in the chat.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Bart's hand has joined.

JORDAN CARTER: Ah, right. Okay. Well, there's one. Bart, go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Normally, I don't speak at these opportunities, but this is a special occasion so I wanted to use it. So, I hope I will not take too much of your

time, being around, now, for so long as I am—also with Chris. But I just want to mention a few instances.

I think the first one was—and I think everybody can recognize some of this—the first time I met Chris. I didn't know him. But it was in November 2000. It was at the Marriott Hotel in Los Angeles. And what is a nice coincidence, it was around a similar kind of event we'll be shortly facing. It was the election in the U.S. between Bush and Gore. So, think about that, talking about coincidences.

So, what was happening right there is you saw this well-dressed man, or I saw this well-dressed man, standing on the other side of the Marriott conference hall, some would say he was almost dressed up for this occasion, and standing next to Peter [LeBlond] and Peter [inaudible] at the time. And we—and that is the center crowd—was standing on the other side, and we were wondering, “Who is this guy? Who is this guy taking the microphone?” We didn't know him. He appeared at this ccTLD event during ICANN.

So, winding forward two years, he, Chris, and others, were selected—and there is no other word—as member of the Assistance Group to the Evolution and Reform Process Committee. It's a mouthful, but this was about the creation of ICANN 2.0.

From the ICANN side, we had Alexander [Passante] and [inaudible] on the board, and with staff support of Theresa Swinehart. And as you know, this resulted in the creation of the ccNSO in June 2003, talking about the [inaudible] process, by the way. But I do not want to go into

the details of this effort, or the myths surrounding it. I just want to make two small observations.

One is, as some of you will know, that Chris, Bernie, Becky, and others—and I think even you, Patricio—played an important role in the creation of ICANN 2.0, but you also played an important role in ICANN 3.0. So, talking about new blood in the ICANN environment, this is quite telling. It is 17 years' difference, or 15 years by the time.

Another observation I want to make is—and this is more for the younger listeners and co-Zoomers—that once you got involved in these intense processes, like the creation of the ccNSO or something like that transition, you start to know people really, really well.

And despite the geographic and time zone distances, and the cultural differences, you start to develop friendships. Some will fade away, but some will last, and I think that is one of the real, real values for everybody who is currently participating in this environment, to keep that in the back of your mind. Business is important but the personal relations, as well, maybe even are more important.

So, now coming to your gifts. Obviously, wine is the safe one, and we consulted Jill for this, up to a certain extent, because you need to know that Chris has an issue with [inaudible] of Cabernet Sauvignon. But that being said, there is so much choice. So, we had to decide which wine, and, what probably is more important, which year.

So, why 2011? I think, besides being a good wine, it stands for the level of maturity of the ccNSO when you left it to go to the board. The ccNSO

was no longer dependent on your 20 hours a week, in addition to what you do/did at the time for [AUDA]. The council organized its work to allow you to take on your role on the board. And thanks to your, I would say, vision to start the succession planning early, it really reached that level of maturity.

The second one, the Spanish one, is from 2009. So, let's start with the year 2009. This was an extraordinarily eventful year for you personally, and the ccTLD, and ICANN community in general, as you already heard on previous celebrations of your contributions.

I just want to mention a conclusion of the fast-track 11 years ago. The reason for taking this as an event is probably it proves, in my opinion, the added value of the ccNSO in the wider community. It showed to the world that the ccNSO, with the right leadership it always had and has had, since its creation, can make difference. So, that's one of the reasons for 2009.

The second reason for having Spanish bottles of wine is just for an insider's joke. At one point at the ICANN meeting in Rome, we were told that the bar did not have any wine anymore. So Chris asked, "Really?" And as the bartender reluctantly had to admit, "Yes, they still had Spanish red stuff." So, as a reminder of the red stuff we've had over the years, again, a gift.

Let me end with thanking you, first of all, for what you've done to date for the community and the broader community, but secondly, and probably, for me at least, more importantly, I want to thank you for 18

years of friendship ever since we embarked on the creation of the ccNSO. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bart. And just to finish this up, because so many people want to say things, we'll have to do this in person. But can everyone turn on your video, turn on your audio, and let's just do a bit of a weird online Zoom applause for Chris as if we were all in a room giving him a class. Come on, let's just do that. Thank you, Annabeth, for the suggestion. Happy looking bunch.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you all so much. I'm going to make the same request as I made yesterday in the interview. Could someone capture the chat for me, please? That would be amazing, if I could grab a copy of the chat. I'd do it myself but, if someone could, that would be cool. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: I'm pretty sure we can do that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And Bart, thank you so much. Bart, you and I will chat on [inaudible]. Thank you so much for everything you said. Take care, everybody.

JORDAN CARTER: And on that happy note, thank you so much for joining this session, and let's hang out for the time we can do this in-person.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Chris.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]